

Halton Borough Council

**Runcorn Old Town,  
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 Consultation Statement 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". In due course the Council will be adopting a Statement of Community Involvement (SCI), that will set out how the public will be consulted on new planning policy and significant planning applications. Once the SCI is adopted, all such planning documents will be required to conform with its provisions. This Consultation Statement has been prepared in advance of the SCI, but 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 details of the Pre-Partnership and Partnership Consultation conducted by Halton Borough Council in relation to the Town Centre Strategy SPD for Runcorn Old Town. It is being made available during the formal period of public consultation, alongside the Draft Runcorn Old Town SPD and the Sustainability Appraisal Report, in accordance with Regulation 17 (1) of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004.

## Pre~Partnership Consultation

**Pre~Partnership consultation period:** 9<sup>th</sup> September 2005 ~ 20<sup>th</sup> September 2005

**Date of consideration of representations:** November 2005

Note – All paragraph and page references relate to the numbers as set out in the Pre~Partnership Consultation Draft

Consultee	Date and method of response	Comments	Response incorporated into Partnership Draft.
Phil Watts Operational Director - Planning	08/09/2005 E-mail	Change references in the documents to Forward Planning Section with EH and P Department.	Reference updated
Steve Rimmer Highways (Section Leader)	09/09/2005 E-mail	Street names need checking (e.g. Regent Road is Regent Street and Leiria Street is Leiria Way)	Street names corrected
Sarah Lucas ; collated comments for Major Projects	15/09/2005 E-mail	The promotion of the area, what does the area have to offer that are not available in other locations?	No changes "The Vision" for the centre set out in Chapter 5 expressly addresses this with references throughout the remainder of the document.
Major Projects		Accessibility and signage from the Expressway – although access has been improved with the addition of Leiria Way it is still unclear what the Old Town has to offer apart from the Brindley.	Lack of prominence / brand / image identified as weakness in SWOT (pg12 and Appendix B)
Major Projects		A design palette for the area may be appropriate ensuring that there is a co-ordinated approach to future developments in the Old Town, which in turn link all the sub-areas.	Comment noted
Major Projects		Use of gateway features (not only in Church Street but all the sub-areas) which clearly define the area that people are in.	Comment noted
Major Projects		Car parking – this will need to be carefully planned as there are already issues relating to parking provision in Runcorn Old Town.	Agreed. Strategic Policy SPI0 outlines a requirement for any significant proposals to contribute to an overall parking and accessibility study. This should not however be taken to be a ban on development on all parking areas. Need for Parking Partnership included
Major Projects		Signage – there should be clear signage directing people to the different facilities and areas in the Old Town.	Agreed. Town Centre Manager believed to be implementing additional signage.

Consultee	Date and method of response	Comments	Response incorporated into Partnership Draft.
David Hall / Ian Boyd via Steve Eccles HBC Transportation	16/09/2005 E-mail	Welcome the references in the Strategy to the recognition that public transport plays an important role in terms of allowing people to access the town centre.	Comment noted and welcomed.  The Strategy intends to acknowledge the importance of public transport to the centre and vice versa the centres importance as a transport node..
HBC Transportation		However the Strategy implies that the remnants of the busway act as a major barrier to movement and development in the town centre. Yet the Strategy fails to pick up on the fact that the A557 and the Bridge infrastructure also act as a major barrier separating the town centre from its immediate hinterland.	Strategy highlights problems associated with <u>original</u> unsympathetic busway. Busway removed from weaknesses in SWOT as barrier to accessibility.  Para 4.5 specifically mentions the A557 and bridge approaches as acting as a "large impenetrable barrier between the Old Town and the surrounding residential areas"
HBC Transportation		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.  It is suggested that as with the other draft SPD's, the Runcorn Town Centre Strategy contains a Movement and Linkages Strategy as an integral part of the Plan.	Document will contain maps / plans showing key movement corridors and linkages between zones and connections out to the wider surrounds.  Each sub-area chapter covers access and linkages in detail.  Further advice required from Transportation on detailed requirements for incorporating a Movement & Linkages Strategy or linking to a stand alone doc.
HBC Transportation		For the purposes of the SPD it is suggested that the Bridgewater Campus and regeneration area be included as a zone within the town centre. The Campus has an important influence on the continued vitality of the town centre and links between the town centre and the College site are a vital component of the SPD.	The Bridgewater Campus is divorced from the town centre being in excess of 1 Km walk from the town centre along non-direct routes of dubious attractiveness. The benefit of college (on such a remote isolated location) to the town centre is therefore questionable. Will increase cross-referencing to UDP Greenways policies

