

Stoneygate Regeneration Framework Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)



Consultation Statement – May 2020

CONTENTS

Para	Content	Page
1	The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012	2
2	Summary of the Consultation Process	2
3	Summary of Comments and subsequent amendments to Final SPD	2-3
Appendices		
	<u>Appendix 1</u> - A screenshot of the online consultation form	4
	<u>Appendix 2</u> - A copy of the March 2020 SPD consultation letter	5
	<u>Appendix 3</u> – A screenshot of the social media posts	6-7
	<u>Appendix 4</u> – Schedule of Representations (comments)	8-17
	<u>Appendix 5</u> – Summary of Changes made to final SPD	17

1 The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012

- 1.1 This statement has been prepared in accordance with the above regulations and in particular, Part 5, which relates to the progression of Supplementary Planning Documents to adoption.
- 1.2 Public participation is covered within the Regulations at paragraph 12. Before a local planning authority adopts a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), it is required to prepare a statement setting out:
- i) the persons the local planning authority consulted when preparing the Supplementary Planning Document;
 - ii) a summary of the main issues raised by those persons; and
 - iii) how those issues have been addressed in the SPD.
- 1.3 In accordance with the above regulations, this statement sets out details of the consultation that took place on the draft Stoneygate Regeneration Framework SPD, and how the consultation process has informed the development and refinement of the document. This includes details of how, when and with whom this consultation took place; the main issues raised; and how these issues have been addressed in the document put forward for adoption.

2. Summary of Consultation Process

- 2.1 The Draft Stoneygate Regeneration Framework SPD was subject to a four week period of public consultation by the City Council from **24th February 2020 to 5pm on 23rd March 2020**, in accordance with the Regulations.
- 2.2 This was sent out via email to the planning policy database to over 2000 consultees, including all statutory consultees. The consultation, including details of how and when to make representations, along with the draft SPD and supporting documents, were publicised on the City Council website at www.preston.gov.uk/stoneygate, on social media and hard copies were made available to view at the Town Hall and at all libraries in the Preston area.
- 2.3 A copy of the webpage form and Consultation letter is attached at Appendix 1 and 2.

3 Summary of Consultation Comments and subsequent amendments to Final SPD

- 3.1 In total 26 responses were received to the consultation (see Appendix 4). These included representations from local residents, property owners in the area, developers / landowners or their representatives and Historic England. Some were relatively short and dealt with one issue, whilst others were lengthy and included comments on various matters, including general, specific, and site-specific issues.

- 3.2 A summary of each response, and how the key issues were considered/addressed in the final (June 2020) Regeneration Framework SPD are shown in the Schedule of Representations (comments) in **Appendix 4 further below**.
- 3.3 Engagement from social media resulted in the following: -
- Facebook – total of 1,024 people reached, 58 engagements, 10 Likes, 2 shares, 46 post clicks, 21 link clicks, 0 comments for 1 post on 25th February 2020.
 - Twitter – 10 retweets, 13 Likes, 3 comments for 1 post 25th February 2020. One of these comments was in support, one comment questioned the location of the picture in the tweet and the other comment in response to this, described the location that they thought the picture illustrated.
 - Prestonian (Council news) – sent 6th February 2020 to 1,098, confirmed opens – 1,227
- 3.4 The Final SPD was updated to reflect the consultation comments, including minor amendments and improvements to plans and text. A summary of changes made to the Final SPD is attached at **Appendix 5**).

Appendix 1: A screenshot of the online consultation form

Consultation on Draft Stoneygate Masterplan SPD

The Council is currently inviting representations on the Stoneygate Regeneration Framework Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).

Please use this form to make any comments to us by no later than 5pm on Monday 23 March 2020.

Please visit the Planning Policy consultation page to view information and the documents on the [Stoneygate Regeneration Framework Supplementary Planning Document \(SPD\)](#).

