

# BRIDLINGTON TOWN CENTRE AREA ACTION PLAN

Report of Consultations on the Preferred Options Draft and Sustainability Appraisal

## Report on Consultations on the Bridlington Area Action Plan

This report presents the results of consultation on the Bridlington Area Action Plan (Preferred Options Draft and Sustainability Appraisal) which was held between October and December 2007.

The report lists all 69 representations made to the Bridlington Area Action Plan. For each entry the complete representation together with a summary is provided. This is then followed by the Council's response and recommendation for taking the comment into account in the Draft of the Town Centre Area Action Plan.

## ISSUE 1 The AAP's Vision and Objectives

**Question 1.1** The Bridlington Regeneration Strategy puts forward a vision which the AAP aims to deliver: Bridlington: a great place to live by the seaside. Visitors welcome! Do you support or object to the vision. If you object what are your reasons and your alternative vision and reasoning

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
6001	Sup	Mrs Alexandra Grimshaw	Supports the vision.	Supports the vision.	Support is welcomed.
6002	Sup	David Armstrong	Supports the vision.	Supports the vision.	Support is welcomed.
6003	Sup	Mr David William Dowson	Supports the vision.	Supports the vision.	Support is welcomed.
6004	Sup	Mr Lance Cook	Supports the vision.	Supports the vision.	Support is welcomed.
6005	Sup	Ms Maggie Walsh	Supports the vision.	Supports the vision.	Support is welcomed.
6006	Sup	Mrs Margaret Lines	Supports the vision.	Supports the vision.	Support is welcomed.
6007	Sup	Mrs / Cllr Pamela Austin	Supports the vision.	Supports the vision.	Support is welcomed.
6008	Sup w cond	Mr Robert Harrison	Supports some excellent suggestions but believes some ideas are unsound.	Supports the vision.  Some excellent suggestions, however some grossly unsound ideas. Please start again, including sorting Chapel Street and non park and ride based policy responses.	Support is welcomed.  The movement and access strategy is designed to reduce traffic congestion in the Town Centre and improve the pedestrian environment. Whilst the AAP cannot reduce the traffic flow itself, changes are proposed to the directional signage in Bridlington, with the aim of separating, before it gets close to the Town Centre, the traffic that is destined for the Town Centre, from traffic that is destined to points north or south of the town. Provision is also made to divert traffic from the Town Centre to a park and ride facility at South Shore.  The alterations to Chapel Street have now been in place for 12 months and following refinements are now broadly accepted. Improvements to the signalling have now

					alleviated the initial problems. Accidents have been significantly reduced and a safer pedestrian environment created.  Recommendation: no change needed.
6009	Sup	Mr Roger Othick	Supports the vision.	Support the vision	Support is welcomed.
6010	Obj	Mr John Winterbottom	<p>Objects to the vision.</p> <p>The town centre suffers from traffic jams. Regeneration is desirable but should not encourage further Town Centre residential development. Short term parking should be retained.</p>	<p>Object to the vision.</p> <p>Bridlington Town Centre is already choked by traffic jams and overpopulated by vehicle owners/users. Bridlington is the only reasonable shopping centre for at least a dozen surrounding villages as well as its own population. Regeneration is desirable but should not encourage or enable further Town Centre residential occupation and should retain short term parking capacity for shoppers to accommodate the less mobile population.</p>	<p>Objection noted.</p> <p>Improved transport connectivity is an important element of the AAP.</p> <p>The evidence base indicates that there is potential to 'claw back' for Bridlington retail spending that is currently lost to competing centres.</p> <p>Not encouraging further Town Centre residential development does not acknowledge the evidence base, which explains that the AAP must ensure there is an adequate provision of housing to meet the different types and tenures of dwellings required to meet new household formation and demand arising during the plan period. The AAP conforms to national planning policy which encourages town centre residential development that contributes to the formation of sustainable communities.</p> <p>The parking strategy significantly increases the number of short stay parking provision serving the Town Centre, and improves the location, safety and convenience of the parking.</p> <p>Failing to encourage Town Centre development does not acknowledge the evidence base which highlights the invaluable and critical role of the Town Centre in driving the long-term prosperity of Bridlington. Also, potentially contravenes national planning policy, which directs retail, office, community and residential development to town centres.</p>

					Recommendation: no change needed.
6011	Sup	Miss Margaret (Meg) Gilpin	Supports the vision.	Supports the vision.	Support is welcomed.
6012	Sup	Mr Roy Lines	Supports the vision.	Support the vision	Support is welcomed.
6013	Obj	Mr & Mrs A & K Sanderson	Objects to the vision.  Concern over effect on recently established small business.	Object to the vision.  Having just established a small business on Hillderthorpe Road (with funding from small business grant) we feel that we are not being given the chance to expand and feel that we are being pushed out with no offer of help with relocation matters.	Objection noted.  The Council will continue to pursue negotiations with property owners who may be affected by the proposed development making appropriate offers to assist with relocation matters.
6014	Sup	Mr Gordon George Vincent	Supports the vision.	Support the vision.	Support is welcomed.
6015	Sup	Mr William Denison Chapman	Supports the vision.	Support the vision.	Support is welcomed.
6017	Sup	Captain Eric Casson	Supports the vision.	Support the vision	Support is welcomed.
6018	Sup	Dr Paul Beal	Supports the vision.	Support the vision	Support is welcomed.
6019	Sup	Mr Jackson	Supports the vision.	Support the vision	Support is welcomed.
6020	Sup	Mr Ian Stoddard	Supports the vision.	Support the vision	Support is welcomed.
6021	Sup	Mr Martyn Coltman	Supports the vision.	Support the vision	Support is welcomed.
6022	Sup	Mr Richard Hudson	Supports the vision.	Support the vision	Support is welcomed.
6023	Sup	Mrs Collette Tyler	Supports the vision.	Support the vision	Support is welcomed.
6036	Sup	Bridlington Harbour Commissioners	Supports the vision.	Support the vision	Support is welcomed.

