

## Appendix 1 – Schedule of Representations on the Town Centre SPD and the Council’s Response

Ref No	Name	SPD reference	Representation	Comments/Response
01spd	Resident	Town scale – car parking and access	<p>Free street parking for cars</p> <p>Public transport not good enough</p> <p>Free parking at Christmas</p> <p>Better access for disability parking and for parents.</p>	<p>There are currently no charges for on-street parking in Warrington. However, the council has committed to review its parking strategy as set out in policies NM4 and NM5 in the Local Transport Plan 4 (LTP4). LTP4 sets out a set of transformational set of policies and actions to support an objective to nearly treble local public transport use in Warrington. Details are set out in the Passenger Transport Chapter of LTP4.</p> <p>The council does not control all of the parking in the town centre and cannot readily influence the charging levels of privately managed parking. The council has from time to time provided discounts to support economic activity in the town centre, specifically aimed at short stay trips.</p> <p>LTP4 contains a policy to ensure disabled parking is accessible and convenient in the town centre (Policy NM8).</p>
02spd	Resident	TS5 Green spaces NS1 Town Centre Riverside	<p>More should be made of the riverside area around Bridgefoot with greening and lighting.</p> <p>Tall buildings are out of keeping with the town centre.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The SPD’s intention is to achieve these aims and specifies greening for day and night time use.</p> <p>Comment noted. However, the document only supports tall buildings in specific areas of the town centre and then only were they can be justified</p>

				through an appraisal.
03spd	Resident	N/A	1. When can we expect the Warrington Way on the Bridgewater Canal to be completed?	1. The Town Centre SPD has no relevance to the Bridgewater Canal.
04spd	Cheshire West and Chester	TS8	1. Need to reference consideration archaeological remains and reference this in the text and requirements.	1. Consider text and adjust accordingly.

Ref No	Name	SPD reference	Representation	Comments/Response
05spd	Business	N/A	1. Please send details of the town centre Mersey Project?	1. Not relevant to Town Centre SPD consultation. Response will be provided separately.
06spd	Resident	Town scale and car parking and access TS1 Town Centre Riverside	Welcome the plans to make the town centre The plans do not show improvements to Bank Park, Marshall Gardens and Queens Gardens	Comment noted.  The SPD is not meant to provide guidance as to the exact improvements to be made to green spaces, it is there to support Local Plan policies by highlighting priorities for improvement and directing s106 resources for those improvements.
07spd	Resident	Town Centre SPD Flooding	Welcome the SPD and hope it improves the town centre. Flooding needs to be considered especially with improved access to the river.	Comment noted.  Adjust the text on flooding.
08spd	Resident	Town scale – car parking and access	Discouraging parking for cars will reduce footfall in the town and make people go to retail parks.  Public transport not good enough  Through Traffic should be restricted	The aim of the proposals in this SPD are primarily around reducing long stay parking within the town centre, reducing the impact traffic has on the environment and to improve conditions for walking, cycling and public transport. Short term parking to support the visitor and retail sector in the town centre is not being reduced as a result of these proposals. LTP4 sets out a set of transformational set of policies and actions to support an objective to nearly treble local public transport use in Warrington. Details are set out in the Passenger Transport Chapter of LTP4. Comments noted. These aims are consistent with the proposed SPD and parallel plans to introduce

				measures to limit through traffic in the town centre, funded from the DfT Active Travel Fund.
09spd	Resident	Poor Quality of the streets (appendix 1) TS1 Street hierarchy. TS3 Town Centre travel plan	Agree with the findings Support improved cycle ways and pedestrian routes Bus services need improving	Comments noted. Comments noted.

Ref No	Name	SPD reference	Representation	Comments/Response
				LTP4 sets out a set of transformational set of policies and actions to support an objective to nearly treble local public transport use in Warrington. Details are set out in the Passenger Transport Chapter of LTP4.
10spd	Resident	TS1 Street hierarchy UB6 Incorporate sustainable design DS5 Appropriate conversion of property to residential use.	Ensure that principle of pedestrian and cycle routes are supported in future developments. Support sustainable heating and ventilations systems including conversions.	Note comments.  Note comments.
11spd	Coal Authority	No comments		
12spd	Belvoir Lettings	Whole SPD Urban Block Dwelling scale D5 Appropriate conversion of property to residential uses	Supportive of the approach and feels that this would respond to market demands in Warrington Would like to see more done on empty properties across the borough	Comments of support noted.  The SPD does provide guidance on the conversion of empty properties. There are other Council initiatives to address this issue including a Bridge Street task Force which is a joint initiative between the Council and the Warrington BID.
13spd	University of Chester	TS3 Car parking and town centre travel plan	Does this 'policy' only apply to new build or to conversions as well which may include other uses where there maybe existing parking? Also the calculation for off- site parking spaces should be amended.	The SPD applies to both new build development and conversions for all types of uses where they require planning permission.  This will be clarified when the Planning Obligations SPD and Parking Standards SPD is updated.

14spd	SMO -MMO	N/A	1. Have regard to the draft Northwest Inshore and offshore marine plans	1. Comment noted.
15spd	South Warrington Parish Councils		1. SWP would like to know how the SPD relates to the draft local plan given their desire to see town centre residential to save Green Belt.	1. a. The draft local plan currently has no planning status and the policies that the SPD supports are in the existing adopted Local Plan Core Strategy. b. However, the intention is to take forward some of the aspirations in the SPD such as national

Ref No	Name	SPD reference	Representation	Comments/Response
			<p>Protection of the town centre welcomed however needs modification.</p> <p>Any establishment of strategic policy should be rejected.</p> <p>How it will work in the determination of planning applications?</p> <p>How it relates to non-statutory plans including the central 6 Masterplan.</p> <p>Relevance of the LTP4 which is considered out of date and the role of the First and Last Mile Transport Masterplan (FLMTM).</p> <p>The First and Last Mile has not been subject to public consultation or democratic scrutiny.</p> <p>The Western link has no funding</p>	<p>dwelling size standards into the new draft Local Plan. The text has been revise to make this clearer.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Chapter 1 of the SPD makes clear that it will support the existing policies in the adopted Local Plan Core Strategy. The full list of policies that it supports are listed in Appendix A.</p> <p>Chapter 8 of the SPD explains how it will support in the assessment and determination of planning applications.</p> <p>Where the policy of the adopted Local Plan meets with the ambitions of the non-statutory documents it will support their implementation.</p> <p>The LTP4 was published in December 2019 and is therefore up to date. The intention is to review the LTP regularly, typically every five years.</p> <p>Recent government policies and guidance has reinforced the main aim of the Warrington LTP which is to tackle an overreliance on the private car for many journeys and support a move to greater use of more environmentally sustainable and low carbon modes of transport.</p> <p>In consulting on the SPD the proposals of the FLMTM, outlined in the Draft Executive Summary have been subject to public scrutiny and members are aware of the proposals.</p> <p>The Western Link has been given a conditional allocation of £142.5m by the DfT. Subject to statutory approvals and submission of a final business case, the road is programmed to start</p>

			support because the land allocations have not been agreed and does not impact on congestion in the way suggested.	on site in 2023. Further details can be found at: <a href="https://www.warrington.gov.uk/western-link">https://www.warrington.gov.uk/western-link</a>
--	--	--	---	---