Consultee	Date and method of response	Comments	Response incorporated into Partnership Draft.
HBC Transportation		<p>The draft SPD raises important issues surrounding the design and operation of the existing Bus Station within Runcorn Town Centre.</p> <p>Based on existing levels of use and plans for improved bus services as set out in the new Halton Bus Strategy there is the need for six bus stands and a coach / layover bay at the site. The Bus Station needs to be more carefully integrated into the main land uses and zones within the town centre.</p> <p>For example the main facilities within the town centre (including the Bridgewater Campus site) by a new high quality shuttle bus service (operated by environmentally friendly low emission buses).</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Welcome that the bus station layout is to be revisited. Strategy raises this as an issue together with the adjacent Alcock Street service yard. Mention that a revised layout could free-up some additional Central area development land (9.18) was not intended to reduce the facilities for buses, but rather present an opportunity for the wider area to be addressed comprehensively to achieve the best design solution thereby enhancing provision for bus patrons and service providers. Provision of shuttle bus to campus only highlights how remote it is.</p>
HBC Transportation		<p>The main bus routes through the town centre should also be better managed through the introduction of appropriate bus priority and traffic management, to ensure the more efficient flow of bus services through the centre.</p>	<p>This would appear to be a strictly highway management issue. The only direct references within the SPD to the operation of bus routes are the opportunities to redevelop Bridge St./ Leiria Way busway and the reconfiguration of the bus station, neither intended to compromise services.</p>
HBC Transportation		<p>The Strategy should also include Runcorn main line station as an integral Gateway, and ways in which interchange between buses and trains should be carefully improved at the site.</p>	<p>Agree in principle but unclear how this can be successfully addressed in this SPD.</p>
HBC Transportation		<p>In general we should be examining how best to increase building densities around the Station and other public transport gateways. The Strategy should aim to encourage the development of new high-density mixed-use development around the rail and bus stations.</p>	<p>Agree in principle. SPD seeks to encourage town centre as a location for high density mixed use and residential development. Perhaps needs stronger cross-referencing to relevant UDP policies. Train Station outwith scope of document.</p>

Consultee	Date and method of response	Comments	Response incorporated into Partnership Draft.
HBC Transportation		Finally we support references to the need to improve public realm in the town centre and feel more could be done to increase the importance and attractiveness of the promenade area as a key amenity site and focus for leisure related land uses and development.	Comments noted and welcomed.  Key part of this strategy is to improve connections as and wherever possible. Policy Bridge Street BSI seeks to maximise benefit of proposed new footpath linkage, Other improvements may be dependant upon redevelopment of intervening uses (covered under policy The Promenade TP2).
Gary Collins Operational Director Economic Development	21/09/2005 E-mail	I will not repeat any of the general comments that I have already given in the Widnes SPD comments except for how up to date is the retail capacity study on which the SPD is based.	The retail study is due to be updated as background for Development Plan Document work from next year. SPD's cannot allocate land and as such these documents deal with general principles and structure rather than allocating specific sites to address a specific demand issues.
Economic Development		[from Widnes comments] There is no mention of waste/bin storage. At the moment there are shops etc that actually leave their bins outside in public areas – often on land they do not own. This makes the area look grotty and leaves them open to arson. All bins should be stored within the cartilage of the premises and out of site/harms way. This needs to be a policy in all the town centre strategies. Actually, we should also be advocating that all businesses should look to address this now as part of creating a safe/pleasant environment.	Fully agree in principle.  Planning can only seek to control this on new developments. Covered under Strategic Policy 13  Need to cross reference with UDP, Industrial / Commercial SPD.  Litter / waste management for existing premises an issue for Town Centre Manager.
Economic Development		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?	TC3 relates to Widnes and TC7 to Local Centres etc. and are therefore of no relevance to this SPD. TC9 is also omitted. Balance to be struck between comprehensiveness and making document overly long. Latter consideration prevails in this instance. No change.
Economic Development		[from Widnes comments] Para2.10. 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.	Comment noted.  Text amended (as for other 2 centres)

Consultee	Date and method of response	Comments	Response incorporated into Partnership Draft.
Economic Development		[from Widnes comments] Para 3.3 who produced the guide?	Comment Noted. Published by ODPM as daughter document to PPG6. Source added to text.
Economic Development		Para. 2.12 should say when exec board approved the strategy.	Not yet been able to find out precise status of document or of Runcorn Map.
Economic Development		Also, what is the actual status of the Runcorn map as per page 5 – I know the waterside strategy went to exec board and was approved, but thought the more detailed plan was indicative only. We need to be clear if this is adopted policy that the SPD has to implement of merely context/guidance.	See above comment.  Town Centre Strategy in broad conformity with Waterside Strategy (except for detailed disposition of land uses on Canal Quarter).
Economic Development		Para 4.1 there was some discussion a little while ago about not calling it Runcorn Old Town anymore (the acronym was not liked...ROT). Can we not call it 'Runcorn'?	Tricky issue. "ROT" not ideal acronym but Runcorn Town Centre leads to confusion with Halton Lea. "Old Town" being promoted in other documents such as on Canal Quarter.  "Old Town" has potential to market USP as historic centre. Runcorn on the Mersey as previously used, too generic and not specific as to area covered.  No change.
Economic Development		I would not be some emotive by saying it is the smallest <i>by far</i> . Better just to say smallest.	It is important to highlight that the Old Town is significantly smaller than Widnes / Halton Lea and is in effect a large neighbourhood centre with a specialist retail role. "By far" deleted.
Economic Development		Para 4.6. similar point – the use of the word relegated may not go down too well. Perhaps say as a consequence of Halton Lea the role of the town centre became	Text rephrased.
Economic Development		Para 4.16 Widnes survey???	Text corrected.
Economic Development		Para 4.20 can you confirm that the yield rose from <u>1.5%</u> to 10% also, need to put the 6.3 % unemployment into context i.e. ILO rate. I am not convinced the ILO rate is lower than 6.3% - please check with research. Also need to put a date in for the % and who it is from (ONS?)	Rental Yield of 1.5% a typo. Corrected to read 11.5%.  Uncertain source for unemployment figure. Reference removed.
Economic Development		Re the 23% who felt intimidated – is this generally or can we be more specific i.e. at night etc	Survey is not specific. Anything further would be speculation.