Your details

Full Name

Address line 1

Address line 2

Town/city

Postcode

Appendix 2: A copy of the February- March 2020 SPD consultation letter



Date: 04 February 2020

Development Directorate
Preston City Council
Town Hall
Lancaster Road
Preston
PR1 2RL

tel. 01772 906912

planningpolicy@preston.gov.uk

NOTE FOR DEPOSIT POINTS

Could you please make the Draft A3 document available for reference as below.

Dear Sir / Madam,

DRAFT STONEYGATE REGENERATION FRAMEWORK SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT (SPD) - CONSULTATION

Preston City Council has produced a draft Stoneygate Regeneration Framework and we are now seeking your comments, before we adopt it as a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) to supplement the Preston City Centre Plan, an area action plan to 2026 (adopted June 2016). Your comments are invited until 5pm on Weds 4th March 2020.

The purpose of the Stoneygate Regeneration Framework SPD is to provide an indicative framework to guide new development in the area and to set out key design principles to encourage a sustainable and attractive new community.

Once adopted, the Stoneygate Regeneration Framework SPD will act as a guide for developers when designing their proposals and will be taken into account when assessing planning applications in the area.

Ancillary documents include:

- Equality & Human Rights Impact Assessment (EHRIA); and
- Screening Report.

The draft SPD and ancillary documents are available to view and comment on at:

www.preston.gov.uk/stoneygate

Hard copies are also available at:

Preston City Council
Town Hall, Lancaster Road, Preston, PR1 2RL
Opening hours Monday - Friday 9.00am - 5.00pm (except Thursday)
Thursdays 10.00am - 5.00pm
Tel: 01772 906900

As well as the following libraries in the Preston area: -

- Preston Harris library, Market Square, Preston, PR1 2PP
- Sharoe Green library, 8 Sharoe Green Lane, Fulwood, Preston, PR2 8ED
- Fulwood library, 294 Garstang Road, Fulwood, Preston, PR2 9RX
- Ingol library, Ventnor Place, Ingol, Preston, PR2 3YX
- Savick library, 6 Birkdale Drive, Ashton-on-Ribble, Preston, PR2 1UL
- Ribbleton Library, Ribbleton Hall Drive, Ribbleton, Preston, Lancashire, PR2 6EE

Feedback from this consultation will be considered and will be reflected in the SPD and the consultation statement at the end of the consultation period, taking into account the issues raised during the consultation. Further information will be communicated via the webpage www.preston.gov.uk/stoneygate

We strongly encourage you to submit your comments via the **online questionnaire**.

Alternatively comments can be returned by email to: planningpolicy@preston.gov.uk or by post to: Planning Policy, Development Directorate, Town Hall, Lancaster Road, Preston, PR1 2RL.

Yours faithfully

C Blackburn

Chris Blackburn

Planning Policy Team Leader

Appendix 3 - A screenshot of the social media posts:

← **Tweet**

 **Preston City Council** 
@prestoncouncil

  **HAVE YOUR SAY**  

The Stoneygate area has the scope for development up to approx 1,655 homes. Development of the scale envisaged requires careful planning & coordination particularly given highway & infrastructure requirements. Deadline: 5pm 23 March
socsi.in/nwh6c



 **Preston City Council**
Published by Orlo [?] · 25 February · 

  **HAVE YOUR SAY**  

The Stoneygate area has the scope for development up to approx 1,655 homes. Development of the scale envisaged requires careful planning & coordination particularly given highway & infrastructure requirements.
Deadline: 5pm 23 March
socsi.in/GoxBS



Appendix 4 - Schedule of Representations (comments):

Summary of public consultation comments to the Draft (Feb 2020) Stoneygate SPD. Summary of each response, and how the key points were considered/addressed in the final Stoneygate SPD.