Your alternative vision and reasoning (if your reasons are not already covered by your objection):

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
6008	Obvs	Mr Robert Harrison	Back to the drawing board I'm afraid.	Back to the drawing board I'm afraid.	Observation noted  Insufficient information to provide detailed response and recommendation.
6010	Obvs	Mr John Winterbottom	Suggests "Bridlington: Jewel of the East Yorkshire Coast" as an alternative.	"Bridlington: Jewel of the East Yorkshire Coast".  A more snappy and realistic logo which is more visitor friendly (after all the object of regeneration is to capture extra holiday makers cash whether via a marina or just extra tourism) and avoids any suggestion of spoiling either Bridlington's historic reputation or its existing ruralistic charm via Flamborough Head / Wlisthorpe clifftop.	Observation noted.  The suggestion is an attractive marketing logo that the Council will take into account in promoting Bridlington. The vision, for planning purposes, needs to imply more about the actions to be taken to regenerate the AAP area. The evidence shows that the future of Bridlington will require a diverse local economy that is less dependent on tourism and more competitive in attracting the spending of its growing population and its businesses.  The Council is very concerned to ensure that Bridlington's historic character is enhanced, not damaged, by the regeneration proposals in the Town Centre AAP, and proposes specific policies to ensure this will be the case.  Recommendation: no change needed.
6013	Obvs	Mr & Mrs A & K Sanderson	Small business should be supported.	Small business should be supported and offered suitable alternative premises to continue to grow and prosper thus investing in the town – supporting local produce – and employing local people.	Comment noted.  The AAP includes specific proposals for developing the small business community in the town centre. Other kinds of initiatives, as indicated in the delivery section of the AAP, will be needed to ensure local people and businesses are the principal beneficiaries of the regeneration proposals.  Recommendation: no change needed.
6017	Obvs	Captain Eric Casson	Vision Statement should be expanded perhaps to	The statement is too short and restrictive and needs to lead the AAP and its overall strategy and aims from the outset. To	Observation noted.

			<p>- 'A great place to live, work and thrive in at Yorkshire's Premier destination. Visitors are welcome throughout the year'.</p>	<p>ensure that Bridlington makes this important 'step change' for the future provided by this AAP.</p> <p>Expand the Vision Statement to perhaps 'A great place to live, work and thrive in at Yorkshire's Premier destination. Visitors are welcome throughout the year'.</p>	<p>The Council however emphasise that a key purpose of the vision is to indicate a better balance between Bridlington's responsibilities to meet the needs of its residents and businesses and its appeal as a visitor destination. The evidence shows that if Bridlington makes a step change in its appeal as a place to live and work, it will also be a more desirable place to visit. But the first change needed is enabling Bridlington to be a more competitive town centre for its residents and businesses.</p> <p>Recommendation: no change needed.</p>
6018	Obvs	Dr Paul Beal	<p>Comment from British Sub-Aqua Club in Yorkshire.</p> <p>I do not object in principal to the plans. I have been contacted by a member who is concerned about the possible lack of consideration for supporting SCUBA diving activities from Bridlington.</p> <p>There is currently just one local diving charter vessel that is booked up many months in advance; showing how popular the area is for diving.</p> <p>I have received feedback that the marina consultation has been biased towards the fishing fleet rather than</p>	<p>I do not object in principle to the plans outlined on the document currently being consulted on. However, as the representative for the British Sub-Aqua Club in Yorkshire I have been contacted by a member who is concerned about the possible lack of consideration for supporting SCUBA diving activities from Bridlington. This activity is undertaken either from commercial vessels operating from Bridlington harbour or private/ club boats launched locally. Bridlington is an excellent base for SCUBA diving as there is a significant amount of wrecks within range of the town and excellent underwater scenery just off the coast. There are 3000 British Sub-Aqua club members in Yorkshire in 80 clubs (or branches). Many of these clubs own Rigid Inflatable Hulled (RIBS) boats which are currently launched at sites such as Bridlington (from the harbour slip or the beach slip), Hornsea, Whitby and Grimsby. Many of these slipways do not provide toilets or changing facilities for divers. If these regeneration plans took divers into account and provided a dedicated slipway, changing areas etc there would be a significant influx of divers to the town which would increase visitors and hence local revenue. Divers are frequently in the higher wage bracket and therefore have disposable income available to support local businesses. In addition, I would like to see support for local diving charter vessels. There is currently just one vessel that is booked up many months in advance; showing how popular the area is for diving. I have received feedback that the marina consultation has been biased towards the fishing fleet rather than an all inclusive policy (to all currently users) as described in your preferred options document.</p>	<p>The Bridlington Marina Supply and Demand Study signed off by Yorkshire Forward and East Riding of Yorkshire Council makes recommendations for marina activity connected to leisure including SCUBA diving activities.</p> <p>There will be spare capacity in the lock water areas. The marina will also be fitted with all that is needed to accommodate the proposed uses.</p> <p>The marina consultation has not been biased towards any group or use. However there is a need to protect the existing sustainable commercial fishing industry. The business case for the marina will examine the profit elements from all marina activity.</p> <p>Recommendation: no change needed to the AAP. Discussions with all groups with potential interest in the proposed marina will continue.</p>

			an all inclusive policy (to all currently users) as described in your preferred options document.		
6021	Obvs	Mr Martyn Coltman	Fully support this exhaustively researched and consulted-on vision for Bridlington.	I fully support this exhaustively researched and consulted-on vision for Bridlington as it brings the emphasis back to catering more for the resident and correct the imbalance to date which has only really catered for the tourist, at the expense of an increasingly wealthy local population, approaching 40,000 residents. The strategy will deliver a great place to live which will automatically be a great place to visit too.	Support is welcomed

**Question 1.2** The AAP’s objectives for achieving the vision:

Objective 1. Reinvigorate the Town Centre’s year round ‘offer’ to meet the needs of its residents and businesses – zoning the seasonal attractions, improving public realm, and providing new and better shops, offices and office-type workspace, new year round leisure facilities, new cafes and restaurants, new hotels and new housing choices.

