

# Halton Lea Town Centre Strategy

Draft Supplementary Planning Document

Statement of Consultation  
January 2007



Halton Borough Council

# **Halton Lea Town Centre Strategy**

Draft

Supplementary Planning Document

## **Statement of Consultation**

Environmental & Regulatory Services  
Environment Directorate  
Halton Borough Council  
Rutland House  
Halton Lea  
Runcorn  
WA7 2GW

## Introduction

Under the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 it is a requirement to prepare and publish a Statement of Consultation for a range of planning policy documents, including Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs). This is a reflection of Government's desire to "strengthen community and stakeholder involvement in the development of local communities". The Council has adopted the Statement of Community Involvement (SCI), this sets out how the public will be consulted on new planning policy and significant planning applications. This Statement of Consultation has been prepared to meet the requirements of the SCI, and also aims to reflect the intentions of Government planning guidance for reporting on community involvement in the plan making process.

This Statement of Consultation sets out the comments and representations made, and the response to them, in respect of the Partnership Consultation Stages conducted by Halton Borough Council, in relation to the Halton Lea Town Centre Strategy SPD. This Statement of Consultation has been produced in accordance with Regulation 17 (1) and 18 (4) of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004.

The period of formal public participation on the Halton Lea Town Centre Strategy SPD will be conducted in early 2007. The document will be made available at various deposit locations throughout the Borough, along with a copy of the public notice of 'SPD Matters and Public Participation', Representations Forms, the Sustainability Appraisal Report and an explanatory letter. Each of the aforementioned documents has also been made available on the Council website and in various formats upon request.

Statutory consultees (as outlined in Planning Policy Statement 12 - Local Development Frameworks, Appendix E) will be consulted specifically via letter with an individual copy of the draft SPD attached. In addition, those individuals on the Council's Local Development Framework consultation database that had requested to be informed of the publication of the draft SPD will also be sent a covering explanatory letter, a copy of the public notice of SPD Matters and Public Participation, and a Representation Form.

# Internal Partnership Consultation

**Internal Partnership consultation period: 2 September 2005-16 September 2005**

**Date of consideration of representations: October 2005**

Note – All paragraph and page references relate to the numbers as set out in the partnership consultation draft

Consultee	Date comments received and how responded	Comments	Response
Michelle Baker	No comments received		
Mike Bennett	No comments received		
Angela Boag Property Services	No comments received		
Ian Boyd Transport Co-ordination	Via email 16/09/05	See comments for David Hall.	
Arnīs Buklovsķis Development Control	No comments received		
Gary Collins Economic Development	Via email 15/09/05	See comments below	
Para 2.9 there are lots of TC numbers but TC 3 and 7 are missing. I know you mention relevant – but it will make people wonder what they are about – can we just not add these in so the number sequence is not broken?			No change. TC3 and 7 are not relevant to Halton Lea.
Para 2.10. is not the SPD trying to implement the community strategy. Think you need more about CS, particularly the vision statement. Also under safe and attractive reference, there is an objective that states ‘ to manage town centres effectively’ - needs to be referenced.			Agreed. More details about the Community Strategy have been included.
Para 3.3 who produced the guide?			Insert (ODPM, 2005)