Ref No	Name	SPD reference	Representation	Comments/Response
			<p>The plan fails to recognise that most trips in Warrington are by private car if the parking is restricted the town centre will suffer.</p> <p>Public Transport is not attractive enough to promote a modal switch.</p> <p>Some of the language needs to be simplified and the relationship between sections clarified.</p> <p>How will the National Design Guide be used?</p> <p>Reference to design codes should be made within the SPD.</p> <p>Failure to note wider air quality issues especially if roads are re-aligned.</p> <p>Context should be referenced in terms of building heights and not in general terms.</p> <p>The Conservation Areas in the town</p>	<p>The SPD is complementary to LTP4 which acknowledges high car ownership and use in Warrington and has approved policies and actions to tackle car dependency with measures to support walking, cycling and public transport. The Plan recognises that the majority of trips are by car, however, it has the intention of securing a modal shift by improving accessibility for sustainable transport modes and restricting car access.</p> <p>LTP4 sets out a set of transformational policies and actions to support an objective to nearly treble local public transport use in Warrington. Details are set out in the Passenger Transport Chapter of LTP4.</p> <p>Comment noted and the text has been simplified.</p> <p>The National Design Guide is the basis for the approach taken.</p> <p>Design codes are not yet adopted into national guidance and therefore have no status. The SPD will be amended when changes are made nationally.</p> <p>The SPD is concerned with the Town Centre, the modal shift and prevention of rat running through the town centre. The encouragement of sustainable transport will though have a positive impact on overall car journeys that use roads into the town centre.</p> <p>The SPD specifies that when buildings of height</p>

			centre should be reviewed as part of the SPD.	are proposed that applicants should assess the site and area as to the impact and suitability of a tall building in the location. Comment noted, it is intended that the Conservation Area Appraisals will be updated in the near future.
--	--	--	---	--

Ref No	Name	SPD reference	Representation	Comments/Response
			<p>The Master Plan for Wilson Pattern Street should be a proper planning document with public consultation.</p> <p>The reference to the re-use of buildings is welcome but should go further and support and promote such re-use.</p> <p>The Design Review Panel's status should be clarified including how it will be used. It should not override public opinion and should include community representation.</p> <p>The best quality of development should be achieved before securing s106 payments or CIL.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The SPD supports the conversion of property to good design standards in line with existing adopted policies. It is not a promotional document.</p> <p>The Design Review Panel is in line with good practice indicated in the NPPF to give professional comment on potential applications coming forward. The ultimate decision on planning applications lies with the members of the planning committee who will take into account the public views.</p> <p>The intention is to secure the best quality of development before any monetary planning obligations, the approach though does take into consideration viability on sites as well as constraints that mean some on site provisions such as green space may not be possible.</p>
16spd	Homes England	N/A	No comments.	

17spd	Resident	Para 2.4	<p>Convenient alternative modes of public transport (LRT) need to be provided to get a modal shift. Support pedestrian and cycle priority. This should include disability and mobility problems. More complete and integrated routes for pedestrians and cyclists</p>	<p>1-3 In approving LTP4 the Council set out a range of transformational policies and actions to improve transport in Warrington and deliver a significant modal shift in favour of public transport, walking and cycling. LTP4 included a commitment over the first 5 years to carry out further study and scheme development work. To date the First and Last Mile study of the town centre has been carried out, further development work has been undertaken on the Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) and a Mass Transit and Bus Priority study has been commissioned. These studies are expected to generate a series of schemes and projects</p>
-------	----------	----------	---	--

Ref No	Name	SPD reference	Representation	Comments/Response
		Para 2.6 How to take Warrington Forward	Need to focus on quick wins in a post Covid world.	which will delivery infrastructure improvements which support travel by sustainable modes and the enhanced provision of public transport services.
		Para 2.9 what makes a Great Place?	Visual consistency does not require conformity. Growth of Britons cities showed this. Agree there is potential to expand the residential population. Agree a stronger sense of place is required. What constitutes a sense of place for Warrington needs further exploration.	The SPD is not an action based Council document, its principle function is to support existing adopted planning policies and the implementation of other Council policy documents that may address Covid. It does support a post Covid approach to the environment by focusing on people's well-being. Comment noted. Comment noted. Comment noted.
		Para 2.12 A Highly Liveable Town	Agree Place making is fundamental to the town's future.	Comment noted.
		Para 2.15 How this can happen	Support for a Mersey green corridor. It would be advantageous to deliver	Support noted. Comment noted.
		Town scale (section 3) FLMMP	distinct quarters, but range of change will be slow. Support shift to a pedestrianised town centre with LRT. Modal shift will be difficult unless roundabouts and crossing points addressed and how residents can access the town outside of	12-14 In approving LTP4 the council set out a range of transformational policies and actions to improve transport in Warrington and deliver a significant modal shift in favour of public transport, walking and cycling. LTP4 included a commitment over the first 5 years to carry out

			<p>comfortable cycling and walking distance. Road layouts should support pedestrians and cyclists.</p>	<p>further study and scheme development work. To date the First and Last Mile study of the town centre has been carried out, further development work has been undertaken on the Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) and a Mass Transit and Bus</p>
--	--	--	--	---

Ref No	Name	SPD reference	Representation	Comments/Response
			<p>Unconvinced that the Western Link will reduce traffic along the Bridgefoot corridor.</p> <p>The parking position is supported though it may have an adverse impact on trade in the town. Residential parking should be discouraged but provision for overstaying should be made. Security in street design needs to be improved especially in areas where there is a night time economy.</p> <p>Shortage of parking at Warrington Central and Bank Quay stations. Support for greening streets and roads. Roofscapes that add colour should be encouraged.</p> <p>There are few tall buildings in</p>	<p>Priority study has been commissioned. These studies are expected to generate a series of schemes and projects which will delivery infrastructure improvements which support travel by sustainable modes and the enhanced provision of public transport services. A key objective the Western Link is to remove traffic from the town centre. The benefits of the scheme are set out in the Outline Business Case which can be found online at <a href="https://www.warrington.gov.uk/western-link">https://www.warrington.gov.uk/western-link</a>.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>During the consultation Cheshire Police's Designing Out Crime Officer was contacted for comment and supporting comments have been received from the Officer including the approach to design of active frontages which were found to support security in the town centre. Cheshire Police's Architectural Liaison Officer is also referenced in the SPD for prospective applicants to contact when considering security and design. The SPD has been adjusted to take account of car parking needs at the stations.</p> <p>Support noted.</p> <p>The SPD encourages the positive use of roof spaces to give animation to buildings as well as</p>
		Paragraph 3.41 Roofscapes		

		Paragraph 3.47 Taller Buildings	Warrington so careful though needs to be given to where they go.	additional space for residents of buildings. The SPD identifies where tall buildings may be considered and also indicates that proper analysis of a site should be undertaken.
--	--	---------------------------------	--	--



Ref No	Name	SPD reference	Representation	Comments/Response
			Development of tall buildings along the riverside may detract from creating a pleasant walkway along the river.	Site analysis is required where there are tall buildings proposed, this will inform design including that to river frontages.
		Paragraph 3.56 Heritage Assets and Historic Street Patterns	Efforts to conserve the historic building are welcome.	Comment noted.
			Efforts to retain and conserve the historic street pattern should be supported together with restoring the street pattern in other areas are supported.	Comment noted.
		Section 4 Neighbourhood Scale	The approach set out in the Neighbourhood scale is supported.	Comment noted.
		Development Quarters Ambitions	Bridge Street should be a priority for regeneration.	Bridge Street is a priority for the Council and a special task force has been formed with the Warrington BID to support improvements to this area.
			The large car park in the Time Square development may undermine use of public transport.	Comment noted.
			Welcome the regeneration of this area this should be the second priority to Bridge Street.	Comment noted.
		Stadium Quarter	Car parking for Central Station needs to be considered given the site opposite is to be developed.	Appropriate parking to support the town centre rail stations will be retained. TS4 supports additional car parking to serve the town centres two rail stations.
			Waterfront redevelopment is supported.	Support noted.
		Southern Gateway	Revised road space to give priority to pedestrians, cyclist and public transport is welcomed. Bus stops should be located for the benefit of	The First and Last Mile study sets a framework for how the streetscape and roads within the town centre should be enhanced and adapted to

			users not car traffic.	support walking, cycling and public transport.
--	--	--	------------------------	--