Objective 2. Create a marina which includes the Harbour and integrates with the Town Centre core.

Objective 3. Create a good quality, stylish new Town Centre residential offer that is attractive to a variety of residential markets.

Objective 4. Make the Town Centre easily accessible and comfortably usable at all times of the year.

Objective 5. Create the enhanced and new public realm, public spaces and related public infrastructure needed to create the conditions for regeneration and provide the capacity to accommodate the growth in activity the will follow.

Objective 6. Raise design standards in the built environment, recover and protect the Town Centre’s historic character, and deliver high quality contemporary buildings to raise the spirits and leave the stamp of our century.

Please indicate whether you support or object to these objectives. If you object what are your reasons for objecting and your proposals for alternative objectives and your reasoning.

Reasons for objecting:

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
6000	Obj	Mr Alex Thompson	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Objective based on assumptions.</li> <li>2. No marina on South Beach</li> <li>3. Who wants town centre living.</li> <li>6. Contemporary</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This objective is only based on assumptions.</li> <li>2. A marina on the South Beach is unacceptable.</li> <li>3. Who would want/choose to live in a Town Centre.</li> <li>6. High quality contemporary buildings</li> </ol>	<p>Objections noted</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The objective arises from the evidence, set out in the published evidence base and summarised in the Preferred Options draft, which shows both the factors which need to be corrected if Bridlington is to be regenerated and, using industry standard methods, that the scale of future demand needed to support the new development and other</li> </ol>

			buildings will not protect historic centre.	do not protect historic town centres.	<p>improvements will be forthcoming. Thus the objective is very far from resting on 'assumptions'.</p> <p>2. The design of the marina is being carefully worked up to minimise the impact on South Beach. The marina will only be built if the environmental impacts, all matters considered, are acceptable where measures cannot be taken to remove the impacts altogether. Whether a marina is built or not necessary works to re-construct part of the existing seawall will have a minor impact on South Beach in any case.</p> <p>3. The AAP conforms to national planning policy which encourages town centre residential development that contributes to the formation of sustainable communities.</p> <p>6. The Council is very concerned to ensure that Bridlington's historic character is enhanced, not damaged, by the regeneration proposals in the Town Centre AAP, and proposes specific policies to ensure this will be the case.</p> <p>Recommendation: make the AAP clearer in relation to the proposed marina.</p>
6001	Sup w cond	Mrs Alexandra Grimshaw	Support objectives 1, 2 and 3.	Support objectives 1, 2 and 3.	Support is welcomed.
6002	Sup	David Armstrong	Supports objectives 1-6	Supports objectives 1-6	Support is welcomed.
6003	Sup	Mr David William Dowson	Supports objectives 1-6	Supports objectives 1-6	Support is welcomed.
6004	Sup w cond	Mr Lance Cook	Supports objectives 1-3 and 5/6. Object to objective 4.	Supports objectives 1-3 and 5-6. Object to objective 4.	<p>Support is welcomed.</p> <p>Objection to objective 4 is noted. Insufficient information given to provide detailed response and recommendation.</p>
6005	Sup	Ms Maggie Walsh	Supports objectives 1-6	Supports objectives 1-6	Support is welcomed.
6006	Sup w cond	Mrs Margaret Lines	Supports objectives 2, 4 & 5 Objects to	Supports objectives 2, 4 & 5 Objects to objectives 1, 3 & 6	<p>Support for objectives 2,4 &amp; 5 welcomed.</p> <p>Objection to objectives 1,3 &amp; 6 noted.</p>

			objectives 1, 3 & 6	<p>1. Bridlington does not need a lot of new shops, certainly not a big supermarket-led development of multiples. Internet shopping will become more popular.</p> <p>3. More residences would mean more cars and not enough support services.</p> <p>6. The town does not need high tech architecture.</p>	<p>1. The evidence base indicates that there is potential to 'claw back' for Bridlington retail spending that is currently lost to competing centres. The continuing development of e-tail (for example; shopping via the Internet) also puts pressure on traditional town centres to become more competitive.</p> <p>3. The scale of housing proposed is in line with the housing allocation for East Riding required by the Regional Spatial Strategy and the distribution between principal towns as set out in the adopted Joint Structure Plan.</p> <p>6. The AAP does not propose high tech architecture, but instead well designed buildings that both meet the economy's needs for efficient and environmentally sustainable buildings and which also complement Bridlington's particular character, in line with all other policy on good design (national and regional).</p> <p>Recommendation: no change needed.</p>
6007	Sup w cond	Mrs / Cllr Pamela Austin	<p>Supports objectives 1-6.</p> <p>If Leisure World is demolished swimming pool must be replaced.</p>	<p>Supports objectives 1-6.</p> <p>Object to subsection of 5 - Subsection of public realm – removal of swimming pool i/e Leisure World to be demolished, I agree that it should be demolished but think a swimming pool must be built on the site.</p>	<p>Support is welcomed.</p> <p>Leisure World recognised as an important community facility as well as a rainy day activity for visitors. The Council's options for the replacement of a swimming pool are: redevelopment on the current site, a new facility on the edge of the Town Centre or a new facility at South Shore near the new Park and Ride and Land Train</p> <p>Recommendation: no change needed.</p>
6008	Obj	Mr Robert Harrison	Objects to objective 4.	<p>Objects to objective 4.</p> <p>Your policy responses will not achieve this vision – especially transport related. It is therefore unsound.</p>	<p>Objection noted.</p> <p>The evidence shows that the objectives, through implementing the AAP's proposals, are all achievable. The evidence, including that on the transport proposals, is set out in the separately published evidence base.</p> <p>Recommendation: no change needed.</p>
6009	Sup	Mr Roger Othick	Supports objectives 1-6	Support objectives 1-6.	Support is welcomed.
6010	Sup w	Mr John Winterbottom	Support objectives 1, 2 and 4.	<p>Support objectives 1, 2 and 4.</p> <p>Object to objective 3 and parts of 5 &amp; 6.</p>	<p>Support for objectives 1,2 and 4 welcomed.</p> <p>Objection to objectives 3 and parts of 5/6 noted.</p>