Consultee	Date and method of response	Comments	Response incorporated into Partnership Draft.
Economic Development		Para 4.21 need to justify more lacks identity given the millions spent on it.	Section summaries more detailed analysis in the SWOT (Appendix B). All the comments in the summary are warranted. Adding justification would only extend the section and focus more on the negatives. Law of diminishing returns applies?
Economic Development		It is here we come across the canal quarter for the first time. Although this is explained in some depth later, I think it is so important that it needs to be introduced earlier say a new 2.13.	Reference to Canal Quarter added under UDP TCI (Para 2.10)
Economic Development		Para. 4.26 I used the phrase vertical drinking in something I did not long ago – management team deleted it. You need to make your point with more subtlety	Phrase deleted and replaced with “traditional and music orientated pubs”
Economic Development		Para. 4.27 what was the % in 1999 to aid comparison.	Comparative figure added
Economic Development		General – do we need to consider charity shops specifically?	Charity shops are no longer considered to represent decline of a town centre. Previously these uses accepted very short leases and therefore would not invest in reasonable fascias / signage. This is no longer the case. Charity Shops fall within the main A1 Retail use class making it very difficult to provide a policy that could restrict their number. It should also be noted the Shop Front SPD should ensure that all shop fronts are of a high quality.
Economic Development		Vision- looks ok – gets the point over	Comments noted & welcomed
Economic Development		General – we need a coat of thinking on waste disposal. Big bins are all over the place looking bad and sometimes being burnt. Some are even stored on the pavement fronting Church Street – this must be stopped. All waste storage must be within curtilage and safe and preferably out of site.	Fully agree in principle. Planning can only seek to control this on new developments. Covered under Strategic Policy 13 Need to cross reference with UDP, Industrial / Commercial SPD. Litter / waste management for existing premises an issue for Town Centre Manager

Consultee	Date and method of response	Comments	Response incorporated into Partnership Draft.
Economic Development		Para. 8.6 explain the use of the term unobtrusive – what are you actually advocating – having them as contrasting to background? What?	The majority of the decorative fixtures <u>are</u> unobtrusive. As an example, at the corner of Church Street / King Street the most visible fixture is not the public art or the decorative lampposts but the pole for the CCTV camera. This is not advocating the use of larger or garish coloured fixtures, simply saying that at present they do not contribute significantly to an unified image or sense of place. References deleted in slimmed down descriptive text
Economic Development		Para.s 8.7 8.9 last part – the planning permission should have covered this?	The design of the central core redevelopment will have to have juggled several (sometimes competing) factors. Introducing such a large unit into a tight urban fabric has lead to severance of previous routes. This is not to say that this does not represent an acceptable or even the best possible design solution. It may have been desirable to improve surface finishes on surrounding streets, but unless failure to do this rendered the scheme unacceptable, it would not have been grounds for refusal. Also if the works were on land outside the applicants’ control, they could not be covered by a planning condition. The SPD is right to highlight issue.

Consultee	Date and method of response	Comments	Response incorporated into Partnership Draft.
Economic Development		Para. 8.10 why are they so bad?- this is a council scheme so how did we make such a mistake?	<p>As stated in the paragraph, the most direct pedestrian routes are “through a rear service yard or down the side of an apparently semi-derelict building.”</p> <p>Alcock Street service yard and the intervening land have not been resurfaced (see photo 13) and do not present the most attractive or welcoming environment.</p> <p>The design of the bus station was compromised by the requirement to service the new market / retail unit development. The servicing requirements were probably not fully known as the units were semi-speculative and the end occupiers were not known.</p> <p>Descriptive text slimmed down, but issue addressed in Central Area Policies CA2, CA3 and CA4.</p>
Economic Development		Para. 8.14 – had not heard of the 2006 date- is this from the company?	<p>Date taken from Wetherspoons website. Website still showing projected opening date as 1<sup>st</sup> February 2006 (as at 24/11/05)</p> <p>Reference removed as facility now open.</p>
Economic Development		Para, 8.23- fair point but perhaps this should have been picked up earlier in construction phase	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Issue probably should have been addressed at design stage, but could necessitate negotiations with other land owners.</p> <p>Right for issue to be flagged up in SPD.</p>
Economic Development		Para. 9.4 though – not thought. That said, I think this needs to be more unpacked to explain what is happening	<p>Typo corrected.</p> <p>Para 9.11 covered issue of long stay parking in greater detail.</p>
Economic Development		Para. 9.5 is this not the site for the proposed new direct link and library. How does this fit?	<p>Direct Link now opened in ‘Island Building’. Location for replacement library not yet resolved.</p>
Economic Development		Para. 9.7 I think David Hall from transport is looking at the bus station now- he may have a view	<p>Transportation have submitted comments to the effect that bus station layout is to be looked at. Central Area policies CA2, CA3 and CA4 seek to address issue.</p>
Economic Development		Para. 9.8 linked to the above – Island building intended to house HDL.	<p>Island Building now occupied by HDL (now opened).</p>