Ref No	Name	SPD reference	Representation	Comments/Response
		Bank Quay	Careful thought IS NEEDED to the redevelopment of the area if there is a HS2/NPR hub. Use of the station at present is restrict by traffic on Wilson Patter Street. Traffic needs to be reduced. Quality of the walk links between Bank Quay Station and the town centre are poor and need to be improved. Pedestrian crossings on Wilson Pattern Street and Parker Street need to be improved.	The council is currently lobbying government and other stakeholders to make the case for a combined HS2/NPR station in Warrington. However, at the current time this is not confirmed or funded. If these aspiration are realised, a review of plans around this part of the town centre will be carried out. The First and Last Mile study sets a framework for how the streetscape and roads within the town centre should be enhanced and adapted to support walking, cycling and public transport. Comment noted and passed on to the Transport section.
		Eastern Gateway	The Church Street/Dial Street/Mersey Street roundabout needs to be removed and replaced with a signalised junction. The townscape needs to be re-adapted to a town centre feel. Need is for safe east-west pedestrian and cycling routes. Object to tall buildings at the southern riverside as these are out of scale with town centre in this location.	This concept is proposed in the First and Last Mile study.  This is the aim of the SPD and the FLMTMP.  Proposed infrastructure is set out in LCWIP study as part of LTP4 <a href="http://www.warrington.gov.uk/LCWIP">www.warrington.gov.uk/LCWIP</a> . Comment noted. Any tall building proposed will need be or architectural merit and a site analysis and view analysis is required.
		Riverside Creating Strong Connections across neighbourhoods Provision of Public Open Space	Welcome the link between Bank Quay Station and Victoria Park. Network of active travel routes should be extended for three miles outside of the town centre. Additional and improved open spaces are supported.	Support noted.  Proposed infrastructure is set out in LCWIP study as part of LTP4 <a href="http://www.warrington.gov.uk/LCWIP">www.warrington.gov.uk/LCWIP</a> .  Comment noted.

Ref No	Name	SPD reference	Representation	Comments/Response
		Visual Consistency	Materials used in building should create visual consistency but should not be restricted to red brick. It might be good to create a community design panel.	The SPD does not preclude the use of materials other than brick.  Members of the public can already comment on the design of schemes either individually or through their Councillor.
		Creation of Clear Focal Points	This is supported. This is supported, young people should be consulted.	Support noted. Support noted.
		Multi-generation appeal Urban Block	Maximising active street frontages is supported.	Support noted.
		Noise and Air Quality	Anti-skid tyres and anti-skid road surfaces have increased noise per vehicle. Support therefore for reducing car access to the town centre and improving pedestrian, cycle and public transport	Comment noted.
		Sustainable Design Dwelling Scale/Layout Private External Amenity Conversions	Concerned about small size of dwellings in the town centre.  The approach is supported. This approach is supported. This is supported where the former use is not supported by available demand.	The SPD looks to address the size of dwellings by encouraging the adoption of national dwelling space guidelines. It also encourages a mix of dwelling sizes. Support noted. Support noted. Support noted.
18spd	Resident	Diagrams	1. Cannot comment because the diagrams are not clear.	1. Comment noted. The number and quality of diagrams has been improved in the final publication version of the document.
19spd	Manchester Airport	N/A	1. No comments.	

20spd	United Utilities	N/A	1. Any developers should contact UU regarding provision of and impact on UU infrastructure.	1. Comment noted and text has been amended to make reference to need to contact utility providers.
-------	------------------	-----	---	--

Ref No	Name	SPD reference	Representation	Comments/Response
21spd	Cheshire Police	<p>Para 4.35 Building Regulations as minimum standards</p> <p>Active Street Frontages</p> <p>Para 5.13 Defensible Space</p> <p>Para 5.17 Waste and cycle storage</p> <p>Para 5.33 and 5.34 communal and shared circulation space</p> <p>Para 6.13 habitable rooms and views</p> <p>Bream link in the document</p>	<p>Strong agreement with the need to see Building Regulations as minimum standards.</p> <p>Active Street frontages are a positive for street safety. This is supported as this is not always taken into account.</p> <p>Thanks for the reference to the Designing out Crime Officers. Comments on the need to properly secure cycles in containers that have natural surveillance.</p> <p>Waste storage that is not thought out can provide an arson risk so support the approach.</p> <p>Support the approach.</p> <p>The advice of dual aspect dwellings will assist in natural surveillance and security.</p> <p>Suggestion that similar to Cheshire East the document contains a link whereby schemes achieve Secure by Design status.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Support noted.</p> <p>Support noted.</p> <p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Support noted.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted and the text has been adjusted accordingly.</p>

Ref No	Name	SPD reference	Representation	Comments/Response
	Zerum on behalf of MSCP	Car parking proposals  Point TS3 1 and 2	Concern that the proposals in the town centre are at odds with development proposals for a car park at Parker Street. Zero car parking on residential developments questioned and feel it should be below the thresholds indicated in the SPD. However: Removed and replaced with a general presumption in favour of car free development TS3 amend and apply to the whole town centre area TS3 point 4 amend to allow sites on the edge of the central area to be considered for long stay parking Figure 8 amend the central boundary to exclude the Parker Street or add a designation for a car park.	The SPD wording has been amended to enable a proportionate parking development relevant to Bank Quay Station within the Central Area parking free area described in Figure 8 (now Fig.10 in Final document). The SPD has a starting point aimed at creating car free development but allows provision for parking to be provided by exception, subject to the case being demonstrated as to why it is essential for the specific needs of the development.
23spd	Squire Patton Bogg on behalf of PQ Silicas	TS2 paragraph 3.29 Paragraph 4.8	Fails to mention their site and their operations. Reference to adjacent land that may come forward in the future could mean their land and this is not acceptable as this would mean it is not going to be a manufacturing hub and contrary to the NPPF. The future operation of the business is not referenced and should be supported and the reference should be amended.	Comments noted adjustments to the diagram made. The reference to the Unilever site has been removed.  The SPD is a planning document it is not an allocation for use of land. Also it cannot

				reference all businesses in the town centre. It is noted that this is an established use and will continue in the foreseeable future.
--	--	--	--	---



Ref No	Name	SPD reference	Representation	Comments/Response
24spd	Environment Agency		<p>The general principles of the SPD are supported</p> <p>Flood risk should be set out more strongly especially in relation to the Southern Gateway and River Mersey.</p> <p>Greater protection should be given to enhancing and protection biodiversity.</p> <p>Greater emphasis should be given to multifunctional open space and wider environmental protection and enhancement of green space</p>	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>Comments noted and the text has been adjusted accordingly.</p> <p>Text relating to open space and biodiversity has been revised and updated.</p> <p>As above.</p>
25spd	Natural England	No specific comments just general comments	<p>NE supportive of the document.</p> <p>Green Infrastructure (GI) in developments in line with NPPF requirements.</p> <p>Green infrastructure can be retrofitted through green walls, green roofspaces and new tree planting, information is in the TCPA's good practice guide.</p> <p>Biodiversity enhancement with bat box and bird box provision for example.</p> <p>Landscape should provide positive contributions to biodiversity.</p> <p>SEA not applicable however if changes take place consult.</p>	<p>1- 5. Text relating to open space and biodiversity has been revised and updated.</p> <p>6. Comment noted</p>

26spd	Tourus	Consultation	<p>Wish to speak to the Council directly on the SPD.</p> <p><u>Sustainable Communities</u></p> <p>Support the focus on sustainable communities and the wider benefits they can bring.</p>	<p>The Council will maintain an ongoing dialogue with Tourus as a Registered Provider operating in the borough on the SPD and other development issues in Warrington.</p> <p>Support noted.</p>
-------	--------	--------------	---	---