#	Summary of comments received / key points	PCC response	Amendments / actions
1. Historic England	<p>Summary of positive support: Overall aims and language of the draft SPD, clear overall vision. Draft SPD seeks to both preserve heritage assets and seeks to encourage a proactive and progressive approach to heritage, and to harness the positive benefit that it can provide.</p> <p>Suggestions summary: The SPD therefore represents a holistic plan for the regeneration of the Stoneygate area, but it could offer greater detail as to how this will be successfully achieved. Support the sentiment of what is proposed, we would consider that the framework could be improved by more in depth consideration of the individual elements of the overall vision.</p>	<p><i>Support noted and welcomed</i></p> <p><i>Comments noted. We will add some further detail to enhance the document and give more clarity on heritage and design considerations.</i></p> <p><i>It should be noted that Adopted policies will be of primary importance when considering planning applications</i></p>	<p>Minor improvements to the document will be made to provide more clarity on heritage and design considerations – to achieve the vision and objectives of the SPD.</p> <p>We will add an appendix with links to policies & plans</p>
2. Cadent and National Grid's response 06/02/20	<p>Ref: NW_GW1B_3NWP_022383</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Detailed comments made which would be relevant to any planning applications coming forward in the area. 	<p><i>Noted.</i></p> <p><i>These comments would need to be taken into consideration in the processing of any planning applications being submitted in the area subsequent to any adoption of the draft Stoneygate Regeneration Framework SPD.</i></p>	<p>No amendments proposed.</p>
3. Plant Protection Cadent Gas Ltd Date: 07/02/20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Detailed comments made which would be relevant to any planning applications coming forward in the area. 	<p><i>As above</i></p>	<p>No amendments proposed.</p>

#	Summary of comments received / key points	PCC response	Amendments / actions
<p>4.</p> <p>Avison Young – UK, on behalf of National Grid</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No comments. Further Advice – National Grid is happy to provide advice and guidance to the Council concerning their networks. Information is attached to the representation outlining further guidance on development close to National Grid assets. Contact details are provided in the representation to be added to the consultation database, if they are not already included. 	<p><i>Further advice is noted.</i></p>	<p>Contact details provided in the representation will be added to the Planning consultation database, if they are not already included.</p>
<p>5.</p> <p>Maddox Planning on behalf of St George’s Shopping Centre owners</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports residential development as the predominant use, and where appropriate, the intensification of residential use, within SPD area. Safeguarding the Primary Shopping Area should be considered for any proposals throughout the Stoneygate regeneration area. Fig. 9 ‘Overall Indicative Framework Plan’ of the SPD illustrates ‘Indicative development blocks (active frontages required to ground floor)’, covering a significant proportion of the SPD area. It is not clear what uses would be encouraged at these active frontages; however, these are likely to be commercial uses. It is important to ensure suitable mechanisms (i.e. floorspace thresholds) are in place to control such uses (e.g. retail and leisure) from adverse impact on the city centre PSA. 	<p><i>Support for residential use in the SPD area is noted. Comments are noted.</i></p> <p><i>The vitality and viability of the Primary Shopping Area (PSA) is safeguarded by tests in The Framework where these are triggered. It is also safeguarded by relevant policies in the Central Lancashire Core Strategy and in the City Centre Plan.</i></p> <p><i>City Centre Plan Policy OP4 requires proposals fronting Manchester Road in the Stoneygate Opportunity Area to contain an active frontage. Both The Framework and the City Centre Plan are clear that the PSA is the most sequentially preferable location for A1 use within the city centre. Within the part of the Stoneygate Opportunity Area of the city centre that falls outside of the PSA, The Framework allows for the provision of main town centre uses in principle excluding A1 use. Policy OP4 identifies the types of uses that are appropriate in the Stoneygate Opportunity Area, which includes A3 use and D2 use.</i></p> <p><i>The draft SPD indicatively illustrates the above approach to retail and commercial uses in the Stoneygate area and in the Horrocks Quarter.</i></p> <p><i>The draft SPD does not (and cannot) propose any allocations and it does not introduce new policies.</i></p>	<p>Appendix to be added which includes links to Policies & other useful information</p>