Consultee	Date comments received and how responded	Comments	Response
		Does/should the SPD take into account emergency planning issues. What happens if we need to evacuate – where do they go etc. talk to Spencer Webster.	No change. This issue is more appropriately covered by the overarching town centre strategy.
		Section 106 – need to keep this as wide as possible for all uses of such money. For example, if cleansing needs to be enhanced/or more town centre management, can we get S106 monies for that – lump sum banked and use the interest.	<p>It would not be appropriate to seek S106 monies for such day to day town centre management matters as street cleaning.</p> <p>It should be noted that a planning obligation (i.e. a section 106) must be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) relevant to planning;</li> <li>(ii) necessary to make the proposed development acceptable in planning terms;</li> <li>(iii) directly related to the proposed development;</li> <li>(iv) fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the proposed development; and</li> <li>(v) reasonable in all other respects.</li> </ul> <p>We have to ensure that we meet each of these criteria.</p> <p>Section 11 of the Design for Community Safety SPD refers to appropriate schemes within town centres for which planning obligations, in the form of S106's agreements, may be sought.</p> <p>Refer to response to comments from Alan West for more details.</p>
Phil Cornthwaite	Meeting held 7/9/05	See comments below	
		Accessibility is one of the LTP priorities including transport barriers and social exclusion.	Chp 2 Policy Background – this is now dealt with by an insert at para 2.16.
		Need to make reference to relevant documents (LTP, walking and cycling strategies and draft accessibility plan)	Chp 2 Policy Background – insert reference to these documents after para 2.17.
		Include reference to Travel Plans (UDP policy TPI6)	Insert reference to policy TPI6 as bullet point to para 2.9
		Expand Paras 1.1 and 1.2 to explain succinctly the difference between the individual town centre strategies and the over arching document.	Agreed, paras 1.1 and 1.2 expanded to more explicitly explain the difference between the individual town centre strategies and over arching document.

Consultee	Date comments received and how responded	Comments	Response
		Links to greenways, current cycle ways and rights of way – possible need to include a map	Expand routes shown on Plan 4 to include cycleways and public rights of way (plan to be completed).
		Refer to LTP Parking Strategy	Reference inserted in Policy Background (Section 2.0)
		Very little parking owned by the Council therefore Private Partnerships are of importance.	Refer to response received in connection with meeting with Alan West (see below)
		Cross refer to Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act (Duty to consider crime and disorder implications)	Insert reference after para 2.4
		A new access adjoining Cineworld is a possibility. Speak to Alan West about the parking strategy for the whole centre.	See comments re meeting with Alan West 4/11/05
Alan West	Meeting 4/11/05		
		The pedestrian circulation strategy for HL involved the construction of footpaths circa 5 years ago.	Noted, amend 'Proposals' accordingly.
		A new vehicular access into Trident Retail Park off the Hallwood Link Road roundabout is planned.	Noted, amend 'Proposals' accordingly.
		There is no 'shopping list' of proposals for town centres in connection with major development proposals and S106 agreements. Each development would be considered on a case by case basis.	Noted, amend 'Proposals' accordingly.
		Parking Partnerships – most town centre car parking is owned by the private sector and not by HBC. There is a need to develop a private and public sector partnership towards car parking to a car parking strategy and a common approach to car parking in town centres.	Noted, amend 'Proposals' accordingly.
		Whilst there is not a problem with car parking provision at HL at present, if the planned extension to Halton Lea is successful there may be a problem in the future.	Noted, for 'Proposals'.
Dave Cunliffe Highways	No comments received		
Mike Curtis	No		

Consultee	Date comments received and how responded	Comments	Response
Major Projects	comments received		
Steve Eccles (co-ordinated response on behalf of the Transportation Division)	Via email 23/09/05	See comments below	
Need to mention LTP and its strategies together with the draft accessibility plan. There should be an emphasis on social inclusion and access from deprived areas.			See response above in response to same comment by P. Cornthwaite.
Mention the Highways and Transportation draft SPD on Highway Development Control.			This document is in the process of being drafted by the Transportation Division and was due for public consultation in 2006 (LDS 2005). Its correct title will be the Transport and Accessibility SPD. Reference will be made to the document in relation to appropriate highway related proposals.
Travel Plans will be required and 106 Agreements to support walking, cycling, buses and car parking.			Refer to earlier response regarding S106's. Cross reference to policies TP6 and TP7 in relevant proposals.
Need greater reference to Greenways, cycleways, cycle parking and Public Rights of Way.			Relevant changes to be made regarding Public Rights of Way. Planning requires further information regarding this issue.
A review of town centre parking needs to take place. A parking partnership needs to be developed between the Council and private car park operators.			Agree. See comments from Alan West above.
Page 8, para 4.4, 3 <sup>rd</sup> bullet, only the library and Rutland House are linked by the enclosed walkway.			Agreed. The wording of this sentence will be redrafted to reflect circumstances more accurately.
Review the need for both bus stations, possibly close the North and modernise the South.			Agreed. This has been incorporated into sections sections 5 and 7.
The Mersey Gateway would significantly increase traffic on the Central Expressway that could benefit Halton Lea.			Agreed. Reference has been made to this matter as an opportunity in section 4 and sets a context for the range of proposals in relation to improving the offer of the town centre.