Ref No	Name	SPD reference	Representation	Comments/Response
			<p>Detail on market capacity is required including tenure and balance of dwelling types.</p> <p><u>Building Heights</u>  Torus supports the principle of the need to control building heights. However Torus feels some of the heights alluded to in the draft SPD are aspirational and raise land owner aspirations on value which in turn gives viability challenge. Right mix of homes is more important. Tall buildings only one option.  Torus as a landlord does not have a preference for high rise apartment schemes and feel they are more difficult to manage and maintain and lend themselves to particular tenures.  Torus is committed to 2 apartment blocks for rent to buy in the town centre and feel that until it is known how these are received by the market more complementary schemes should be offered on sites elsewhere.</p> <p><u>Car Parking</u>  Agrees that car parking requirements in the town centre</p>	<p>Note the comments.</p> <p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Comments noted. SPD has been prepared taking viability issues into account.</p> <p>The SPD does promote a mix of housing typologies in a variety of locations across the town centre.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p>

			should be relaxed and not meet adopted standards.	
--	--	--	--	--

Ref No	Name	SPD reference	Representation	Comments/Response
			<p>Tourus feels that the SPD is introducing a new policy (car free parking) and objects to this blanket approach, including its potential impact on Mr Smith's site which they own.</p> <p>Removal of car parking is likely to raise expectations around land values as higher densities may result.</p> <p>Lack of car parking will reduce certain product types including on the riverside quarter.</p> <p>More research required around marketability and car free homes.</p> <p>Suggested that the car free zone is removed prior to adoption or the boundary reviewed removing the riverside site as it is not within the commercial core.</p> <p><u>Neighbourhood Quarters</u></p> <p>Tourus own Mr Smiths and would like to be involved in any Master planning.</p> <p>Guidance refers to a variety of housing typologies but also refers to</p>	<p>The proposed guideline does allow consideration of some parking, provided the developer can demonstrate that it is essential to the specific needs of the development.</p> <p>Removal of car parking is seen as important as part of making most efficient use of brownfield land and promoting sustainable transport modes.</p> <p>The proposed guideline does allow consideration of some parking, provided the developer can demonstrate that it is essential to the specific needs of the development.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Boundary to be retained. The proposed guideline does allow consideration of some parking, provided the developer can demonstrate that it is essential to the specific needs of the development. Sites south of Wilson Patten Street are very close to centre of the Town Centre and accessibility across the road would be expected to be enhanced through any development, which would serve to reinforce the inclusion of the sites within the Central Area.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p>

			12 storey buildings, Tourus do not feel they can support this at this stage.	
--	--	--	--	--

Ref No	Name	SPD reference	Representation	Comments/Response
			<p><u>Design and Living Standards</u> Supportive of the quality design and living standards in the draft SPD.</p> <p><u>Viability</u> Concerns on ongoing viability issues with £/sqm still modest. Need for grant to make the schemes a good product. S106 contributions a concern including contributions (T3) for the Town Centre Travel Plan which is based on equivalent price for parking space. The requirement to support sustainable transport connections to river through s106. Paragraph 4.11 which requires contributions for developments in the Town Centre Riverside quarter to support green space and footway improvements through s106. Clarity on town centre contributions S106 what is included and contributions.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>Comments noted. The SPD has been prepared taking viability issues into account.</p> <p>Reference should be made to the Planning Contributions section of the SPD and the guidance set out on viability and priority for contributions.</p> <p>Reference should be made to the Planning Contributions section of the SPD and the guidance set out on viability and priority for contributions.</p> <p>Reference should be made to the Planning Contributions section of the SPD and the guidance set out on viability and priority for contributions.</p> <p>Reference should be made to the Planning Contributions section of the SPD and the guidance set out on viability and priority for contributions.</p>

27spd	Lichfields on behalf of Altered Spaces	<p>General Comments</p> <p>Conformity with the Local Plan</p>	<p>Welcome the SPD but concerns with the approach – Has it been tested for viability impact? Is it feasible?</p> <p>Should not introduce new policy – the National Space standards are not part of the current Local Plan. The SPD presents opportunities for younger people to move into the town centre.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>Noted that they do not form part of the current Local Plan. However, the intention is to adopt the space standards through the revised Local Plan and will until such time be an aspiration of the SPD.</p> <p>3. + 4. The NPPF at para 91 indicates that decisions should aim to achieve healthy, inclusive and safe</p>
-------	--	---	--	--



Ref No	Name	SPD reference	Representation	Comments/Response
		Storey Heights S4.9 TS7	<p>Some of the expectation from the SPD will put significant burden on a developer. As well as the NDSS this includes open space and public realm.</p> <p>No explanation as to why the storey heights are acceptable and for the restrictions – requires for the developer to justify.</p>	<p>places. The requirements for open space and public realm are based on the Local Plan policies and the need to ensure that NPPF requirements are met. This is especially the case given Covid 19 impacts. The intention through the SPD as per Para 38 of the NPPF is to work with applicants to secure developments that will improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area.</p> <p>The storey heights in general reflect those of the Town Centre Masterplan which is an aspiration of the Council. The SPD relates to policy TC2 of the adopted LPCS, whereby environmental enhancement and quality is sought especially at gateways and on major sites. Supporting SPDs are mentioned. As part of a planning application applicants are required to provide design and access statements. Though there is less evidence submitted on an outline given the importance of town centre sites it is felt that to support the policy intention proposals being brought forward should address key issues that impact on the identity of an areas to ensure proposals are beneficial.</p>
		Town Centre Recovery	The SPD gives no other guidance for other types of development that can assist town centre recovery.	<p>The SPD has been prepared to meet with the current focus on redevelopment of brownfield sites in the town centre and to meet with urban intensification needs. Whilst the focus is on providing additional guidance for residential development because that were there is currently the most development pressure, it does provide guidance for all types of</p>
		General Approach	It should contain guidance on post pandemic recovery.	

				<p>development.</p> <p>The guidance in the SPD does respond to Covid issues in addressing the need to ensure residential amenity and amenity/green space standards. The SPD is not a document that makes policy including that for post pandemic recovery, it has to relate to existing policy.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

Ref No	Name	SPD reference	Representation	Comments/Response
			<p>Feel that the SPD should meet NPPF standards for Local Plans ‘aspiration but deliverable’.</p> <p>SPD not positive e.g. car parking requirements at zero.</p> <p>Some of the areas outside of the town centre boundary identified have no formal designation though all fall into the Inner Warrington areas. These have different policy aspirations.</p> <p>Town Centre boundary should only be changed in the Local Plan process. Existing town centre boundary should be used.</p> <p>Parcel blocks have no relevance and should be removed from any plan.</p> <p>Additional requirement on Design</p>	<p>The Council’s planning response to post pandemic recovery will be formed through government guidance including any revisions to the NPPF and through the revised Local Plan.</p> <p>It is felt that the SPD does meet this requirement. The SPD seeks to ensure sustainable development in the town centre that will be marketable and viable and to prevent speculative approaches on sites whereby over inflated values based on poor site and building design present site development or produce poor outcomes for residents and the town as a whole.</p> <p>Proposals for parking are intended to support creating a better town centre to live and work, creating a less car dependant culture and environment, and maximising the good public transport accessibility of the town centre. In that sense the SPD is considered positive.</p> <p>Comments noted. The SPD boundary has been revised to reflect existing designations in the adopted LPCS.</p> <p>The existing town centre boundary, defined in the adopted LPCS, has not been changed. However clarity on how the boundary sits with other allocations and aspirations of the SPD has been provided.</p> <p>Comment noted and the blocks have been removed from the TC Boundary plan.</p>
		Town Centre Boundary		
		Design Review		

			Review and its process should be provided.	The Design Review Panel is based on good practice and is run by Places Matter a RIBA north led
--	--	--	--	--