#	Summary of comments received / key points	PCC response	Amendments / actions
<p>6.</p> <p>Walsingham Planning on behalf of Cardinal Newman College</p>	<p>Support the aims and objective of the Stoneygate Regeneration Framework. However, the level of detail provides little guidance other than setting out its general location and height parameters.</p> <p>College see the document as aspirational, largely descriptive and contains no specific policies to support and enable delivery of the vision and associated objectives (including the growth of the College). The college also suggest sites are allocated or added to the plan – as they have put forward to the Central Lancashire ‘Call for Sites’ exercises.</p> <p><u>Area Appraisal Summary (SPD page 5)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Figure 3 contained in Section 3 presents a graphical appraisal of the area. It identifies a “lack of clear, safe routes from the College to the City Centre and Bus Station”. <p><u>Vision Objectives (SPD Page 7)</u></p> <p>Proposes the following amended wording to the Vision Objective– “to support and foster the continued success of Cardinal Newman College enabling it to meet its current and future needs by providing support for the extension of the College on new sites within the area; support for the provision of new buildings and the extension of existing accommodation; creating a high-quality environment around the College and along key routes used by students and bringing forward measures that assist in better integrating the College with the surrounding area”.</p> <p><u>Overall Framework and Design Principles (SPD Page 9)</u></p> <p>The College wish to draw attention specifically to two directly adjacent parcels of land which have development potential, but which appear to have been omitted from the Framework Plan. These are the surface car park at the junction of Arno Street with Manchester Road and the small retail parade on Manchester Road at its junction with Larkhill Road. These both link to the development site identified at the junction of Manchester Road with St Austin’s Place.</p>	<p><i>Comments and general points of support noted.</i></p> <p><i>With reference to “Policies” or “allocating sites”– the document is to be adopted as a Supplementary Planning Document (therefore indicative guidance) – supplementary to Adopted Policy (primarily the City Centre Plan). An SPD cannot propose new policies or allocate new sites. This would be done through the local plan process (currently in the process of being reviewed). See: https://centrallocalplan.lancashire.gov.uk/</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Noted. We will look to change the wording of this label (Page 5 – map label to bottom right).</i> <p><i>We will amend this bullet point to offer support to the growth of the College (Page 7, para 6.3, bullet point 6).</i></p> <p><i>As further above - With reference to “Policies” or “allocating sites”– an SPD cannot propose new policies or allocate new sites. This would be done through the local plan process (currently in the process of being reviewed). However - the SPD encourages sustainable development and regeneration in line with policy. Local plan review: https://centrallocalplan.lancashire.gov.uk/</i></p>	<p>We will make minor changes as highlighted below:</p> <p>We will also add an appendix with links to other useful policies, plans & info</p> <p>Amend text to plan label (Page 5)</p> <p>Text to be amended to offer support to the growth of the College</p>