Consultee	Date and method of response	Comments	Response incorporated into Partnership Draft.
Economic Development		The pronto print shop (or what ever it is called) opposite Kwik Save is an eyesore and needs sorting	Agreed. Increased prominence given to site in text of para 9.16 and site added to list of development opportunities (No. 23)
Economic Development		Para. 9.14 the A boards issue is on Dicks radar and he is to attend the next traders meeting about it. It would be good to get something into the SPD to reinforce what he says there.	'A' boards and on highway display of goods known to be a thorny issue. SPD does not directly address this, as this considered to be an issue for day-to-day management or the overarching strategy. On highway display of goods with canopies over could add 'charm' and distinctiveness to centre, but only if necessary (highway) consents are in place.
Economic Development		Para. 10.10 good point. Do you know who owns it, who parks there? What would be the consequence if it was build on?	Owner not known, parking patrons not known. Possible consequences for loss of parking spaces. Comprehensive parking / accessibility study may need to address this.
Economic Development		Para. 11.4 what makes us believe they are in poor condition- if visual inspection say so.	Reference rephrased to be more generic.
Economic Development		General – there is no reference to the future of the swimming baths. These are in poor condition and work on a replacement will have to begin in the next few years. I think it should be located in the town to aid/promote footfall and non-drink uses.	Agree. Unfortunately SPD cannot allocate land and funding for a replacement facility, nor allocated replacement use for current building. Possibility of including swimming baths on Canal Quarter briefly investigated but now considered unlikely. No specific reference in SPD at this time.
Economic Development		Para. 11.11 leads to a more general issue of commuters using free parking. This needs to be explicitly stated and appropriate policy developed- e.g. is there going to be a pay and display charge for long term parking? And how would this impact (if at all) on planning policies?	Agree, ongoing issue. Parking and accessibility study will need to address issue of making best use of existing spaces. This may include establishing a Parking Partnership with private space providers (inc. Kwik Save). Covered under Strategic Policy 11
Economic Development		Para. 12.4 the council (ED Williams site) car park was only ever meant to be temporary and will now in all likelihood be lost via canal quarter	Chapter 12 (Canal Quarter) deals with this issue.

Consultee	Date and method of response	Comments	Response incorporated into Partnership Draft.
Economic Development		General issue – much has been said about creating good walking circulation routes round the town to boost shopping etc. This leads onto the idea of creating a centre / gathering space (square) which traders have talked about and urban splash is looking at. Does the SPD not need to advocate such a space and set out some parameters of size/functionality etc? This also links to the possible closure of high street in front of the bus station to create a square – what is the planning view about this and what does the SPD need to do to facilitate it?	Agree. Phase I of the Canal Quarter (para 13.15) covers this issue. “Extensive public realm improvements centred on the Brindley Arts Centre including improvements to the northern towpath, creation of a piazza / public square and removal /reconfiguration of the ‘mound’.” It is noted that this reference is quite generic at this time, but details are yet to be resolved through the detailed design.  Level of detail in SPD regarding Canal Quarter has to be balanced with need for flexibility and to provide overarching principles applicable to any development proposals.
Economic Development		Para. 13.1 there are a lot of sites mentioned here, and the later map is very useful. Perhaps we could just reference in the text see map page	Paragraphs changed to better reference UDP. Small map added within this chapter for information.
Economic Development		Para. 13.3 the mound is a really big issue and it is good to mention it.	Comment noted & welcomed
Economic Development		Para. 13.8 can we be bold enough to say the buildings adjacent to the canal quarter zone fronting high street have some merit but demolition would be seen as appropriate if it was part of a bigger scheme – they have a limited life anyway	Preceding chapter covers properties on High Street and indicates that for certain properties, their future will be determined by the needs of the Canal Quarter scheme.
Economic Development		General point – we are still at early stages of the canal quarter, what happens if it does not go ahead, or goes ahead on a very different basis to what was originally stated? What does that mean for the SPD?	Canal Quarter concept is not tied to a single developer. Concept should remain even if incrementally delivered. It is necessary to fully reference the CQ scheme in this SPD as this will be used to help guide the development.  Canal Quarter policies drafted to provide overarching principles that can be applied to current development scheme or alternatives, should they arise.
Economic Development		Para. 14.8 not sure you have described old quay earlier and as such it needs a bit of meat on the bone	Small map extract (UDP) added to illustrate area being referred to,

Consultee	Date and method of response	Comments	Response incorporated into Partnership Draft.
Economic Development		General – need to explore relationship and accessibility issues between the town centre and the college, particularly relevant for this section given pathways	Para 14.2 discussed pedestrian routes through to college. With completion of housing on intervening sites scope for further improvements limited. Issue of undercroft parking fronting Mersey Street mentioned and highlighted as issue to be addressed in any future redevelopment schemes.  General policies promoting walking / cycling and use of Promenade included in Public Consultation draft.
Economic Development		Para. 14.9 last part- very good point	Comment noted and welcomed.
Economic Development		Para. 15.2 functions clearly relate to Halton Lea – I understand that- but there are other functions in relation to the whole borough that perhaps need to be explored. For example the Bindley is for everyone. The town centre, along with Victoria square are to become the two main evening leisure areas complimenting each other.	Agree in principle, however, Strategy seeks to position Old Town as having a complementary retail role to Halton Lea and wider leisure role.
Economic Development		Proposal 5 talks about shoppers car parking – but in the area there is an issue of safe parking for traders, especially in winter. What is the position for them? It is thought that many of the Kwik Save spaces are where local traders park!	Needs of traders and commuters are important, but should be secondary to adequate short stay provision for shoppers. Covered under Strategic Policy 11.
Economic Development		Proposal 7 same issue about the wider role for the whole borough	Reference to population south of the Mersey removed.
Economic Development		Proposal 11 I like it- but needs contextualising earlier in the document – use of water as part of the identity, links to tourism, potential for the lock flight etc.	Runcorn Locks section added to chapter 11 (High Street). De-coupling of Silver Jubilee Bridge may remove key physical barrier to the realisation of this scheme.
Economic Development		Proposal 13 soft landscaping – like the idea but in reality we struggle to look after what we have – amalgamate 13 and 14 into a general landscaping policy.	Previous Strategy proposed “introduction of floral displays and hanging baskets”.  Specific reference to additional ‘hard’ and ‘soft’ landscaping removed.
Economic Development		Proposal 18 If it is an application for only a small shop, they will not be able to make such provision. Or is there a link to s106 to provide money for such facilities.	Proposals redrafted as policies. Various policies seek provision of facilities or contributions towards provision of facilities. Each application will be dealt with on its merits.