	cond		Object to objective 3 and parts of 5 & 6.	<p>Whilst broadly supporting the objectives suggested in principle, any additional residential expansion within the suggested AAP area would destroy the regeneration intention. All new residential expansion should take place well outside the AAP area to avoid excessive town centre traffic – the misguided alteration having Chapel Street ‘single tracked’ has already shown capacity at busy times to back traffic up Prospect Street and Quay Road to and beyond the Springfield Avenue Junction. The resulting jams now cause choke traffic by making every attempt to choke pedestrians with resultant fumes – the very opposite of the regeneration plans objective.</p>	<p>Not encouraging further Town Centre residential development does not acknowledge the evidence base, which explains that the AAP must ensure there is an adequate provision of housing to meet the different types and tenures of dwellings required to meet new household formation and demand arising during the plan period. The AAP conforms to national planning policy which encourages town centre residential development that contributes to the formation of sustainable communities.</p> <p>The movement and access strategy is designed to reduce traffic congestion in the Town Centre and improve the pedestrian environment. Whilst the AAP cannot reduce the traffic flow itself, changes are proposed to the directional signage in Bridlington, with the aim of separating, before it gets close to the Town Centre, the traffic that is destined for the Town Centre, from traffic that is destined to points north or south of the town. Provision is also made to divert traffic from the Town Centre to a park and ride facility at South Shore. The AAP intends to enhance pedestrian priority in the Town Centre using a variety of techniques, including the widening of pavements or full pedestrianisation where warranted.</p> <p>The alterations to Chapel Street have now been in place for 12 months and following refinements are now broadly accepted. Improvements to the signalling have now alleviated the initial problems. Accidents have been significantly reduced and a safer pedestrian environment created.</p> <p>Recommendation: no change needed</p>
6011	Sup w cond	Miss Margaret (Meg) Gilpin	Support all objectives except objective 3.	<p>Support all objectives except objective 3.</p> <p>I do not understand the ‘town centre residential offer’ and (more specifically) ‘variety of residential markets’? LA / private / houses / flats? Redevelopment of brownfield sites / green land for residents / tourists or visitors?</p>	<p>Support is welcomed.</p> <p>The AAP proposes a preference for using land which is already within Bridlington’s built up area instead of greenfield land, in line with national and regional policy. Within the AAP area, the aim is for a mix of housing types (flats of different sizes, townhouses, detached houses and so on) as well as a mix of tenures (ownership, rental and shared ownership).</p> <p>Recommendation: make the AAP clearer in relation to the ‘town centre residential offer’.</p>

6012	Sup w cond	Mr Roy Lines	Support all objectives except objective 2.	Support all objectives except objective 2.  The use of 'marina' here and throughout is misleading. What is proposed is a marina and a lot of land based extra development (a lot of housing, shops, eateries etc).	Support is welcomed.  Following the completed Bridlington Marina Supply and Demand Study the marina will include 'marina related development'. Other uses will be located in the town centre.  Recommendation: no change needed.
6014	Sup w cond	Mr Gordon George Vincent	Support objectives 2, 4 and 6.  Object to objective 1.	Support objectives 2, 4 and 6.  Object to objective 1.  Objective 1 is 'pie in the sky', support the harbour and coastline as this is where tourists (and locals hopefully) will spend their money.	Support is welcomed.  The objective arises from the evidence, set out in the published evidence base and summarised in the Preferred Options draft, which shows both the factors which need to be corrected if Bridlington is to be regenerated and, using industry standard methods, that the scale of future demand needed to support the new development and other improvements will be forthcoming. The evidence shows that the only route to achieving solutions to the existing town centre involves raising the aggregate level of activity in the town centre. The evidence also shows that there is sufficient prospective demand from shoppers and visitors to support both the new and the existing development.  Recommendation: no change needed.
6015	Sup	Mr William Denison Chapman	Supports objectives 1-6	Support objectives 1-6.	Support is welcomed.
6017	Sup	Captain Eric Casson	Supports objectives 1-6	Support objectives 1-6.	Support is welcomed.
6019	Sup	Mr Jackson	Supports objectives 1-6	Support objectives 1-6.	Support is welcomed.
6020	Sup	Mr Ian Stoddard	Supports objectives 1-6	Support objectives 1-6.	Support is welcomed.
6021	Sup	Mr Martyn Coltman	Supports objectives 1-6	Support objectives 1-6.	Support is welcomed.
6022	Sup	Mr Richard Hudson	Supports objectives 1-6	Support objectives 1-6.	Support is welcomed.
6023	Sup w cond	Mrs Collette Tyler	Support objective 2, 4 & 6.  Object to objective 1 & 3.	Support objective 2, 4 & 6.  Object to objective 1 & 3.  It is my belief that regeneration should concentrate around the existing town centre	Support for objective 2,4 & 6 is welcomed. Objection to objectives 1 & 3 noted.  1 & 3. The evidence shows that the only route to achieving solutions to the existing town centre involves raising the aggregate level of activity in the town centre, which requires new development of the type that will