#	Summary of comments received / key points	PCC response	Amendments / actions
<p>Walsingham Planning on behalf of Cardinal Newman College</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Streetscape enhancements required throughout – College suggest detail is added / unclear. • Active frontages are required to <u>all</u> ground floors – College suggest not a blanket requirement. <p>Table 1 provides further guidance on the masterplan. It identifies Cardinal Newman College/ Manchester Road as 'Key (new) places required'. It is entirely unclear what this means and how this relates to new development coming forward in the area.</p> <p><u>Character Areas and Design Guidance (SPD page 16)</u> An alternative wording for the text in the second paragraph of Section 8.4 is set out below: "Current projections indicate an increase in demand for places at Cardinal Newman College. In order to meet the demand for places, it is likely the College will need to expand its existing accommodation and facilities through either the extension of existing accommodation and / or the construction of new buildings. Concurrently, Cardinal Newman College are keen to improve the visibility of the College and its prominence within the area. Key pedestrian routes from the College to the bus station would benefit from enhancement and environmental improvement, in order to support and encourage increased access to the College by public transport, which could be further improved by the provision of new bus layby's in the vicinity of the College".</p> <p>With regard to the Framework Plan comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Given the main entrance to the College has been relocated to the junction of Princess Street with Larkhill Road, it is considered that Princess Street should be identified as a key and important route on the plan; and • The Barnfather site at the junction of Queen Street with Manchester Road is identified for a potential landmark / taller building. This is supported; however, this aspiration appears to conflict with the plan at Figure 6, which indicates development of a lower scale of 4-6 storeys. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>We will add some further explanation and links to wider (transport) plans to the document for ease of reference</i> • <i>We will remove word <u>all</u> and add some further explanation of key principles.</i> <p><i>As above – we will add some detail to explain key places</i></p> <p><i>We will amend the wording in this para to support the growth of the College and amend the wording in relation to safety and security of students.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>We will add this link to the plan(s)</i> • <i>Noted</i> 	<p>Page 9 – detail to be added explaining key principles.</p> <p>Text Page 16, 2nd para to be amended</p> <p>Add links to Framework Plans, Fig 9 Pg 11 & plan pg 16)</p>

#	Summary of comments received / key points	PCC response	Amendments / actions
<p>7.</p> <p>Trafford Housing Trust (THT)</p>	<p>Supports delivery of improvement of housing options in the area. Trafford Housing Trust has been working with Brookhouse Group to develop residential proposals for the Horrocks site. When comparing the emerging THT proposals for the Horrocks site with the draft SPD vision diagram, several issues are observed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • THT question the key views/routes and large Key place created from north to south through their proposed site. • Propose access from Grimshaw Street and the creation of a more subtle network of linked spaces in a north south orientation. • THT plans include a number of east-west linkages, but we have previously discounted the proposed east–west pedestrian route running through Walker Place. <p><u>Additional general points:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Raise concerns about commercial realities and the viability of schemes. • Any scheme to come forward on the site will be subject to pre-app process and potentially through a Places Matter Panel review. We are more than comfortable with the minor differences noted with the SPD’s indicative vision diagram and how this would perform during a Places Matter Review. • Recognise and accept the wider objectives of the draft SPD, but request that given the size and constraints of the Horrocks site, the SPD acknowledges that a more detailed masterplanning-led approach is required to refine development proposals and allows for sufficient flexibility to ensure that a viable scheme can come forward. 	<p><i>Comments and general points of support noted.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>All Comments/minor differences noted – the framework plans and SPD will be reviewed/adjusted (to integrate the principles of the THT proposals were possible).</i> • <i>Noted. We will review the connections shown.</i> • <i>Noted</i> • <i>Noted and we welcome suggestion to continue dialogue with the council and to potentially take any scheme coming forward on the site to Design Review.</i> • <i>Noted and agree a detailed masterplanning process is required and welcomed.</i> 	<p>We propose to make some minor changes to the document to reflect the comments from THT</p> <p>Amend text/plans to allow either large space or series of linked spaces – along with tweaks to key routes</p> <p>We will add links to Design review in the appendices (along with other useful info)</p>
<p>8.</p> <p>Brookhouse (major landowners of Horrocks site)</p>	<p>Support the aims and objectives of SPD and want to work with the council and stakeholders to bring forward regeneration.</p> <p>Suggest some alterations to the plans to reflect updates and new developments on their site including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The retail park layout updates • Pedestrian routes through the site & proposed from the north and west. 	<p><i>Comments and general points of support noted.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Retail park layout will be added to plans</i> 	<p>We propose to make some minor changes to the document to reflect the comments from Brookhouse & THT (as above)</p>