Consultee	Date and method of response	Comments	Response incorporated into Partnership Draft.
Economic Development		Proposal 19- think they should also contribute to public transport via s106 (sort of mini Daresbury park) – also we should advocate s106 for town centre management	Various policies seek provision of facilities or contributions towards provision of facilities. No specific inclusion of TC Management fund.
Steve Eccles Transportation (Section Leader)	23/09/2005 E-mail	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.	LTP added to list of policy considerations (Chapter 2)
Transportation		Mention the Highways and Transportation draft SPD on Highway Development Control.	Section added to end of Chapter 2
Transportation		Travel Plans will be required and 106 Agreements to support walking, cycling, buses and car parking.	Reference made to Travel Plans and possible requirement for 106 contributions.
Transportation		Need greater reference to Greenways, cycleways, cycle parking and Public Rights of Way	Comments noted.
Transportation		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.	Comments noted. Need for access and parking study mentioned at various points. Covered under Strategic Policy SPI0 (Access study) and SPI1 (Parking Partnership)
Transportation		The previous Runcorn Town Centre parking study indicated that the introduction of parking controls in the central areas would displace long stay parking to the edge of centre. The implementation of this strategy would resolve the current parking problems. More work however needs to be done to predict future parking needs and management.	Comments noted. Parking controls / charging would be expected to displace long-stay parking to peripheral areas. However, EDU express concern about parking for traders/staff.  Need for access and parking study mentioned at various points Covered under Strategic Policy SPI0 (Access study) and SPI1 (Parking Partnership)
Transportation		Building on Top Locks and Leiria Way car parks should be avoided.	Comment rejected.  This prejudices any results from the access and parking study. Also, parking should be subservient to the needs of the centre not the other way around. Mention of development affecting either of these car parks clearly references the Study. Both sites are shown as 'Long Term' opportunities.
Transportation		Public transport issues need to be addressed in more detail in the context of accessibility. Refer also to comments made by Transport Co-ordination.	Accessibility will be a key theme for the Core Strategy. Issues covered in this SPD focus of ease of pedestrian movement / cycling access and enhancement of public transport facilities.

Consultee	Date and method of response	Comments	Response incorporated into Partnership Draft.
Transportation		Obstruction of the highway by traders with goods and "A" boards needs to be addressed.	'A' boards and on highway display of goods known to be a thorny issue. SPD does not directly address this, as this considered to be an issue for day-to-day management or the overarching strategy. On highway display of goods with canopies over could add 'charm' and distinctiveness to centre, but only if necessary (highway) consents are in place.
Transportation		Para. 4.5, population of 70,000? Needs same explanation as para. 4.5 in Halton Lea SPD. Need to mention segregation of footway and cycle routes.	Reference reworded to make clear relates to original objectives for Runcorn New Town.
Transportation		Para. 4.20, don't understand Rental Yields.	Explanation of Rental Yields added.
Transportation		Para. 4.20 Need to mention LTP and parking partnership.	Not relevant in this section.
Transportation		Para. 4.21, weaknesses, signing could be improved.	"poor signage" added to summary.
Transportation		Para. 4.23, line 7, centre's.	Typo corrected
Transportation		Page 15, 3 <sup>rd</sup> bullet, street furniture could play a role.	References to co-ordinated street furniture added to revised document.
Transportation		Page 19, photo 11, 48-50?	Typo corrected
Transportation		Para 8.23, need for legal signage, not the illegal "A" board.	Comment noted.
Transportation		Para 9.7, need to check HGV swept paths.	Shouldn't this be done as part of re-visiting of the bus station design?  Comments in SPD seem reasonable as they raise this as an issue.
Transportation		Para 9.8, is more explanation needed about the Direct Link?	Paragraph seems self-explanatory. Some additional info added.
Transportation		Para 9.14, the Council should not be promoting the use of "A" boards, best to delete the last 3 lines.	Lines deleted.
Transportation		Page 25, need to mention linkages to Runcorn Station.	Cannot see how this fits easily into this chapter.
Transportation		Para 10.12, not seen as a particular highway safety issue.	Paragraph deleted.
Transportation		Para 11.22, loss of car park could be a problem, need to look at town centre wide parking issue.	Reference added to any changes affecting parking being made in the light of the parking study.