Consultee	Date comments received and how responded	Comments	Response
		Page 13, para 2, where possible improve cycle access especially as part of the Runcorn Cycleway passes Halton Lea. Also the need to consider secure cycle parking.	It is considered that the document makes sufficient reference to secure cycle parking. However, a reference has been made to cycle access in strategic point 2 and the Runcorn cycleway in particular in connection with the greenway network (see sections 8 and 11 in particular).
		Page 17, para 7.14, better information and signage for the two bus stations.	Agreed. This point has been incorporated, but in the context of the need to review the need for two bus stations.
		Page 17, para 7.16, cycle parking on level D is not directly accessible from ground level and the bridges over Westway are not suitable for cyclists. Need to consider ground floor cycle parking.	Agreed. This has been mentioned as an option requiring further investigation.
		Page 17, para 7.17, many of the stairwells are uninviting.	Agreed, this has been stated explicitly.
		Page 19, para 7.23, final bullet, need to provide secure cycle and motorcycle parking.	Reference is already made at this point to secure motor cycle parking, but cycle parking has now also been added.
		Need to mention review/revamp of bus stations and the use of bus stops at night.	Agreed, this has been mentioned in the context of the need to review the operational requirement for two bus stations (north and south) to serve the centre.
		Page 21, para 8.7, Runcorn Cycleway passes through the car park, front of carpet world, fitness first and needs to be formalised.	This requirement has been incorporated into section 8.
		Page 21, para 8.8, replace 2 <sup>nd</sup> part of 2 <sup>nd</sup> sentence with, "a financial contribution has been agreed to improve accessibility to public transport.	Agreed, text amended accordingly.
		Page 21, para 8.12, replace "poorly maintained" with "in need of upgrading". Consider removing one or both bridges to the Asda site, but would need to have suitable at-grade crossings.	Agreed, text amended accordingly.
		Page 22, para 8.15, PSA not PCA?	Agreed, typo corrected



Consultee	Date comments received and how responded	Comments	Response
Page 22, para 8.16, need to review bus stations.			Agreed, see comments above and from Alan West.
Page 23, para 9.2, 2 <sup>nd</sup> to last line, change "accessible" to "desirable", as Halton Lea was designed to be very accessible in integrated transport terms.			Agreed.
Page 23, para 9.3, ground level taxi rank is no longer used, perhaps consider the inclusion of a taxi rank in the car parks.			Not agreed, this comment is factually incorrect. Also, the shopping centre owners have no plans to include taxi ranks in their multi-storey car parks
Page 24, paras 9.6 and 9.11, Northway is currently one way and lightly used but the potential new development could change this. Therefore future traffic levels would need to be considered when making an at grade crossing. Also differences in level with the existing infrastructure could make this unfeasible in any event.			Given these comments, reference to the possibility for an at grade crossing at this location has been removed from the SPD.
Page 25, para 9.11, 6 <sup>th</sup> bullet, parking may not be possible if Northway becomes 2 way.			Comment accepted. Reference to redesigning car parking on Northway has been removed in favour of comments in relation to reassessing the wider vehicular circulation around the centre.
Page 25, para 9.11, 7 <sup>th</sup> bullet, taxi rank has gone.			Not agreed, this comment is factually incorrect. The Council will reduce the length of this taxi rank, but it will be maintained.
Page 26, para 10.5, pedestrian and cycle linkages.			Reference to cycle linkages added.
Page 26, para 10.6, one of the bridges would need to be removed if the new development took place.			Reference to this matter has been incorporated.
Page 27, para 10.7, where do pedestrians cross to on East Lane?			No change. Where pedestrians cross East Lane is not relevant to the comments in the paragraph in question.
Page 27, para 10.8, change "maintenance" to "upgrading"			Agreed.
Page 27, para 10.10, change "accessible" to "attractive".			Agreed.
Page 27, para 10.11, 1 <sup>st</sup> bullet, pedestrian and cycle linkage, Palacefields and Hallwood Park.			Agreed.