Ref No	Name	SPD reference	Representation	Comments/Response
		<p>Associated Documents</p> <p>Design Rationale</p> <p>Town Scale para3.2 Para 3.3 FLMTMP</p>	<p>It should not be a paid service and should be part of the pre-application process.</p> <p>Some conflict at paragraph 1.19 on the documents. Their status needs to be reviewed in terms of the SPD.</p> <p>'Highly liveable environment' is a vague concept and should be better defined.</p> <p>Document has not identified the fundamental benefits of higher residential development. Also some issues including air pollution, strategy for the town centre recovery, breaking down barriers and opening up a free flowing place. This should be part of the approach.</p> <p>Suburban living different to town centre/city living this needs to be defined.</p> <p>FLMTM needs to be published in full alongside the SPD. Costs cannot be borne by adjacent developers.</p>	<p>initiative. A link to the web site will be put in the text.</p> <p>Pre-application is a paid process. It is established process that Design Review is paid for.</p> <p>The documents quoted are adopted Council documents the relevance is related to joint objectives with Local Plan policy, which has been clarified.</p> <p>Comment noted. Disagree but the concept has been defined within the text.</p> <p>High rise living should be accompanied by proper amenity standards for residents including properly sized dwellings, private and public outdoor space, views and access to reasonable daylight. This is specified within the SPD, without this there is little advantage to high rise living.</p> <p>Comment noted the text has been revised.</p> <p>The FLMTM is being finalised and will be published alongside the final SPD. The Planning obligations text and associated SPD should be referred to. The expectation is that the delivery of FLMTM measures will come from a combination of public and private funding, delivered incrementally as opportunities are identified. In all cases where development occurs which has an impact on the transport and travel</p>

				<p>behaviour in the town centre a proportionate contribution to the FLMTM measures would be expected.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

Ref No	Name	SPD reference	Representation	Comments/Response
		<p data-bbox="477 592 696 624">TS1.2 TS1.3 – 1.4</p> <p data-bbox="477 951 696 983">Para. 3.8 to 3.14</p>	<p data-bbox="808 276 1283 584">Bream requirement should be deleted, cannot be required. Suggested amendment to the wording 'Applicants bringing forward development proposals are expected to have regard to Town Scale design principles where appropriate'.</p> <p data-bbox="808 592 1283 775">The SPD states it supports the FLMTMP but the FLMTMP has not been published and is placing additional burdens on the Developer.</p> <p data-bbox="808 783 1283 1046">Fig 4 does not show the granularity of the FLMTM so it one may not accord with the other, there may be better options which would not necessarily compromise either. Also it does not represent all of the street.</p> <p data-bbox="808 1054 1283 1206">Should be deleted as it suggests that development will be restricted if there is no funding for the FLMTMP.</p> <p data-bbox="808 1294 1283 1366">It is not for new development to address existing issues.</p> <p data-bbox="808 1493 1283 1525">Questions the wording as being</p>	<p data-bbox="1283 276 1924 735">This is an aspirational standard and is one that the Council wishes to keep in the SPD. To only have regard to the Towns Scale principles is not considered strong enough. To ensure that the NPPF aims of achieving well designed places and Local Plan policy is properly supported the current wording is required. The FLMTM is being published with the SPD. The requirements accord with the adopted SCI of the Council. The FLMTM follows the LTP4 document which is Council policy. The Plan has been revised.</p> <p data-bbox="1283 951 1924 1485">The wording does not restrict development, the contribution to parking off site is less than providing on-site parking so is not an increase in costs. Contributions and how they are to be applied are set out in the planning obligations guidance. Development however will impact on the existing infrastructure and the SPD is there to make sure the policy in the local plan (MP1 and MP3) is applied for new developments so as the situation is not made worse. The guidance is there to give more detail to policy and therefore needs to be firm in its intent.</p>

			vague and challenges 'won't not be permitted' and 'must be' comment this should not be used as the SPD is guidance.	
--	--	--	---	--



Ref No	Name	SPD reference	Representation	Comments/Response
		TS2 TS3	<p>Challenges the typologies and feel Scotland Road doesn't fit.</p> <p>Question the rational of the gateways and feel there should be more work including how they can function properly to improve liveability.</p> <p>Blobs on the diagram don't marry with TS2.</p> <p>Object to zero car parking suggest that any provision of over 5% should be challenged also commercial viability needs to be considered.</p> <p>Unclear on whether zero car parking is supported for the central area and how the Council will make cost effective parking available.</p> <p>Not clear how spaces will be calculated against costs of provision</p> <p>Electric charging points should be specified.</p>	<p>Disagree the designation of Scotland Road as an informal street is appropriate, with some areas of full pedestrian priority.</p> <p>Gateways have been defined better in the final published document.</p> <p>As above.</p> <p>The SPD has a starting point aimed at creating car free development, but allows provision for parking to be provided by exception, subject to the case being demonstrated as to why this is essential for the specific needs of the development. This exception would allow consideration of viability to be made.</p> <p>Publically available car parking is currently found within the Central Area. Each car park operator of these existing sites can influence availability of parking to different types of users via charging levels.</p> <p>S106 contributions will be required on a per space basis based on a calculation of what a developments parking requirements would be, were it situated outside of the town centre. The level of fee per space is to be set out in a separate updated Planning Obligations SPD.</p> <p>The Council has 58 electric vehicle charging points in the time square Multi Storey Car Park, and will be looking to expand or support further provision to deliver appropriate levels of EV</p>

				charging infrastructure across the town centre. If the inclusion of EV charging Infrastructure is deemed
--	--	--	--	--

Ref No	Name	SPD reference	Representation	Comments/Response
		TS4	<p>Further information on public car park strategy required.</p> <p>The Town Centre Travel Plan is only represented by a flyer, this is insufficient to rely on for the SPD. Also guidance does not specify the relationship with travel Plans produced for developments.</p> <p>How has the central area been defined for zero parking?</p> <p>Linkage to open space standards? Suggested that Council's standards can't be met on sites in the town</p>	<p>essential to the development, for instance by virtue of there being no nearby provision, this will be considered.</p> <p>The parking strategy approved in 2013 by cabinet is still in place, however, a full review of parking strategies and policies will be carried out in the first 5 years of LTP4 (approved in December 2019). The proposals for parking in this SPD are part of the process of reviewing and evolving the parking strategy for the town centre to support eh transport objectives set out in the LTP.</p> <p>The area wide travel plan is being developed to be launched later this year to coincide as the first of a number of town centre residential developments start occupation. An updated and more detailed Town Centre Travel Plan is to be appended to the final SPD for approval, containing more details on the range of incentives, discounts and measures which will be available to town centre residents and business to support less car dependant activity.</p> <p>The Central Area has been defined to reduce the number of long stay car trips with a destination in the town centre, which enter the core of the town centre or need to pass through certain junctions or streets which the council would seek to make less car dominated in order to park. It also seeks to identify an areas where new and existing residents and visitors can be well supported in terms of access to sustainable travel options.</p>

			centre.	It is accepted that smaller and more constrained sites that space standards may not be met, off site provision through s106 contributions will be expected.
--	--	--	---------	---