Consultee	Date and method of response	Comments	Response incorporated into Partnership Draft.
Transportation		Para 12.8, Top Locks car park may be needed for displaced long stay from the town centre. There may also be demand for this parking from the Canal Quarter development.	Comments noted. Paragraph specifically tempers development potential with need for parking review. No change required.
Transportation		Para 13.7, this is also used by pedestrians.	Pedestrians added
Transportation		Parking provision for new residential developments will need to be addressed through the highway development control SPD, with different provision levels in accordance with accessibility to public transport and services.	Interesting but does not need to be included in this document. SPD makes reference to Transport and Access SPD.
Transportation		Para 13.20, how can lost parking be replaced?	Heads of Terms of Canal Quarter work includes requirement to include same number of spaces on north bank.
Transportation		Page 38, Proposal 10, could mention greenway link to Wigg Island.	
Transportation		Page 38, Proposal 11, could improve the Bridgewater Greenway.	
Transportation		Page 39, Proposal 18, Sheffield racks tend to be for short stay, long stay cycle parking for employees could be provided by cycle lockers.	Cycle lockers mentioned as most preferable.
Transportation		Page 39, Proposal 19, travel plans are required with a contribution to public transport and pedestrian facilities.	
Arnis Buklovskis collated comments for Development Control		Para 4.14, include reference to the central area redevelopment.	Reference added,
Development Control		Para.s 9.19 and 9.20, include reference to improved pedestrian linkages to Old Quay area.	Achievement of wider pedestrian linkages between Old Quay / Canal Quarter are covered ad-infinitum throughout the SPD. No benefit in adding here as concerned with delivery of particular stretches of footpath.
Development Control		Para 14.14, [commercial activities] marketing issues. Applicants are open to looking at small commercial element, but only of 'good quality'	Included in recent planning permission.
Development Control		Para 14.14, Car Parking issues?	Dealt with in recent planning permission
Development Control		Section 16; Site 23, Time frame dependant upon granting of full / reserved matters application.	Date removed & text updated to reflect recent consent.

Consultee	Date and method of response	Comments	Response incorporated into Partnership Draft.
Derek Sutton Operational Director Major Projects	28/10/2005 E-mail	Don't criticise HBC	Document does not seek to criticise HBC, however, it would be wrong not to reappraise developments, now completed and highlight outstanding issues regarding the physical environment and seek to address these wherever possible.
Derek Sutton		Contents The documents should start with the proposals for each area and then show how each area can contribute to them.	Document follows a house style for such SPD documents.  The document sets out the policy background, emerging issues and establishes a Vision for the centre, before discussing each sub-area in detail and how they will contribute to the delivery of the vision.. No change
Derek Sutton		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	Para 1.1 covers this point “ <i>The <b>overarching strategy</b> will deal explicitly with non-land use planning matters such as marketing and visitor information, promotion of business, day to day town centre management, car parking management, crime and anti-social behaviour and the like.</i> ” The overarching strategy is to be produced by Gary Collins section.
Derek Sutton		Contents The section numbers are all wrong	Numbering & titles corrected
Derek Sutton		9 Paragraph 4.10 Delete the word effectively	Word deleted
Derek Sutton		10 Paragraph 4.14 (backed by SRB, NWDA, NRF and capital priorities fund)	Funding partners added,
Derek Sutton		11 Paragraph 4.20 2 <sup>nd</sup> bullet point should read ‘..though recent new housing developments and planning applications are expected to <del>may have</del> reversed this trend <del>locally</del> ’	Text amended
Derek Sutton		12 Paragraph 4.21 • Weaknesses – what does legibility mean?	Explanation added.
Derek Sutton		12 Paragraph 4.21 • Opportunities – from Current development proposals to the end of that paragraph is one sentence and needs to be broken up.	Paragraph amended

Consultee	Date and method of response	Comments	Response incorporated into Partnership Draft.
Derek Sutton		12 Paragraph 4.21 Threats – include Cheshire Oaks and St Helens in the list of retail competition	Disagree. The Old Town is a lower order centre and unlikely to be directly impacted upon by Cheshire Oaks & St/Helens. Existing Centres listed in document especially Chester & Warrington were probably overly tenuous and have been removed..
Derek Sutton		13 Paragraph 4.24 A planning application has been submitted for the Expressway site	Capacity referred to is for convenience goods. Expressway site is for Bulky Goods.
Derek Sutton		13 Paragraph 4.26 Line 8 – remove the word 'vertical'.	Phrase replaced.
Derek Sutton		13 Paragraph 4.27 Full stop after 'lying empty' and delete the rest of the sentence	Disagree. Units listed are specifically covered later in document as development opportunities.
Derek Sutton		15 Other issues <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Importance of bus routes to centre must be maintained</li> <li>• Reinforcement of the Town Centre by centralising public services into the Town Centre (the library, HDL etc) is needed.</li> </ul>	Document does seek to protect bus routes. Proposal to remove section of busway is clearly justifies as having no impact on services.  References regarding both points added to section5 Strategic Issues.
Derek Sutton		17 Paragraph 8.6 Delete the following wording 'but with their subdued tones and unobtrusive nature somehow fail to impart any sense of place'.	Text added that surfaces and furniture are of high quality. But point regarding lack of sense of place considered valid and retained for Partner Consultation..
Derek Sutton		18 Paragraph 8.10 Delete the following wording 'with the most direct routes being through a rear service yard or down the side of an apparently semi-derelict building'	Paragraph slightly amended, but problem of routes is a statement of fact that document is right to highlight.
Derek Sutton		20 Paragraph 8.23 Delete the wording 'Presence of the newly opened'	Wording deleted.
Derek Sutton		21 Paragraph 9.5 Delete the sentence beginning with 'In its current condition...'	Text deleted
Derek Sutton		21 Paragraph 9.7 Delete the paragraph from the word 'However its design'.	Section rephrased, but issues restated as considered valid.
Derek Sutton		22 Paragraph 9.8 Delete the paragraph from the wording 'utilised as a temporarily home'	Paragraph reworted though many issues restated as considered valid.