Consultee	Date comments received and how responded	Comments	Response
		Page 29, para 11.7, some vegetation may need to be removed and replanted.	Comment incorporated.
		Page 29, para 11.9, cycletrack needs to be rededicated on a new line.	Reference to this matter incorporated.
		Page 30, para 11.10, proposed greenways to be delivered as part of developments.	No change. This matter is already addressed by paragraph 11.13.
		Page 31, Proposals 1 and 2, need to mention cycling.	Agreed.
		Page 31, Proposal 2, "glazed over", is this a recognised term?	Yes, no change proposed.
		Page 32, Proposal 6, need a clear idea (master plan) of improvements that 106 will fund in whole or part. Other comments on proposals have been given in the preceding text.	Not agreed. This comment appears to contradict those given by Alan West (see above). Furthermore, it is not the role of this document to draw up a master plan of improvements for the centre that S106 agreements could fund. If such a master plan is needed, this should be agreed within, and undertaken by, Highways and Transportation.
Phillip Esseen	No comments received		
Jonathan Farmer Transport Policy	No comments received		
Andy Findlater Highways	No comments received		
Steven Garnett	No comments received		
Jerry Goacher Property Services	No comments received		
Angela Gore Property Services	No comments received		

Consultee	Date comments received and how responded	Comments	Response
Ian Grady Policy & Performance	No comments received		
David Hall Transport Co- ordination	Via email 16/09/05	See comments below	
The draft SPD should place greater emphasis on ensuring there are better linkages between the different zones within the town centre by walking / cycling and public transport.			This point is already made throughout the document.
It is suggested that as with the other draft SPD's, the Town Centre Strategy contains a Movement and Linkages Strategy as an integral part of the Plan.			Not agreed, it is not the role of this SPD to produce such a strategy. If Highways and Transportation wish to produce such a strategy it can be either incorporated or cross referenced by the 3 Town Centre Strategies at the appropriate time.
It is recommended that the proposed complementary Movement and Linkages Strategy carefully examines and identifies the optimum location of public transport gateways / and interchange as part of proposals to improve the land uses within the town centre.			Not agreed as above. Highways and Transportation needs to produce this Strategy if they wish it to be included or cross referenced in the Town Centre Strategies.

Consultee	Date comments received and how responded	Comments	Response
		<p>The SWOT analysis needs to recognise the problems associated with the one way busway loop around Halton Lea. This results in there being two main public transport gateways to the centre (Halton Lea North and South) – both of which require investment to improve the passenger environment and waiting facilities. There is a considerable walk between the two bus interchanges, which does not aid effective integration. This is compounded by the fact that when the Mall is closed passengers needing to connect between bus stations must do so via the ground level, which has poor pedestrian linkages. There would be great advantages to combining main bus operation through a single arm of the busway with an enhanced single bus station facility. Basing this on the existing Halton Lea South site would also help improve public transport accessibility to the Trident Park site. This would also facilitate the introduction of an additional new bus stop to serve the Asda development off the southern link on the busway.</p>	<p>Agreed. This has been incorporated in the SWOT analysis at Appendix B and in section 4. Combining the bus termini into a single facility and the ongoing need for a section of the busway around Halton Lea is noted as a matter needing further investigation.</p>
Debbie Houghton Policy & Performance	No comments received		
John Hughes Property Services	No comments received		
Steve Johnson	No comments received		
Mandy Jones Property Services	No comments received		
Brian Leacy	No comments received		