Ref No	Name	SPD reference	Representation	Comments/Response
		TS5	<p>What does all round year colour mean?</p> <p>Linkage to the FLMTM needs to be clarified.</p> <p>Suggested case by case better approach with focus on quality.</p>	<p>This is about the appropriate landscape and planting specification.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p>
		TS6	<p>Routes and connections should be identified.</p> <p>Challenge on the consideration of historic roofscapes on all sites. Need to update the text?</p> <p>Accommodation in roof spaces should be deleted as it is not deliverable.</p> <p>Suggests that no flat or monochrome roofs supported but viability would mean that they are unlikely to be proposed.</p> <p>Suggests that this guidance does not make sense and does not follow any contextual analysis.</p>	<p>There will be a case by case approach, the SPD is there to inform the developers of the Council's expectations this will help in bringing forward applications as Development Management will use it to provide advice.</p> <p>Do not see the need to identify all routes. Further work will be undertaken within the draft Local Plan.</p> <p>Disagree, unless there is contextual analysis then the impact cannot be assessed especially with buildings at height. The provisions set out meet with the Historic England guidance.</p> <p>Disagree with this statement, the use of roof spaces is an aspiration and the Council wishes to encourage their use.</p> <p>Again this is an aspiration of quality in design, and as the SPD wishes to support quality to improve land prices then this will help viability.</p>
		TS7 building heights	<p>Suggested revised text that significant buildings of height will be considered on their own merits with contextual analysis.</p> <p>Comments on wording including on what are the areas defined by eastern urban grain and wording</p>	<p>Disagree, this guidance looks at the whole town centre, for example where different uses and potential conversions can take place.</p> <p>Disagree, Warrington as a town has limited heights across its areas. The guidance allows for some taller buildings with a contextual analysis.</p> <p>Comments noted.</p>

			associated with it?	
--	--	--	---------------------	--

Ref No	Name	SPD reference	Representation	Comments/Response
		Neighbourhood Scale	<p>Gateways don't match with Town Scale needs to differentiate. This is an issue for Scotland Road site which is defined in 2 areas.</p> <p>Relationship between gateways is required.</p> <p>Eastern Gateway doesn't identify the opportunity for commercial office space.</p> <p>The Cockhedge Centre retail is not recognised nor the need for rationalisation of its shopping offer.</p> <p>Suggested revised text references the western part of Cockhedge with Taller buildings permissible.</p> <p>Section 106 linkages should be deleted. FLMTMP should be funded by the Council.</p> <p>Bullet points lack clarity with regard to what is meant by poor amenity with no standards.</p> <p>Additional guidance for the Eastern Gateway what is this?</p>	<p>Comments noted. The text and definition of gateways has been revised.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Policy TC1 of the LPCS refers to sustainable uses in this location. If office is sustainable it may be allowable. The text has been altered to reflect policy wording.</p> <p>The SPD is not a Masterplan or a policy allocation. The centre is noted in the Local Plan. Again the sustainable development wording in the policy needs to be reflected. Proposals would then need to meet this whatever the use.</p> <p>This is not appropriate as the contextual analysis offers the approach to look at the site and determine what is appropriate including height and location of tall buildings on a site.</p>
		NS2 Gateway connections	<p>Does not explain why the routes are important just the destinations.</p> <p>Why would anybody walk along these routes?</p>	<p>Disagree, the planning transport policies in the Local Plan MP1 require funding to be provided.</p> <p>Bullet points have been reviewed and clarification added where it is considered necessary.</p> <p>Reference to additional guidance deleted.</p> <p>The routes have been identified in the FLMTM as important routes for pedestrians and cyclists.</p>

Ref No	Name	SPD reference	Representation	Comments/Response
		NS3 Open space	<p>You cannot maximise sun penetration on schemes due to existing built development.</p> <p>Reference to public access to private space confusing.</p> <p>There should be no requirement to liaise with 3<sup>rd</sup> parties this puts far too much burden on a developer.</p> <p>SPD cannot require accreditation for secure by design.</p> <p>Not the job of developers to review the FLMTM.</p> <p>Mentions neighbourhoods but does not define.</p>	<p>The guidance is to maximise sun light within the context of the site.</p> <p>Text revised to clarify the requirements for public and private space.</p> <p>Disagree, paragraph 127 of the NPPF (f) refers to safety, including the need to make sure crime does impact on amenity. Seeking the views of the Police on design will help this.</p> <p>As with any scheme the developer should have regard to relevant transport guidance and policies.</p>
		NS4 Visual Consistency	<p>Suggest developments should complement their areas revised wording provided.</p> <p>Do not agree that brick should be the predominate use of materials especially with Tall buildings.</p>	<p>Further clarification is provided to define the neighbourhoods.</p> <p>The aim is to improve design quality. If there is existing poor design then reflecting this will not raise standards.</p> <p>The use of other materials is not excluded the requirement is to present materials that add to and improve the appearance of areas.</p>
		NS5 Community and Cultural Facilities	<p>These should be identified on a plan, including what is sustainable access.</p> <p>Unlikely developments will provide monuments and halls.</p>	<p>Sustainable access is that which allows for good walking, cycling and access for all types of disability as a priority for access.</p> <p>This is understood however contributions on larger developments are sought for sports and community facilities.</p>
		NS6 Make it accessible with multi- generational appeal	<p>What are access best principles</p>	<p>Reference has been made to specific legislation/regulations.</p>
		Urban Block scale	<p>At the end of paragraph 6.2 add in if</p>	<p>Wording changed, to reflect the aim for dual</p>



			appropriate that single aspect dwelling should be allowed	aspect dwellings however allowing single aspect where good residential amenity standards can be achieved.
--	--	--	---	---

Ref No	Name	SPD reference	Representation	Comments/Response
			<p>Guidance on size of dwellings vague</p> <p>Dual aspects contradictory not possible to arrange around a courtyard.</p> <p>Dual aspect will impact on viability</p> <p>BTR or PRS cannot be mixed with other tenure this is in the NPPF and PPG.</p> <p>No requirement to exceed building regulations.</p> <p>Not explained what an Urban Block is.</p> <p>Change wording at 5.4 to include 'have regard to' where it says proposals should reference predominate patterns of pedestrian and cycle movements'</p>	<p>Guidance is based on National Design guidance. The requirements for dual aspect dwellings have been revised to allow some flexibility in recognition that it may not always be possible to meet this aspiration.</p> <p>A proper viability assessment is required as part of the application process. Developers should have regard to comparable schemes and costs. Comment noted.</p> <p>This is an aspiration. The text has been revised to reflect this.</p> <p>The introductory text has been revised to explain what is meant by an urban block.</p> <p>It is not considered necessary to change the wording.</p>
		UB1 Active Street frontages	<p>Contradicts how active frontages can be achieved as these are mainly commercial, it is a planning application detail.</p> <p>Street level residential may not be appropriate.</p>	<p>An active frontage can include appropriately designed residential at ground floor an example is show in the figures.</p> <p>This will need to be defined through the contextual analysis and viability.</p>
		UB2 Properly Plan for the servicing of buildings	<p>Topographical issues on sites may stop access to all and visibility.</p> <p>Waste storage and servicing needs to be in accessible areas at ground floor.</p>	<p>Ensuring appropriate access for all is a key requirement in terms of the Council's equalities duty.</p> <p>This is acknowledged in the policy requirement. However it should not be at the expense of amenity and should be sufficient to meet Council</p>

				policies.
--	--	--	--	-----------

Ref No	Name	SPD reference	Representation	Comments/Response
			<p>The requirements cannot be met for habitable rooms to face the street. This should be deleted.</p> <p>It may not be possible to locate all storage as detailed in the guidance No planning basis to require a post room to be located at the reception area of a building.</p> <p>Servicing may not be possible at the quietest part of day and not at night. DGN1 parking and servicing is out of date.</p> <p>Not all space should be green and 'as appropriate' should be added to UB3.1</p> <p>UB3.1 roof spaces should be considered with regard to viability.</p> <p>Where are new spaces to be located and why should there be a link if there is on site provision? Unclear how this can be achieved and no policy basis.</p>	<p>Efforts should be made to meet this requirement and with dual aspect dwellings this is easier to achieve.</p> <p>As stated in the guidance this should be discussed with the authority at an early stage.</p> <p>Comment noted. This requirement has been removed.</p> <p>As stated early engagement is required. The standards for waste are those adopted by the Council.</p> <p>Efforts should be on making space green as this is considered most beneficial and especially important in residential developments.</p> <p>Where possible use of roof space should be explored.</p> <p>There is a requirement for variety of open space infrastructure to be provided for residents including green links between buildings and spaces.</p> <p>This is contained in policy QE3 Green Infrastructure.</p>
		UB3 Green space and amenity space		
		UB4 Instilling a sense of community	Double loaded corridors should be identified as a viable provision for new development	Double loaded corridors with single aspects are not considered to be the optimal design approach nor do they give a sense of connection between residents.
		UB5 Noise and Air Quality	Issues should be considered on a site by site case. Not clear why Air Quality and Noise	The purpose of the SPD is to give clear guidance on the Council's expectations for developers to

			should be considered here as these	consider prior to application. It is considered important to assess any impacts at the start of the design process so that appropriate measures and mitigation can be taken into account
--	--	--	------------------------------------	---