Consultee	Date and method of response	Comments	Response incorporated into Partnership Draft.
Derek Sutton		22/23 Paragraph 9.13 Delete the following wording 'This has the look and feel of being somewhat of an afterthought' and 'a fire escape being the only feature of any visual interest'.	Text amended.
Derek Sutton		23 Paragraph 9.14 Delete the text from 'Unfortunately, these routes are not particularly..'	Valuable secondary accesses. Text amended to highlight positives whilst still acknowledging shortcomings.
Derek Sutton		24 Other issues <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Service access is poor to many of the retailers especially on Church Street and Regent Street.</li> <li>• Links to Runcorn Station – when you come out of the station, how do you know where the Town Centre is or how to get there?</li> </ul>	Comments noted. Will consider further at next stage.
Derek Sutton		25 Paragraph 10.2 Delete the following wording 'There are currently only 2 vacancies and 1 charity shop present'.	Statement was intended as a positive, not a negative.
Derek Sutton		25 Paragraph 10.4 Add in the following text after 'excellent condition' <b>because of the take up of the Council's shop front improvement scheme. The quality of the units to the west of this point is poorer with a few poor frontages.</b>	Text added.
Derek Sutton		25 Paragraph 10.6 Delete the following wording 'which would benefit from some further improvement'.	Text slightly amended and similar para 10.13 deleted
Derek Sutton		25 Paragraph 10.10 This paragraph should be in with the Church Street section.	Understandable point. Church Street section is intended to relate to the principal shopping area with the western areas falling under Regent St & fringes. Sub zone map tweaked to better show differentiation. Will be improved for next stage.
Derek Sutton		26 Paragraph 10.15 The library occupies an <b>attractive</b> Victorian building, <del>which should be retained if possible.</del> The policy is to redevelop.	No change. The library is an attractive building and as a Planning Document the SPD is right to say it should be retained if possible. The paragraph does however end by saying that a "significant opportunity exists for conversion <b>or redevelopment.</b> "

Consultee	Date and method of response	Comments	Response incorporated into Partnership Draft.
Derek Sutton		26 Paragraph 10.16 Chip shops and takeaways won't relocate to the Canal Quarter will they?	"Quality" food & drink. Intention is not for take-aways on Canal Quarter, but emphasis of leisure uses along new activity corridor is intended to include restaurants etc.
Derek Sutton		29 Paragraph 11.21 Delete all the text and the picture apart from 'The current Leiria Way car park presents a poor environment'.	Items deleted.
Derek Sutton		29 Paragraph 11.23 Delete the text from 'The route involves buses running..' to 'improved running times to the bus operators'.	No change. It is considered important to explain why we consider that this proposal will not be a detriment to bus services.
Derek Sutton		30 Paragraph 12.4 Should read 'The centre's bus station'	Typo corrected.
Derek Sutton		30 Paragraph 12.5 '..will be determined <del>shortly</del> as the Development brief.'	Word deleted.
Derek Sutton		30 Paragraph 12.6 <del>The possibility presents itself to</del> should be replaced with 'A preferred option would be to'.	Text amended
Derek Sutton		33 Paragraph 13.12 This paragraph is unnecessary and will be untrue in 6 months time.	Paragraph amended.
Derek Sutton		34 Paragraph 13.15 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Delete all the phase numbers</li> <li>• Delete the wording 'and removal / reconfiguration of the 'mound'</li> <li>• Paragraph starting with 'North bank' needs to be reworded so as it makes sense</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No change. Considered important in conditioning redevelopment scheme.</li> <li>• No change, Forms part of architectural brief.</li> <li>• Paragraph changed.</li> </ul>
Derek Sutton		34 Paragraph 13.16 <del>Certain phases may overlap or run concurrently. However, phase 4 which</del> should be replaced with 'This latter phase'	No change.
Derek Sutton		35 Paragraph 14.3 This may change when detailed permission has been approved	Text updated to reflect reserved matters consent granted 21 <sup>st</sup> Nov'05
Derek Sutton		35 Paragraph 14.5 The paragraph should read ' <del>The site of Belvedere House, a hostel for the homeless, could become available for redevelopment as...</del> '	Text amended.