Consultee	Date comments received and how responded	Comments	Response
Tim Leather	No comments received		
Stephen Leng Transport	No comments received		
Ian Lifford Landscape Services	No comments received		
Sarah Lucas Major Projects	Received outside of consultation period Via email 28/10/05	See comments below	
The documents should start with the proposals for each area and then show how each area can contribute to them.			Not agreed. Each Town Centre Strategy needs to set the context before providing any proposals.
The 'softer' non-physical form proposals – marketing, skills, customer care training, street scene enhancement, events etc should all be covered and common to <b>all</b> centres			Non planning related issues are to be covered by overarching strategy and not by the individual Town Centre SPDs.
I Paragraph 1.5 b Should read 'as <b>a</b> safe and accessible places to shop'			Relevant changes made
I Paragraph 1.5 d borough should read ' <b>Borough</b> '			Relevant changes made
I Paragraph 1.6 Should read 'or meet, the principles encouraged and required <b>within</b> <b>by</b> this SPD and the Halton UDP'.			Relevant changes made
I Paragraph 1.7 Should read ' This SPD is also intended to encourage all of those who have, or will have,' '... it contains wherever opportunities arise. <b>This will apply</b> whether or not..'			Relevant changes made
Rob Mackenzie Policy & Performance	No comments received		
Martin McCrimmon Property Services	No comments received		

Consultee	Date comments received and how responded	Comments	Response
David Murray Property Services	No comments received		
Dave Owen	No comments received		
Andrew Pannell Forward Planning	No comments received		
David Parr Chief Executive	No comments received		
Andy Pownall	No comments received		
Mark Prendergast Property Services	No comments received		
Stephen Rimmer	No comments received		
Pat Shone	No comments received		
Paul Smith Town Centre Manager	No comments received		
Derek Sutton Major Projects	Meeting 17/10/05	See comments below	
There is a need to water down criticism of what HBC has been involved with in the SPDs			It is only proper that problems in the three town centres are noted, irrespective of how they may have developed. However, any such comments have been redrafted to be as constructive as possible e.g. regarding the pedestrian footbridges.
Garry Taylor Major Projects	No comments received		
Dave Tierney Building	No comments		

Consultee	Date comments received and how responded	Comments	Response
Control	received		
Dick Tregear Environment	Meeting held 7/9/05	See comments below	
Need to include worklessness and other corporate priorities			This will be covered by Overarching Strategy and other sister documents.
The closure of the northern bus terminus and the northern part of the busway around Halton Lea is a possibility. This would affect footfall to HDL and the two shops in this area.			Agreed. This matter has been incorporated in the SWOT analysis at Appendix B and in section 4. Combining the bus termini into a single facility and the ongoing need for a section of the busway around Halton Lea is noted as a matter needing further investigation.
The SPD should make reference to the potential for increased traffic on the Expressway (and passing HL) if the new Mersey Crossing is built.			Agreed. This is now included in section 4, dealing with opportunities.
More consideration needs to be given to evening circulation around HL			This has been covered in considering matters in connection with the rationalisation of the bus termini (see above).
Do not be so critical of the condition of the footbridges at paragraph 8.12			Agreed, amendments made in connection with comments from Transportation Policy (see above).
The underpass from HL to the Palacefields residential area is prone to flooding and needs commenting upon.			No change proposed. Having spoken with Alan West regarding this matter, there are no further Council proposals to address this situation other than those already implemented.
Cllr Rob Polhill	Meeting 17/10/05	See comments below	
We need to lift the bar in terms of the quality of design of developments			Noted. The document takes this on board e.g. in relation to Proposal 1.
John Tully Legal Services	No comments received		
Richard Wakefield Transport Policy	No comments received		
Phil Watts Environment	No comments received		
Spencer	Via email	See	

Consultee	Date comments received and how responded	Comments	Response
Webster	01/09/05	comments below	
Promotion of Business Continuity to local businesses (a Local Council statutory responsibility from 1st May 2006, but we now have to begin those preparations)			This should be covered by the overarching town centre strategy or other sister documents and not by the individual town centre strategies.
Town Centre evacuation plans - my division are currently working on Widnes, one exists for Halton Lea, none for Runcorn old town			This should be covered by the overarching town centre strategy and not by the individual town centre strategies.
Des Wilkinson	No comments received		
Development Control Section	Written Comments 29/9/05	See comments below	
Update paragraph 7.12 to reflect that the application in question now has planning permission, subject to the signing of a S106 agreement.			Updated text incorporated.
Update paragraph 8.5 to reflect that the application in question now has planning permission, subject to the signing of a S106 agreement.			Updated text incorporated.