Ref No	Name	SPD reference	Representation	Comments/Response
		<p>UB6 Incorporate Sustainable Approaches to Design</p> <p>DS1 Dwelling size DS2 Dwelling Layouts</p>	<p>should be part of pre-application discussions.</p> <p>How is a design led response to the issues achieved?</p> <p>Conflict with guidance on balconies elsewhere.</p> <p>Noise mitigation is not achieved through trees and landscape treatments.</p> <p>No policy requirement to exceed Building regulations</p> <p>BREEAM has no planning weight and there is no policy standing in the local plan and all should be deleted.</p> <p>No basis for dual aspect dwellings and to say single aspect including north facing dwellings do not provide residential amenity.</p> <p>No guidance on how this can be delivered in a commercially viable way.</p> <p>Maximising glazing may be against building regulations and work against viability.</p> <p>Dual aspect is dependent on the site and aspect.</p>	<p>at the design stage and not retro fitted or fudged at a later stage.</p> <p>By consideration of the impacts and understanding of how mitigation can be creatively put into the design at the outset rather than dealing with issues retrospectively.</p> <p>Not necessarily as there may be different opportunities through design to do both.</p> <p>At lower levels trees, planting and hedges can provide barriers to noise in dwellings as well as filtering noise at high levels.</p> <p>Text has been amended to exceed Building Regulation requirements as an aspiration.</p> <p>Text has been amended to seek this aspiration.</p> <p>The text has been amended to clarify that single aspect dwellings may be acceptable where they can provide good daylight and outlook. It is still the Council's aspiration to maximise dual aspect dwellings wherever possible.</p> <p>As 95 above.</p> <p>Disagree – the Council considers maximising glazing where practical will provide for better residential amenity. The Council will not seek any development that would not comply with building regulations and the SPD recognises viability issues.</p> <p>As 96 above.</p>

			Figure 18 relates to a house.	Fig.18 is based on a design for a dual aspect apartment.
--	--	--	-------------------------------	--

Ref No	Name	SPD reference	Representation	Comments/Response
		DS3 Private Amenity Space	<p>Private amenity space is not achievable in all schemes, communal space should be considered as private space.</p> <p>Should be updated to reflect private communal space.</p> <p>Conflicts with providing communal space.</p> <p>How can winter gardens be provided. Should be deleted.</p> <p>No policy basis for external private amenity space</p>	<p>Comments noted. It is acknowledged that this may not be achievable in all cases and the requirement has been amended to allow some flexibility.</p> <p>Text revised</p> <p>Text revised</p> <p>Reference removed</p> <p>Local Plan policy SN7 promotes design that creates well- being including a mixture of tenure and dwelling types. Private amenity space is an important component of this.</p> <p>Precedent images to be supplied. The SPD provides design guidance not a detailed design code.</p>
		DS4 Noise and Air Quality issues in Dwelling Design	<p>Pre applications can't consider ventilation systems.</p> <p>No issues in Warrington Town Centre that would require an out of the norm approach.</p> <p>There is no viability evidence accompanying the SPD</p>	<p>This is not about ventilation systems. It is about consideration of natural ventilation and how constraints may impact on the site. The proper consideration of ventilation should therefore be considered early in the design process.</p> <p>There are air quality and noise monitoring areas that require consideration.</p> <p>Viability has been considered in preparation of the SPD, linking in with viability work being prepared in support of the Local Plan and recent</p>



				applications for town centre schemes.
--	--	--	--	---------------------------------------

Ref No	Name	SPD reference	Representation	Comments/Response
		Planning Obligations	Contributions to sustainable transport options should be through standard travel planning obligations No need for other sustainable transport contributions in a well-connected town.	Policy MP4 of the Local Plan allows for contributions toward to public transport and MP3 for contributions to walking and cycling.  The high level of usage of car trips in the town centre and road layouts present barriers to pedestrians and cyclist mean that improvements are needed
			Comments on the fact the open space standards can't be met in and should be assessed on case by case basis. Maintenance of public open space provided by the Developer is unreasonable. Places matter review should be paid for by the Council	It is stated in the guidance that this will mean an off- site contribution  Contributions to establishment and maintenance are common practice, this is usually through a section 106 payment. As part of the pre-application process it is considered that the developer should pay for the review as it will ultimately expedite the overall planning application process.
		Design and Planning Process	Significant abnormal costs will arise for developments  The SPD needs a viability test	Comment is noted but as previously all applications need to provide viability evidence with comparable schemes As above viability has been considered in preparation of the SPD, linking in with viability work being prepared in support of the Local Plan and recent applications for town centre schemes.
		Conclusions	The aspirations need to be deliverable.	It is considered that the aspirations are deliverable and will contribute to the health and well-being of residents as well as raising land values in the town to support good quality development.

28spd	Our Green Warrington	Overall SPD	1. Support the overall intent of the document to reduce vehicles, improve residential standards and green the town centre.	1. Support noted.
-------	----------------------	-------------	--	-------------------

Ref No	Name	SPD reference	Representation	Comments/Response
		Para 3.2 Design Review	This is supported but query what the Council will do if design standards are not met.	The Council will use the SPD to strengthen its ability to secure high quality design and it will be a material consideration in the determination of planning applications.
		Para 3.3	Support enhanced connectivity again what will the Council do to support this.	The Council will seek planning obligation contributions, where possible support through its own capital programme and seek grant funding where available.
		TS4 Maximise the river as a place making feature	Support this concept but feel both sides of the river should be made accessible with public art and picnic tables. Access to Victoria Park would encourage more visitors if the industrial centre and recycling site were avoided. Lighting should be considered.	This may achieved in the future however the first step is to get access from the town centre side of the river. Lighting would be a matter of detail at the time of works.
		TS5 Green Infrastructure	Support the approach. Question whether this can be enforced and whether the SPD should be more prescriptive. Suggest demolition of buildings on the edge of Golden Square and suggest green planting. What can WBC do if the developers do not meet s106 requirements?  Would planning permission be refused if a Landscape Architect is not employed? Would design guidance include public furniture for residents use? Support this approach, could visuals be provided.	Where the provision of green infrastructure is part of the planning policy this can be supported. The SPD however cannot allocate sites for different purposes as this is the role of the Local Plan.  The S106 is a legal agreement and attached to the planning permission. If a developer fails to meet s106 requirements legal action can be taken. This cannot be enforced but can be encouraged through pre-application discussions.  The Council has separate guidance in terms of provision of street furniture.