Consultee	Date and method of response	Comments	Response incorporated into Partnership Draft.
Derek Sutton		36 Paragraphs 14.12, 14.13 and 14.14 are in different fonts from the rest of the document.	Font amended
Derek Sutton		38 Proposal 11 Cheshire (Canal) <del>Loop</del> Ring	Text amended
Derek Sutton		39 Proposal 16 Need to include the link from the railway station.	“Station Road (from train station)” added to pedestrian gateways.
Derek Sutton		46 SWOT analysis Strengths Need to include rail access under accessibility	Not convinced that railway station contributes meaningfully towards v&V of town centre. Added to list.
Derek Sutton		48 Site 3 Progress Proposed purchase of gas board building	Comment noted. Need to check progress with Property Services before highlighting in SPD. No change at this time.
Derek Sutton		48 Site 5 Future Remove ‘former college site’ as it is not in Dukesfield	“former college site” relates to the Annexe on Waterloo Road. Text amended to make this clear,
Derek Sutton		48 Site 6 Progress ‘but no road <del>yet</del> provided’	Additional text added. ( Are there proposals for a new road route? )
Derek Sutton		48 Old Police Station Building <del>refurbished and now</del> occupied by Halton Strategic Partnership	Additional text added

# Partnership Consultation

**Partnership consultation period:** 25<sup>th</sup> November 2005 ~ 9<sup>th</sup> December 2005

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

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

Consultee	Date and method of response	Comments	Response incorporated into Public Consultation Draft.
Meeting : 22 <sup>nd</sup> December 2005			
<p><u>Attendees:</u>            Dick Tregae, Strategic Director - Environment            Phil Watts, Operational Director – Environmental and Regulatory Services            Andrew Pannell, Divisional Manager – Planning and Policy            Jerry Goacher, Operational Director – Property Services            Derek Sutton, Operational Director – Major Projects            Steve Leng, Divisional Manager - Highways            Mike Curtis, Divisional Manager – Major Projects            Neil Macfarlane, Principal Planner            Alasdair Cross, Senior Planner            Joanne Dutton, Senior Planner            Nathan Renison, Senior Planner            Perran Baragwanath, Planner</p>			
Andrew Pannell	22/12/05 Meeting	Current drafts of documents somewhat a hybrid containing both issues and proposals.	Accepted. Partnership draft very much structured as an 'Issues' document
Jerry Goacher		Thought that the document titles of "Town Centres Strategies" were misleading as he was expecting a more fundamental review of the structure of the individual centres (something more akin to a Masterplan (or Area Action Plan)).	Runcorn Old Town and Halton Lea are being progressed as Supplementary Planning Documents. These cannot allocate land or alter the proposals map. Decision has been taken to progress Widnes as an Area Action Plan (DPD).
		Need to ensure that strategic issues are continued throughout the documents	Comment noted.  Strategy seeks to deal with linkages to Community Strategy, establish a Vision and refer to these strategic themes throughout.
Derek Sutton		Glad to hear that these are still issues papers as still concerned about some of the content.	

Consultee	Date and method of response	Comments	Response incorporated into Public Consultation Draft.
		Had raised concerns earlier that these documents should not be over critical. Believes that there are still references that highlight problems without an understanding of the history or issues behind previous decisions / developments. Will be construed by the public as criticisms.	Comments noted. However, it is important to identify problem areas and identify solutions.  Public consultation version more Policy driven, so less detail provided on specific issues. Hopefully more forward looking and hence 'positive'.
		Island Building (Runcorn Old Town) heavily criticised. Should be framed as an opportunity.	Island Building identified as an opportunity. Now occupied by Council HDL, so most references removed.
		Documents should not highlight problems / issues that cannot be addressed.	Comment noted.  Public Consultation Draft more Policy driven, so less detail provided on specific issues. Hopefully more forward looking and hence 'positive'.
		Documents intended to be used as a development control tool, so issues and actions should be made in that context, i.e. where development can address issues, not raising expectations for the Council to carry out work that is hasn't the resources for.	Comments noted  Public Consultation Draft presented as draft Policy document.
		There is often criticism that not enough development is occurring in the centres despite much having been achieved. Acknowledged that achievements are mentioned in preamble and in appendix at the back, but should be more explicitly highlighted within main body of the documents.	Successes highlighted, where space allows.
General Discussion		Next draft needs to be a draft SPD, <u>NOT</u> an issues paper.	Public Consultation Draft presented as draft Policy document.
Agreed Outcomes		References to Overarching Strategy to be removed (Not going to be written in time)	References removed.
		Need to more explicitly highlight past achievements from previous strategies.	Public Consultation Draft presented as draft Policy document..  Successes highlighted, where space allows, within this context.
		Need to better tie proposals into wider framework, i.e. Community Strategy".	TC Strategy seeks to deal with linkages to Community Strategy, establish a Vision and refer to these strategic themes throughout..



<b>Consultee</b>	<b>Date and method of response</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Response incorporated into Public Consultation Draft.</b>
		Frame any problems created in context of "works in progress".	Public Consultation Draft presented as draft Policy document.  Problems highlighted, only within a proposed policy context.
		Remove references to 'emerging issues' ~ these are not issues papers.	Partnership Drafts were part issues papers.  Public Consultation Draft presented as draft Policy document.
		Need to tie proposals back to key strategy.	TC Strategy seeks to deal with linkages to Community Strategy, establish a Vision and refer to these strategic themes throughout..

<b>Consultee</b>	<b>Date and method of response</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Response incorporated into Public Consultation Draft.</b>
Town Centre Working Group	27/04/05	Overhaul of signage in Old Town and Widnes to give more continuity, being carried out by Transportation.	
		Possibility of locating an outdoor market on Church Street on Tuesdays (say 40 pitches) being investigated by TC Manager. This goes back to a proposal from 1999. Crosville site to be used as overspill car parking on these days?	
		Bin Cages - ones near Somerfield to be completed mid June 2005	
		HDL fit out Sept/Oct 2005.	