# Partnership Consultation

**Partnership consultation period: 25 November 2005 - 9 December 2005 with additional face to face meetings on 22 December 2005, 27 January 2006, 9 February 2006, 27 February 2006, 23 October 2006.**

**Date of consideration of representations: November/ December 2006**

Note – All paragraph and page references relate to the numbers as set out in the partnership consultation draft

Consultee	Date comments received and how responded	Comments	Response
<p><b>Numerous Council officers as follows:</b>            David Parr,            Strategic Directors,            Operational Directors, Sue Davies,            Michelle Baker,            Mike Bennett,            Angela Boag,            Ian Boyd,            Nathan Chesney, Phil Cornthwaite,            Dave Cunliffe,            Phil Esseen,            Jonathan Farmer, Andy Findlater,            Steven Garnett, Iasn Grady, Angela Gore, David Hall, John Hughes, Steve Johnson, Brian Leacy, Tim Leather, Ian Lifford, Mandy Jones, Stephen Leng, Martin McCrimmon,</p>	<p>No comments received</p>		

Consultee	Date comments received and how responded	Comments	Response
Dave Owen, Mark Prendergast, Stephen Rimmer, Pat Shone, Paul Smith, Richard Wakefield, Spencer Webster, Des Wilkinson, Daniel Seddon			
Andrew Pannell, Planning & Policy Manager HBC	December 2005	Comments below	
Link Paragraph 9.8 (which deals with dedicated car parking) to the strategic car parking issue			Agreed. The document has now been reorganised so that policies are contained within the relevant sub area rather than in one section at the end of the document. This has allowed more details to be given regarding implementation. In this particular instance, new paragraph 10.10 cross refers to strategic policies 5 and 14 and therefore gives the necessary link.
Proposal 5 Brakes office site. Why mention this if it is not shown on Plan 3?			Not accepted. The Brakes office site (now referred to as Vestric House) is purposely not shown on Plan 3 'Development Opportunities' because, unlike the other sites on that plan, it is unclear if the site is a development opportunity at this point in time. This is reflected by the wording of the relevant policy (now West Lane Policy 2) which begins "Should the Vestric House site become available..." In order for the SPD to not become quickly out of date, it is correct to make reference Vestric House. In order that the site may be located, it is now shown hatched on Plan 2 Sub Areas of Halton Lea and (for the reasons given above) not on Plan 3.

Consultee	Date comments received and how responded	Comments	Response
Proposal 16	Seek active uses for remaining vacant units at Trident Park, if necessary by use of attractive letting terms is not a planning proposal.		The inference is that this proposal should be deleted. This is not accepted because although it is not a direct planning policy it would contribute towards planning objectives (i.e. improving vitality and viability). Given that the policy was not objected to by the site owners, Fordgate, it is retained (now as Trident Park Policy 3).
Proposal 26	Develop a Parking Partnership. Cross refer to Local Transport Plan.		Accepted. This policy has been renamed Strategic Policy 5 and moved to the relevant section of the revised document. Explanatory text to the policy makes clear reference to LTP2.
Proposal 27	set up a Halton Lea town centre working group to meet periodically. There needs to be a section on how proposals should be taken forward through either the planning system or town centre management.		It is agreed that more details needed to be given regarding the implementation of proposals. Therefore the document has been redrafted to include a section entitled 'implementation' in respect of every policy.
Plan 3	Development Opportunities. Add references to the relevant proposal in respect of each site		Agreed, these references have been added.
Plan 3	Development Opportunities. What about the Brakes office site, Proposal 5?		See comments above. The Vestric House site is now shown on Plan 2 Sub Areas of Halton Lea.
Development Control Team HBC	December 2005	Comments below	NB in actual fact the comments received related to the Internal Partnership copy of the SPD. Given when they were received, and the fact that they still apply to the Partnership Consultation document, they are considered at this stage.
Paragraph 7.12	Update text that the scheme in question has been approved, subject to signing a legal agreement		This was updated in any event as part of the Partnership consultation stage
Paragraph 8.5	correct text so say that the scheme in question has been approved, subject to signing a legal agreement		This was an error in the Internal Partnership consultation which has been corrected at Partnership Consultation stage.