		3.44 Roofscapes	Support the approach	Precedent images have been provided in the final published version of the document. Support noted.
--	--	-----------------	----------------------	---

Ref No	Name	SPD reference	Representation	Comments/Response
		TS7 Building heights and the human scale	What can the Council do if development proposals are dumbed down at a later stage?	The application will be conditioned to the design and changes will require planning permission which is likely to be refused if there is not a valid reason for them.
		TS8 Heritage Assets	Can WBC stipulate the use of experienced conservation architects in conservation areas?	This is something that be encouraged through pre- application discussions but not enforced.
		Neighbour Quarters – overview	Should Dial St/St Elphins/Church St conservation area be considered?  Could more public engagement be specified for designing of new neighbourhoods?	The conservation areas identified are the ones in the boundary of the town centre, these will be reviewed in the near future.  As a matter of course developers should carry out public consultation. Although the Council cannot be prescriptive, extensive consultation will be encouraged.
		Warrington Riverside Eastern Gateway NS6 Make it accessible with multi-generational appeal	What steps can be taken to ensure that there is inspirational design at the Riverside?  Should more specific representations on the architecture and design intent be provided?	The design guidance promotes good design and will seek to ensure that its aspirations are met for the riverside.  This is outside of the scope of planning guidance the SPD though examples of good practice will be provided.
		UB3 Greenspaces and Amenity Space within Urban Blocks	This is supported, could tenure blind typologies for housing be specified.	Design should result in tenure blind developments and the Council will support this approach in development.  If a site cannot accommodate on site provision then policy requires contributions to off-site provision.
		DS3 Provide private amenity space to all dwellings The role of the Warrington Design Panel	Supportive but question what would be acceptable if developers were not to provide green space and amenity space in developments? Support, can WBC support a refusal	The SPD will have weight in the determination of planning applications. The emerging Local Plan

			of planning on this?	will seek to support and strengthen this approach further.
--	--	--	----------------------	--

Ref No	Name	SPD reference	Representation	Comments/Response
		Other comments	<p>Question of the Design Panel members and their experience</p> <p>Lack of public engagement at pre-applications stage.</p> <p>More public engagement should be specified</p> <p>SPD Should be more specific.</p>	<p>All will be built environment professionals with extensive experience and understanding of Warrington.</p> <p>As above the Council cannot prescribe what pre application public engagement a developer carries out, but it is strongly encouraged as part of the pre- application process.</p> <p>As a matter of course developers should carry out public consultation. Although the Council cannot be prescriptive, extensive consultation will be strongly encouraged.</p> <p>The Council at this stage cannot be more prescriptive in design. Proposals nationally for design codes if introduced may allow this to take place.</p>
29spd	Historic England	<p>General Comments</p> <p>TS7 The human scale and taller buildings</p>	<p>Supportive of the general approach and note that it concurs with Central Government's design quality agenda.</p> <p>Concern though on the Conservation Area Appraisals (CAA) as these were last update in the early 2000s</p> <p>Provides prescriptive advice however the impact on the historic environment has not been assessed.</p> <p>Up to date CAA, 3 D modelling, setting and view analysis would help insure that the SPD is place specific.</p> <p>Welcome the mapping of all heritage assets in the town centre</p>	<p>Note support.</p> <p>Conservation Area Appraisals to be updated in the near future.</p> <p>Note the CAA advice but feel this approach is overly prescriptive.</p> <p>Note comments but this is not the role of the SPD</p>



			including further graphics. Recommend further background work is down.	Note Comments
--	--	--	--	---------------

Ref No	Name	SPD reference	Representation	Comments/Response
30spd	Resident	General Comments	<p>Updates are welcome</p> <p>Transparency in the planning process is encouraged</p> <p>General comments made on the planning application process including 14 day consultation process is unfair.</p> <p>Some concerns on the uploading of applications and time limits.</p>	<p>Comment noted</p> <p>Comment noted</p> <p>This is in line with the Council's adopted SCI</p> <p>This will be fed back to Development Management</p>
31spd	Savills on behalf of Alaska UK Trustee Ltd	<p>General Comments</p> <p>NPPF/Emerging Local Plan and Masterplan</p> <p>TS7 Taller buildings</p> <p>TS2 Golden Square as a gateway and part of NS1</p>	<p>The SPD provides a barrier to increasing town centre residential development that is in the 2020 Town centre Master Plan.</p> <p>Golden Square should be identified as a gateway location</p> <p>NPPF at paragraph 123 urges the intensification of the use of urban land and density. This is in both the Masterplan and Draft Local Plan. The taller buildings 'policy' looks to restrict height of buildings. This will limit the ability to deliver 8000 dwellings.</p> <p>Other sites can take taller buildings.</p> <p>Taller buildings should be located next to Golden Square because it</p>	<p>The SPD is in line with the Town Centre Masterplan and looks to supplement the adopted Local Plan Core Strategy to facilitate increased residential development in the town centre.</p> <p>The southern extent of Golden Square is within a 'Key Gateway' whilst Golden Square as a whole is important shopping and leisure destination that is reached by entering gateways /entrance points to the town.</p> <p>The NPPF also requires at paragraph 122 (c, d, e) that sustainable transport is promoted; desirability of maintaining an area's prevailing character and setting; and the importance of securing well designed, attractive and healthy places.</p> <p>Taller building have not been precluded in other areas however a contextual site analysis is required in all cases.</p>

		Time Square and the Cultural Quarter.	has car parking and at a gateway.	The SPD identifies the potential for taller buildings in Gateway Locations. Any taller building proposals need contextual analysis to ensure the will be acceptable in design and planning policy terms.
--	--	---------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--

Ref No	Name	SPD reference	Representation	Comments/Response
			<p>As a gateway it has 1000 parking spaces and is sited of Midland way and connected to the bus exchange and this should be supported.</p> <p>It is also part of the Time Square and cultural quarter of the town and this should recognised in the neighbourhood scale which encourages diversification of uses.</p>	<p>The parking at present is supporting commercial activity in the centre any change of this and requirements for residential car parking will need to be discussed as part of any proposals coming forward.</p> <p>Properly considered diversification of uses are not discouraged and will be considered in their context. The area is within the Time Square and Cultural quarter and is identified as part of the commercial core.</p>
1Lspd	Trans Pennine Trail	<p>Summary</p> <p>SPD area map and the Trans Pennine trail</p> <p>Para 2.7 TS1 para 3.3 Para 3.4</p> <p>Para 3.8 Fig 5/6</p> <p>TS3, para 3.16 to 3.26, TS4 para 3.38paraa 3.32, 3.39</p>	<p>The documents do not reference LTN1/20 guidance for walking and cycling as per the DFTs latest guidance</p> <p>Further weight can be given to the SPD to indicate how new facilities will be fully accessible to all residents and visitors.</p> <p>Though not directly impacted by consultation there is an opportunity to promote the links to the trail and the national cycle route (NCN62).</p> <p>No reference to cycling</p> <p>Pedestrian and Cycling connectivity should also be fully accessible</p> <p>Pedestrian focused town centre is noted but would be good to highlight secure cycle parking will be provided</p> <p>LTN1/20 should be followed for new</p>	<p>This representation was received late, but as a partner organisation it is noted that the Trans Pennine Trail have made a number of constructive comments.</p>

			cycling and walking schemes	
--	--	--	-----------------------------	--

Ref No	Name	SPD reference	Representation	Comments/Response
		<p>Fig 9</p> <p>Neighbourhood scale</p> <p>UB2</p> <p>FLTMP Exec summary</p>	<p>Does not show segregated walking and cycling and keys are needed</p> <p>No reference to cycle parking</p> <p>Reference cycling provision needed</p> <p>Link to Trans Pennine trail can be made within this drawing</p> <p>Guidance LTN1/20 should be referenced</p> <p>Plans for servicing should not be detrimental to the sustainable transport offer.</p> <p>Doesn't meet latest sustainable transport guidance</p> <p>Fig 5 does not show and para 3.3 cycling provision</p> <p>Signage for the Trans Pennine trail and national cycle route should remain.</p> <p>Safe cycling crossing points should be provided as well as safe pedestrian crossings</p> <p>Para 4.1 Sankey Street image does not include cycling provision. Is this to be pedestrian only?</p> <p>Para 4.3 It is not clear whether Scotland Road is to be pedestrianised.</p>	