#	Summary of comments received / key points	PCC response	Amendments / actions
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Echo the comments made in the THT (#7) response above – (minor) differences in their proposed masterplan and the SPD Framework plan – particularly relating to open spaces and proposed connections. <p>As more general points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reconsider the 7-9 storey landmark building indicated on the Queen Street frontage (Fig 6, Page 9 – indicative heights) Page 10: what is meant by ‘key places to be created/ enhanced’? Page 17, point 2: we are uncomfortable with the requirement to overlay the scheme on the framework plan. Don’t want the SPD to be overly prescriptive. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All Comments/minor differences noted – the framework plans and SPD will be reviewed/adjusted (to integrate the principles of the THT proposals were possible). We will look to amend this diagram (Fig 6, page 9, Blue block) Text to be added to explain “Key places” Comments noted. 	<p>Plans to be updated</p> <p>Amend Fig 6, Page 9</p> <p>Add detail to explain key principles & Places – Page 9.</p>
9. From a Member of public	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comments - Further details needed of bicycle infrastructure. There should be less focus on maintaining 'strategic' vehicular traffic routes in favour of the provision of vehicle control measures, bus control lanes and pedestrian priority as an extension of the Fishergate Gateway Project. Consider future provision of tram lines 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted. Transport issues will be dealt with via liaison with Lancashire County Council (LCC) as local highways authority and through the planning application process. <p>For further information on wider Transport plans, including the City Transport Plan see the LCC website links below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> https://www.lancashire.gov.uk/council/organisation-and-partnerships/partnerships/city-deal/preston-city-transport-plan/ https://www.lancashire.gov.uk/council/strategies-policies-plans/roads-parking-and-travel/ 	<p>Appendix to be added which includes links to wider (Transport) Plans & other useful information</p>
10. From a Member of public	Transport, highways and parking concerns – Good to see proposals for Preston, but how will residents access the area and be able to park probably over 2000 cars in the area that is served by inadequate roads.	<p>Support is noted.</p> <p>These issues will be dealt with via liaison with Lancashire County Council and through the planning application process.</p> <p>See response at #9 and links above.</p>	As above
11. From a Member of public	Support - Spelling error on the last page, Stoneyate Nursery instead of Stoneygate Nursery. However, generally looking good, it's what that area has desperately needed since the dropping of the previous scheme, it's a tired and run down area of town.	<p>Support is noted.</p> <p>Comment is noted.</p>	“Stoneyate” Nursery Spelling error will be corrected (last page).
12. From a Member of public	Support - The Tithebarn scheme blighted this area.	<p>Support is noted.</p> <p>Comment is noted.</p>	No amendments proposed.

#	Summary of comments received / key points	PCC response	Amendments / actions
13. From a Member of public	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support - Great to see Cardinal Newman Students involved in stakeholder engagement. • Suggests that primary school children are involved in these planning stages. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Support and comments noted.</i> • <i>It is considered that consultation on the SPD has met the requirements of the relevant regulations and of Preston City Council's Statement of Community Involvement (SCI). Additional consultation with young people and primary school children would not be proportionate for a Supplementary Planning Document.</i> 	No amendments proposed
14. From a Member of public	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support - looks good and I'm glad there are plans to regenerate the area. Understands building work will be needed in the area. • Concerned whether Lark Hill Street housing backing onto the Smiths Recreation grounds will be affected or demolished. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Support and comments noted.</i> • <i>This is not proposed in the SPD.</i> 	No amendments proposed
15. From a Member of public	Support - like your idea of the plan for Stonegate	<i>Support is noted.</i>	No amendments proposed
16. From a Member of public	Support - Stoneygate is an area with impressive historical significance...which should be capitalized upon. Support for the provision of greenery and to contribute to improving local air quality. Support for street lighting and for making the area open and welcoming to address concern about personal safety in the area at evening and night time.	<p><i>Support for these aspects of the draft SPD is noted.</i></p> <p><i>Comment is noted.</i></p>	No amendments proposed
17. From a Member of public	Concerns about affordable housing provision - What proportion of housing will be affordable? By what cash terms is "affordable" defined?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Affordable housing issues are outside the scope of the draft SPD. Affordable housing provision is a matter covered by Core Strategy Policy 7 (Affordable and Special Needs Housing) and by the Central Lancashire Affordable Housing SPD (October 2012).</i> • <i>See Planning Policy pages: https://www.preston.gov.uk/article/928/Planning-policy</i> 	Appendix to be added which includes links to Policies & other useful information
18. From a Member of public	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support - I like the ideas highlighted. • Comments - consider for all housing to meet or exceed low carbon emissions / footprint. Hence high level of insulation and consider the provision of district / communal heating. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Support is noted.</i> • <i>Carbon emissions / carbon footprint targets, energy efficiency measures of developments and district / communal heating are outside the scope of the draft SPD.</i> • <i>These would be covered by local policies – see the link: https://www.preston.gov.uk/article/928/Planning-policy</i> 	As above