Consultee	Date comments received and how responded	Comments	Response
Stephen Leng, Dick Tregea, Phil Watts, Andrew Pannell, Derek Sutton, Jerry Goacher, Mike Curtis	Meeting 22 December 2005	Comments below	
General comments were made about the SPDs resembling Issues Papers in terms of layout			It is accepted that SPD required redrafting to resemble a more user friendly policy document. Consequently, it has been extensively reorganised to move policies from section 12 at the back of the Partnership Consultation version to either a new section dealing with overarching/ strategic policies or within the various sub areas. Text which might be expected to be found in an Issues Paper as background information has also been removed.

Consultee	Date comments received and how responded	Comments	Response
		<p>Add to strategic issues that a car parking strategy is required. This is because most of the available car parking, although currently not charged for, is owned and controlled by the retail sector, the owners of the shopping centre and Asda. Visitors and workers at Halton Lea largely have to rely on the shopper car parks. There is no genuine public car park that is controlled by the Council like in Widnes and Runcorn Old Town.</p> <p>If private car park operators began to charge or introduced a different parking regime in terms of length of stay, this would inhibit parking for workers and visitors who wish to stay longer than the restricted parking time. This would affect the centre as a place of employment and investment.</p> <p>The Council should therefore work with the owners of the current car parks to agree a strategy for public car parking.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.1.9 of the Local Transport Plan mentions that a Parking Partnership will be established to review and respond to parking issues emerging from the regeneration of Halton's town centres.</p>	<p>Accepted. The Strategic Issues section has now been extensively redrafted to become a Strategic Policy section. As such the matter of car parking, and parking partnerships in particular, is addressed by the inclusion of new Strategic Policy 5 in this section (Proposal 26 at the Partnership Consultation stage). Explanatory text makes reference to the Local Transport Plan and how a parking partnership could be developed is dealt with under the sub heading entitled 'implementation'.</p>
Mr Bill Badrock Halton Chamber of Commerce & Enterprise	No comments received		
Laura McMurtire and Paul Bond Halton Primary Care Trust	No comments received		
Asda Stores	No comments received		

Consultee	Date comments received and how responded	Comments	Response
Barton Willmore on behalf of Fordgate	Letter received 9 January 2006	Comments below	
We welcome the aims and objectives of the draft Halton Lea town centre strategy. Fordgate would welcome the opportunity for an early meeting to discuss their interests in this draft SPD in more detail.			Noted.
We welcome the acknowledgment at paragraph 4.21 that the provision of an anchor store on the site of East Lane would reduce leakage of shopping spending to other centres.....however for the avoidance of doubt we would recommend that the wording of this paragraph be altered to reflect that the opportunity has been realised as (it) is being progressed with the Council.			Partly accepted. Paragraph 4.20 has been reworded as follows (additions in bold, deletions struck through) for clarification: "The provision of an anchor store in connection with the <b>implementation of the planned extension of the centre to Halton Lea</b> across East Lane....." The wording reflects the fact that this scheme does not yet have planning permission (this is subject to the signing of a legal agreement, which is still outstanding).
Paragraph 4.22 – Fordgate, as freehold owners of the shopping centre, object to a single bus station facility and would wish to see the retention of both bus stations.			Accepted. This matter has been clarified since the Partnership consultation stage and it is understood that the two bus termini will be retained. Improvements to the north terminus are to take place shortly.
<p><u>Sub area analysis</u></p> <p>We would recommend that Asda and Trident Park are identified as separate sub areas for the purposes of the Town Centre Strategy document. The two sites are physically separate from one another and have different functions/ offers. It is clear that Trident Park functions as part of the Primary Shopping Area, has strong links to the covered shopping area via the Southern Bus Station and also provides leisure based evening economy.</p> <p>This is further supported by paragraphs 8.5 and 8.12.</p>			<p>Accepted. Trident Park is now section 8 of the revised document and Asda (referred to as the West Lane Area) is section 9.</p> <p>As new Strategic Policy 2 indicates, the Primary Shopping Area boundary will be reviewed as part of the future Retail and Leisure Development Plan Document.</p>