				<p>and problems in this area should be solved in the first instance, before creating a new area. If this does not happen, the existing town centre will further degenerate, causing more eyesores and empty shops. The current town centre cannot be filled accordingly with shops.</p>	<p>attract efficient and competitive 'anchor'-type retailers and a much more attractive public realm throughout the centre as a whole. The evidence also shows that there is sufficient prospective demand from shoppers and visitors to support both the new and the existing development. Therefore by accommodating this additional activity and connecting carefully to the existing town centre, the evidence from elsewhere shows there is the greatest possible chance of improving trading conditions in the existing town centre. The AAP also includes significant proposals to improved public realm in the existing centre, as well as significant improvement in pedestrian environment, traffic management and parking aimed at the existing centre. The under-used and poorly used land and poorly maintained buildings in the Burlington Parade area badly affect the appeal of the town.</p> <p>Recommendation: no change needed.</p>
6036	Obj	Bridlington Harbour Commissioners	<p>Object to objective 2.</p> <p>Please see attached report.</p>	<p>Object to objective 2 – 'create a marina which includes the Harbour and integrates with the Town Centre core.</p> <p>Please see attached report (included as appendix).</p>	<p>The Council, Yorkshire Forward and Harbour Commissioners have now agreed the Bridlington Harbour Supply and Demand Study.</p> <p>Discussions are ongoing with the Commissioners to agree a proposed layout.</p>

Your proposal(s) for alternative objectives and your reasoning:

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
6000	Obj	Mr Alex Thompson	<p>1. Improve properties or penalise. Encourage shops to change catchment policies.</p> <p>2. Marina within harbour.</p> <p>5/6. Less ERYC jargon.</p>	<p>1. Improve properties or put in place penalties. Encourage 'better' shops to change their policies of only having a 55,000 catchment area before coming. The promenade provides better shops but still remain empty.</p> <p>2. A marina within the Harbour (updated) is more desirable, we do not need 500 berths.</p> <p>5/6. Less ERYC jargon.</p>	<p>1. Comments noted. The Council has limited powers to enforce maintenance, but exercises these where it can. The 55,000 catchment already exists for the town centre; the problem is that too few in the catchment choose to shop or otherwise use Bridlington as their principal town centre. The reasons for the empty shops in the Promenades relate to locate and shop size and configuration.</p> <p>2. The Bridlington Marina Supply and Demand Study recommends 320 berths, with an initial investment in 250 berths. The existing harbour does not have sufficient space to accommodate these and its current uses.</p> <p>5./6. Comment noted. More effort still will be made to ensure the AAP is in plain English and removes jargon.</p> <p>Recommendation: More effort to ensure document meets plain English standards.</p>
6006	Obvs	Mrs Margaret Lines	<p>1. Encourage individual shops of character – not 'clone town'.</p> <p>3. Better public transport and parking.</p> <p>6. Emphasise historic character.</p>	<p>1. individual shops of character should be encouraged – Bridlington should not become a 'clone' town. 'Recreational-type' shopping not multiples.</p> <p>3. better public transport and car parking to bring people into town.</p> <p>6. emphasise the town's historic character.</p>	<p>1. Comment noted. The AAP aims to enhance and complement Bridlington's character and provide, drawing on evidence and best practice, a trading environment in the town centre that will make it possible for individual small businesses to prosper. Anchor multiples are a means of creating this environment – and the absence of sufficient critical mass in the multiple sector is, in Bridlington's particular circumstances, one of the reasons the shopping offer very seriously underperforms at present.</p> <p>3. The AAP proposes significant improvements to public transport facilities, traffic movement and parking in the town centre.</p> <p>6. A key aim of the AAP is to protect and enhance the particular historic character of the AAP area.</p> <p>Recommendation: no change needed.</p>
6010	Obvs	Mr John Winterbottom	New business premises should	1. All newly created business premises should include designated staff parking facilities.	Observations noted.

			<p>include designated staff parking.</p> <p>Replacement of Carnaby and Daisy Road crossings by 'fly-overs' should be the first objective. The second be integration of railway station with bus station and Park and Ride integrating with Carnaby crossing to the South West.</p> <p>Tesco should not be allowed to issue petrol on the present site due to, (a) traffic congestion and (b) public safety</p>	<p>2. The replacement of Carnaby and Quay Road crossings by 'fly-overs' should be the first objective in the regeneration traffic plan. The second should involve the integration of the railway station with a re-located bus station and Park and Ride integrating with Carnaby crossing to the South West (re-routing the A165 via Carnaby Industrial Estate, already a very suitable road carriageway) and utilising Carnaby Station for access as an alternative to road transport.</p> <p>3. Tesco should not be allowed to issue petrol on the present site due to, (a) traffic congestion and (b) public safety - it is too close to a large residential area.</p>	<p>The AAP makes provision for dedicated parking in line with the parking standards set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and objectives for increasing the use of public transport, walking and cycling for work journeys.</p> <p>The proposals for Burlington Parade include a new bus facility near to the railway station and the proposals for traffic movement suggested in the comment.</p> <p>The evidence on traffic effects of the proposals show that the likely supermarket location is acceptable in traffic impact terms.</p> <p>Recommendation: no change is needed.</p>
6012	Obvs	Mr Roy Lines	Create a marina within the harbour.	Create a marina within the harbour, which integrates with the town centre.	<p>The AAP proposes integration between the existing harbour and the town centre. The Bridlington Marina Supply and Demand Study recommends 320 berths, with an initial investment in 250 berths. The existing harbour does not have sufficient space to accommodate these and its current uses.</p> <p>Recommendation: no change is needed.</p>
6014	Obvs	Mr Gordon George Vincent	Areas outside No.2 should be planned long-term to return to	Areas outside No.2 should be planned long-term to return to residential use. Regard these areas as brown developments in the long term for residential use.	The areas outside the area 2 will be covered by the HMO policy to return to residential uses.