#	Summary of comments received / key points	PCC response	Amendments / actions
19. From a Member of public	With the climate crisis and environmental destruction high on the political and social agenda to what standards will new housing be energy efficient. Moreover are renewable sources of energy fitted into the infrastructure of this new urban village?	<p><i>The energy efficiency of housing development in the area and renewable energy development are matters that are outside the scope and aims of the draft SPD.</i></p> <p><i>The Central Lancashire Core Strategy Policies 27 (Sustainable Resources and New Developments) and 28 (Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Schemes), Preston Local Plan Policy EN9 (Design of New Development) cover these planning issues.</i></p> <p><i>See: https://www.preston.gov.uk/article/928/Planning-policy</i></p>	Appendix to be added which includes links to Policies & other useful information
20. From a Member of public	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support - Looks like an excellent plan for regenerating this area. In its current condition, the area is a blemish on the city. • Looking at investing in residential property in the area on the proviso that the Stoneygate Plan comes into fruition. • Having an urban city area would undoubtedly attract innovative and forward thinking businesses and people to the City which would support the continual development, growth and variety that Preston has the potential to offer. 	<i>Support and comments noted.</i>	No amendments proposed.
21. From a Member of public	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mix of general support, comments and concerns – • Not sure what style this housing will take. Does not support the development of flats. Need to keep the great history of the area, Arkwright House, The old cock pit, etc. • Concerned about main entrance to The Minster car park, too dangerous to have only Church Street narrow road as too much traffic for this single car route. This is an important building and should be made more visual from the back as beautiful. • Great idea to improve the area but why just show market stalls and a cafe, bar area which don't exist? 	<p><i>Support and comments noted.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The SPD supports a mix of housing types in the area, consistent with the City Centre Plan (and adopted policies). Heritage assets are to be retained and enhanced (see Appendix 2 & 3) – again consistent with adopted policy.</i> • <i>The comment about the entrance to The Minster car park is site specific, the detail of which would be addressed via liaison with Lancashire County Council and in the event that planning application(s) are submitted for the site, through the planning application process.</i> • <i>Illustrations of market stalls, a café and a bar area are only indicative of active uses to help visualise potential change in the area.</i> 	Minor changes proposed to SPD to more clearly support retaining & enhancing heritage assets
22. From a Member of public	<p>Support - If it can all be made to work it looks excellent.</p> <p>City centres are changing and are not going to recover their dominance as retail centres that they once "enjoyed". The idea of an urban village with a mix of residential development and employment</p>	<p><i>Support is noted.</i></p> <p><i>Comment is noted.</i></p>	No amendments proposed.