Consultee	Date comments received and how responded	Comments	Response
		<p>Paragraph 7.23 indicates that the planned extension to the covered shopping centre could have capacity implications if significant numbers of new shoppers are attracted to the centre. The Transport Assessment (TA) submitted in support of the outline application for the shopping centre demonstrated that the development would not have capacity implications for car parking in and around the existing centre, and this was accepted by the Council's Highways officers. Furthermore, Fordgate are developing a number of highway proposals with the Council to ensure traffic circulation around the centre is not hampered by the development, but rather aided by the proposals. In this respect, we recommend that this statement be removed from the document.</p>	<p>Not accepted. The relevant text has now been moved to paragraph 5.13 in connection with Strategic Policy 5 (Parking Partnership).</p> <p>Whilst the TA in connection with the extension to the shopping centre indicated that there would not be adverse traffic capacity implications for the centre from that development, the point is that it could contribute towards a 'step change' in the attraction of the centre (and therefore numbers of visitors). It is therefore appropriate to keep the situation under review and a parking partnership is considered to be the appropriate mechanism to do this.</p> <p>The paragraph will therefore be reworded as follows (additions in bold, deletions struck through):</p> <p>Currently, there is not a parking capacity problem <del>for the centre</del> <b>at Halton Lea</b>, with upper levels of multi-storeys <del>having available capacity</del> <b>being underused</b>, particularly at weekends. However, <del>the demolition of the Meadow car park in connection with the planned extension (albeit that new parking provision would be created in this area as a result)</del> <b>to the centre (see East Lane Policy I)</b> could have capacity implications in the future if, <b>as desired, the development contributes towards a 'step change' in offer and consequently attracts</b> significant numbers of new shoppers are attracted to <del>the centre in connection with this new development</del> <b>Halton Lea</b>.</p>

Consultee	Date comments received and how responded	Comments	Response
		<p>We would recommend that the Council considers the creation of a 'gateway' entrance to the centre which will function as an obvious access point from the approaches to the centre. The planned extension to the shopping centre, with surface (mall level) parking and outward facing entrances, would perform this role.</p>	<p>Accepted. A gateway entrance into the covered shopping centre already exists at Trident Park and a further entrance of this nature would be desirable to address a weakness identified in the SWOT analysis i.e. the centre's impenetrable appearance from the outside. An additional bullet point is therefore included in East Lane Policy I which states:  <b>"create a gateway entrance into the Halton Lea Shopping Centre;"</b></p>
		<p>We welcome paragraph 8.14 and would support the Council's view that the potential exists for additional retail development on the car parking area to the south of the cinema. There are, in our view, other opportunities to improve the retail and leisure offer within Trident Park.</p>	<p>Noted. This opportunity is promoted by new Trident Park Policy I.</p>
		<p>We welcome paragraph 8.16 which indicates that there is a need to review the Primary Shopping Area boundary. We would also recommend that the Council considers the inclusion of land which benefits from a resolution to grant planning permission for a new anchor store across East Lane up to the existing Busway (on the eastern edge of the site).</p>	<p>As new Strategic Policy 2 indicates, the Primary Shopping Area (PSA) boundary will be reviewed as part of the future Retail and Leisure Development Plan Document. This would be the appropriate time to consider an extension to the PSA in the manner described by Barton Willmore.</p>