			residential use.		
6023	Obvs	Mrs Collette Tyler	Surely, the existing town centre already has close links with the harbour/marina area. regeneration should not centre solely on the retail industry should include leisure activities and facilities different to nearby towns.	Put regeneration funds into the existing town centre first, incorporating a new harbour/marina area. Surely, the existing town centre already has close links with this area. Additionally, I am of the opinion that regeneration should not centre solely around the retail industry as this alone will not attract people year-round. Money should be invested in leisure activities and facilities for families that reside in the local area as well as those visiting - the facilities provided should be different to those offered in nearby towns such as Scarborough in order to capture a different market. The current proposal appears to focus on the retail industry, which, it is clear to see, is now moving towards e-enablement, therefore, a different focus should be sought.	<p>The evidence shows that the only route to achieving solutions to the existing town centre involves raising the aggregate level of activity in the town centre, which requires new development of the type that will attract efficient and competitive 'anchor'-type retailers and a much more attractive public realm throughout the centre as a whole. The evidence also shows that there is sufficient prospective demand from shoppers and visitors to support both the new and the existing development.</p> <p>Therefore by accommodating this additional activity and connecting carefully to the existing town centre, the evidence from elsewhere shows there is the greatest possible chance of improving trading conditions in the existing town centre. While the Harbour adjoins the town centre core, it is poorly integrated with it.</p> <p>The regeneration proposals are for a mix of uses, including shopping which addresses the particular problems of the town centre's underperformance as a retail centre in Bridlington's role as a Principal Town. Leisure facilities and offices are part of the proposed development mix, and these are aimed at residents as well as visitors (indeed residents will form the core, year round, market for the new development as well as the regenerated existing core). While e-trading accounts for a growing share of retail spending, the evidence shows that the need for shops will remain.</p> <p>Recommendation: make it clearer that the Bridlington Parade and other proposals for the AAP area encourage a mix of uses. Otherwise, no change is needed.</p>
6036	Obj	Bridlington Harbour Commissioners	Create a marina within the Harbour.	Create a marina within the Harbour. For the purpose of the consultation responses and the attached report the Harbour is defined as the water area and the commissioners land estate.	<p>The Council, Yorkshire Forward and Harbour Commissioners have now agreed the Bridlington Harbour Supply and Demand Study.</p> <p>Discussions are ongoing with the Commissioners to agree a proposed layout.</p>

## ISSUE 2 Town Centre Boundary and Boundary of the Primary Retail Area

### *Town Centre Boundary*

**Question 2.1** The reasons for the proposed boundary of the Town Centre and its meaning for planning purposes are set out in Section 3 at paragraphs 3.7-3.10. The boundary itself is shown in the Draft Town Centre AAP Proposals Map.

Do you support or object to the proposed Town Centre boundary. If you object to the Town Centre boundary what are your reasons. What is your proposed alternative boundary for the Town Centre for planning purposes and your reasoning.

Reasons for objecting to the Town Centre boundary:

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
6001	Sup	Mrs Alexandra Grimshaw	Support proposed boundary.	Support proposed boundary.	Support is welcomed.
6002	Sup	David Armstrong	Support proposed boundary.	Support proposed boundary.	Support is welcomed.
6003	Sup	Mr David William Dowson	Support proposed boundary.	Support proposed boundary.	Support is welcomed.
6005	Obj	Ms Maggie Walsh	Objects to the proposed boundary as North Side is not considered.	Objects to the proposed boundary.  Whilst I am totally in favour of financial and creative input into Bridlington and accept that it be of benefit to the townspeople as a whole I am very concerned that North Side is never considered in any of these proposals and is indeed ignored.	Objection noted.  While the focus of the regeneration effort is the area within the AAP, one of the key aims in doing so is to provide the conditions that will secure improvements in the whole of Bridlington. The evidence shows that improvements to the whole depend first on improvements in the town centre core area. The AAP does not preclude improvements elsewhere, and indeed encourages them where these will not pose a risk to the

					strategy within the AAP area.  Recommendation: make it clearer in the AAP text that the focus on the town centre is in order to improve the whole of Bridlington for the people who live, run businesses and work in Bridlington as well as for visitors.
6007	Sup	Mrs / Cllr Pamela Austin	Support proposed boundary.	Support proposed boundary.	Support is welcomed.
6008	Sup	Mr Robert Harrison	Support proposed boundary.	Support proposed boundary.	Support is welcomed.
6009	Obj	Mr Roger Othick	Object to proposed boundary, would like investment in North Side.	Object to proposed boundary.  Would like to see some investment in North Side, which is often overlooked.	Objection is noted.  While the focus of the regeneration effort is the area within the AAP, one of the key aims in doing so is to provide the conditions that will secure improvements in the whole of Bridlington. The evidence shows that improvements to the whole depend first on improvements in the town centre core area. The AAP does not preclude improvements elsewhere, and indeed encourages them where these will not pose a risk to the strategy within the AAP area.  Recommendation: make it clearer in the AAP text that the focus on the town centre is in order to improve the whole of Bridlington for the people who live, run businesses and work in Bridlington as well as for visitors.
6010	Obj	Mr John Winterbottom	Object to the proposed boundary, it requires far more flexibility.	Object to the proposed boundary.  Far more flexibility is required in the definition. There neither is nor has been in the recent past any definitive town centre in Bridlington. Whilst the area defined in the map contains much of the area requiring regeneration it is certainly not definitive so it is feasible that the regeneration exercise will result in the necessity of both	Comment noted.  In fact, the existing East Yorkshire Borough Wide Local Plan, does define a town centre because it is an obligation of the planning system to do so.  The Council accepts that it may be necessary in time to extend the regeneration area. At present,