#	Summary of comments received / key points	PCC response	Amendments / actions
	is an attractive one, especially where care is clearly going to be given to protect the heritage assets. The pedestrianised route from Church Street to Manchester Road looks pretty spectacular.		
23. From a Member of public	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support - The masterplan is very promising. It is both ambitious and organic in its ambition, with its mix of buildings and uses and its proposed public realm. • Supports a mix of residential, live/work units, perhaps a co-living scheme. A mix of housing types. • Supports that the area between Church Street and the Bus Station ramp is proposed to be opened up. • Supports the sweep of public realm from Church Street via the Minister down to Manchester Road but it is essential this has both a real wow factor and connected the different areas. • Supports the provision of some wild flowers and other ornamental planting in this area & inspiring design; artworks / murals. • Comment - Supports the idea of a 'Minster Precinct' design competition to provide an entrance from both Church Road to the north, and Stonegate to the south, knitting the Minster to its context, with inspiring landscaping and proposed future uses of adjacent plots next to the church. 	<p><i>Support and comments noted.</i></p> <p><i>Comments noted/welcomed. The suggested design competition is site specific and is outside the scope of the draft SPD. We would be happy to work with partners/stakeholders to help bring sites and designs forward.</i></p>	No amendments proposed.
24. From a Member of public	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support – Supportive of regeneration of the area. • The plans look fantastic with plenty of mixed use, active frontages and will help tie the college / communities to the city centre in particular the developing area of the bus station and markets. • Comment – Would like the provision of a water feature in a prominent location, possibly in the Stonegate historic core area. 	<p><i>Support and comments noted.</i></p> <p><i>Provision of a water feature – this raises an issue of detail that is outside the scope and aims of the draft guidance SPD. However, the SPD does encourage the provision and improvement of the public realm in the area.</i></p>	No amendments proposed.
25. From a Member of public	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support - pleased that Preston City Council has been able to plan a decent future for this neglected area. If the plan is carried out the area will be more welcoming and accessible, an asset to the city. • Hope that private developers will find the plan attractive and come forward with complementary proposals. 	<p><i>Support is noted.</i></p> <p><i>Comment is noted.</i></p>	No amendments proposed.

#	Summary of comments received / key points	PCC response	Amendments / actions
26. From a Member of public	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support – It is a great start but the details are vague. Supports saving and enhancement of heritage assets in the area and the importance of a sense of place. Supports increased population density and mixed communities. • Design should be integrated into the area including choice of materials whilst allowing for contemporary design. • Public spaces should be open, well lit, with cctv and safe. • Does not support the provision of a market or lots of shops in the area as there are vacancies in the city centre. 	<i>Support and comments noted.</i>	No amendments proposed.

Appendix 5 - Summary of Changes made to final SPD (in response to comments above)

Page	item	Summary of Changes
1	Front cover - Date	Amend (and adoption date)
2	Contents	Update at end (page no's)
5	Appraisal summary (College route)	Updated labels & to bottom right ("safety")
7	Vision objectives	Amend college bullet point 6, para 6.3 – "growth"
9	Principles & heights plan	Update text in principles and explain: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Active frontages (remove word "all") • What key "places" are • Streetscape – encourage walking and cycling
	2D Plans (Brookhouse site)	Add new retail units/layout to base plans
10	Summary principles + plans (Figs 7 & 8)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Label key places (eg A-J) • Update base plans (clearer text etc)
11	Fig 9 – Overall Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update plans text (resolution). • Amend Brookhouse links etc • Add College links / views • Label key places (eg A-J) • Added heritage assets
13	8.1 – Stoneygate area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update base plans (clearer text etc) • Label key places (eg A-J)

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Added heritage assets • Update views / routes text etc
14	8.2 – Percy St / Church St	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As above
15	8.3 – Horrocks Q / Grimshaw St	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As above
16	8.4 – College / Queen St	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As above plus: • Amend College text – to support growth • Add new College entrance / link
17	Checklist & links	Double check links work / add others
19	Appendix 3 – Buildings of Townscape value	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Updated text (more legible) • Spelling mistake at 4 (Stoneygate Nursery)
20	New page - Further information	Added further links / useful refs (eg Highways & other policy/guidance etc)