				extension of the AAP area and the necessity of relocation of existing businesses currently within the AAP area.	however, the evidence is unequivocal in the priority that needs to be given to the town centre area. Demand for town centre uses is finite, and it is essential for the success of the target uses that they be located in close proximity to each other, allowing customers easy and comfortable access and giving businesses the trading advantages of concentration and critical mass.  Recommendation: no change is needed.
6011	Sup w cond	Miss Margaret (Meg) Gilpin	Do not support the proposed Town Centre boundary entirely; some sections of the Town Centre appear to be arbitrary.	Do not support the proposed Town Centre boundary entirely.  Some sections of the Town Centre appear to me to be arbitrary. In particular I cannot see any justification for including the Western spur (Town Hall etc) on the North side of the railway line.	Comment noted.  The reason for including the Town Hall is that it is very odd to exclude from it the principal civic focus in Bridlington. The Council appreciate that in plan the boundary may look contrived, although there are good reasons for the inclusion of each part (and the exclusion of others).  Recommendation: clarify the rationale for the town centre boundary, ensuring the reasoning for it is clear and justified.
6012	Sup	Mr Roy Lines	Support proposed boundary.	Support the proposed Town Centre boundary.	Support is welcomed.
6014	Sup	Mr Gordon George Vincent	Support proposed boundary.	Support the proposed Town Centre boundary.	Support is welcomed.
6015	Sup	Mr William Denison Chapman	Support proposed boundary.	Support the proposed Town Centre boundary.	Support is welcomed.
6016	Sup	Mr Peter Gleave on behalf of Tesco Store Ltd	Support proposed boundary.	Support the proposed Town Centre boundary.	Support is welcomed.
6017	Sup	Captain Eric Casson	Support proposed boundary.	Support the proposed Town Centre boundary.	Support is welcomed.
6020	Sup	Mr Ian Stoddard	Support proposed	Support the proposed Town Centre boundary.	Support is welcomed.

			boundary.		
6021	Sup	Mr Martyn Coltman	Support proposed boundary.	Support the proposed Town Centre boundary.	Support is welcomed.
6022	Sup	Mr Richard Hudson	Support proposed boundary.	Support the proposed Town Centre boundary.	Support is welcomed.
6023	Obj	Mrs Collette Tyler	Objects to the proposed Town Centre boundary. Business is now directly affected by the town centre proposals and feels aggrieved that information has not been shared sooner.	Object to the proposed Town Centre boundary.  Details as above.  As someone whose business is now directed affected by the town centre proposals, I feel aggrieved that information on the 'new' plan had not been shared with me sooner. My building is less than 6 years old and at the time of building it, the area was not part of the regeneration plan. It is only within the last month that I have been made aware of the Council's new plans, and, therefore, due to non-communication, I feel somewhat threatened by these proposals and lack of prior information. Furthermore, as a local business owner it is now essential that I am given regular information on the progress of the Council's plans as I feel I am now somewhat in 'limbo' and do not want to invest further in my business due to the uncertain future.	The plans have been widely consulted upon, including the regeneration strategy.  Youth provision within the town centre is being considered as part of a separate study. The requirement to relocate the dance studio will be considered in the context of these plans.  Recommendation: no change to AAP needed. Future consultation with the Council will provide for relocation options.
6032	Obj	Mr Richard Frudd on behalf of National Grid Property Ltd	Objects to the proposed Town Centre boundary.  Indigo act on behalf of National Grid Property Ltd ("NGP") and representations are submitted on their behalf relating to their	Object to the proposed Town Centre boundary.  Indigo act on behalf of National Grid Property Ltd ("NGP") and the following representations are submitted on their behalf relating to their landholdings off Quay Road, to the north west of Bridlington town centre.  Council Officers are aware that NGP are seeking to promote a housing led scheme on the site as a means by which to secure prestige redevelopment of this gateway brownfield location. The development will catalyse regeneration of the area in line with the wider aspirations of the Bridlington Town Centre Area Action Plan (AAP).	The site in question does not form part of the town centre and is physically and functionally divorced from it.  Whist no formal planning has been submitted for this site planning will look at the land as part of the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.  Recommendation: no change needed.

			<p>landholdings off Quay Road, to the north west of Bridlington town centre.</p> <p>NGP object to the exclusion of the Quay Road site from the town centre boundary due to the prejudicial impact that this could have on the regeneration of this brownfield development opportunity.</p> <p>It is recommended that the town centre boundary is extended to include the Quay Road site.</p>	<p>NGP object to the exclusion of the Quay Road site from the town centre boundary due to the prejudicial impact that this could have on the regeneration of this vacant, sustainably located brownfield development opportunity.</p> <p>The Quay Road site extends to some 0.44 hectares, and is located to the north west of the town centre, adjoining the Hull-Scarborough railway lines, as shown on the attached plan. The site is previously developed (i.e. “brownfield”), vacant and cleared. The site could be made available for redevelopment within a reasonable timeframe.</p> <p>The site adjoins both residential and retail/commercial properties, is located within 150m direct walking distance of Bridlington train station, fronts one of the two main arterial road routes into the town centre from Scarborough Road (A614/165), and is within convenient walking distance of the other services and facilities of the town centre.</p> <p>The site’s early release as a residential redevelopment opportunity would assist in catalysing and providing increased investor confidence in the regeneration of the town centre, rather than having any negative impact on these proposals. It is evident that the NGP site does provide an opportunity to contribute to the regeneration of the town centre within the relatively short term, particularly given the consistent recognition within the Consultation Document that greater housing choice is needed within Bridlington town centre.</p> <p>It is therefore recommended that the town centre boundary is extended to include the Quay Road site, due to the positive linkages of the site with the town centre core, the Burlington Parade redevelopment site, and the opportunity to create a high quality landmark development in this key gateway location to the town centre, contributing to physical regeneration and investor confidence in the town centre at an early stage of the</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

				process.	
6036		Bridlington Harbour Commissioners	Object to proposed boundary.  Should be reduced to accord with the Bridlington Harbour Demand and Supply Report.	Object to proposed Town Centre boundary.  Please see attached report (included as appendix), the maximum extent of the marina forms part of the Town Centre boundary and should be reduced significantly to accord with the recommendations set out in the Bridlington Harbour Demand and Supply Report (Nov 2007).	The Council, Yorkshire Forward and Harbour Commissioners have now agreed the Bridlington Harbour Supply and Demand Study.  Discussions are ongoing with the Commissioners to agree a proposed layout.

Your proposed alternative boundary for the Town Centre for planning purposes and your reasoning (if not already addressed in your reasons for objecting to the draft boundary as shown):

<b>ID</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Summary of Representation</b>	<b>Full Representation</b>	<b>Response and recommendation</b>
6005	Obvs	Ms Maggie Walsh	I would suggest that north is also part of the town.	I would suggest that north is also part of the town. Yes, we have new paving and trees but that is the extent of the regeneration.	<p>Only certain areas require planning policy of the nature within the AAP. The Strategic Development Framework and Town Charter provides guidance on other areas including the north of the town.</p> <p>Recommendation: make it clearer in the AAP text that the focus on the town centre is in order to improve the whole of Bridlington for the people who live, run businesses and work in Bridlington as well as for visitors.</p>
6010	Obvs	Mr John Winterbottom	Believes that the suggested site for the marina should be to the North rather than the South of Harbour.	<p>Not definitive.</p> <p>It still remains the opinion of a large proportion of the residents that the suggested site for the marina should be to the north rather than the south of Harbour, quite apart from obvious anomalies to be revealed on land.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The AAP explains why, notwithstanding this opinion, that the area of search proposed in the Preferred Options Draft is very much to be preferred.</p> <p>Recommendation: no change is needed.</p>

### Primary Shopping Area

**Question 2.2** The reasons for the proposed boundary of the Primary Shopping Area and its meaning for planning purposes are set out in Section 3 at paragraphs 3.12-3.14. the boundary itself is shown in the Draft Town Centre AAP Proposals Map.

Do you support or object to the Primary Shopping Area boundary. If you object, what are your reasons and your proposed alternative boundary and your reasoning.

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
6000	Sup	Mr Alex Thompson	If the plan is carried out 'in full' this could deliver a larger and better shopping area	If the plan is carried out 'in full' this could deliver a larger and better shopping area.	Support is welcomed.
6001	Sup	Mrs Alexandra Grimshaw	Support proposed boundary.	Support the proposed primary shopping area boundary.	Support is welcomed.
6002	Sup	David Armstrong	Support proposed boundary.	Support the proposed primary shopping area boundary.	Support is welcomed.
6003	Sup	Mr David William Dowson	Support proposed boundary.	Support the proposed primary shopping area boundary.	Support is welcomed.
6004	Obj	Mr Lance Cook	Object to Cliff Street and Prince Street being omitted from the primary shopping area, risk of losing M&S and Woolworths.	Object to Cliff Street and Prince Street being omitted from the primary shopping area. Two main shops (M&S and Woolworths) are here. If you restrict parking and omit them from the PSA and glibly say they will relocate (3.14 ii), you run the risk that they will indeed relocate, but out of Bridlington altogether.	<p>Objection noted.</p> <p>The Council is fully aware of the implications of withdrawing this area from the primary retail core. The definition of the core in this way does not preclude the continuation of these operations in any way. Instead the re-designation provides the conditions for the improvement of this area, recognising that it has – for compelling reasons as explained in the AAP – lost its way as a primary shopping area.</p> <p>Recommendation: no change is needed.</p>
6005	Sup	Ms Maggie Walsh	Support proposed	Support the proposed primary shopping area boundary.	Support is welcomed.

			boundary.		
6007	Sup	Mrs / Cllr Pamela Austin	Support proposed boundary.	Support the proposed primary shopping area boundary.	Support is welcomed.
6008	Sup	Mr Robert Harrison	Support proposed boundary.	Support the proposed primary shopping area boundary.	Support is welcomed.
6009	Sup	Mr Roger Othick	Support proposed boundary.	Support the proposed primary shopping area boundary.	Support is welcomed.
6010	Sup	Mr John Winterbottom	Support proposed boundary.	Support the proposed primary shopping area boundary.	Support is welcomed.
6011	Sup	Miss Margaret (Meg) Gilpin	Support proposed boundary.	Support the proposed primary shopping area boundary.	Support is welcomed.
6012	Sup	Mr Roy Lines	Support proposed boundary.	Support the proposed primary shopping area boundary.	Support is welcomed.
6014	Sup	Mr Gordon George Vincent	Support proposed boundary.	Support the proposed primary shopping area boundary.	Support is welcomed.
6015	Sup	Mr William Denison Chapman	Support proposed boundary.	Support the proposed primary shopping area boundary.	Support is welcomed.
6016	Sup	Mr Peter Gleave on behalf of Tesco Store Ltd	Support proposed boundary.	Support the proposed primary shopping area boundary.	Support is welcomed.
6017	Sup	Captain Eric Casson	Support proposed boundary.	Support the proposed Primary Shopping Area boundary.	Support is welcomed.
6020	Sup	Mr Ian Stoddard	Support proposed boundary.	Support the proposed Primary Shopping Area boundary.	Support is welcomed.
6021	Sup	Mr Martyn Coltman	Support proposed boundary.	Support the proposed Primary Shopping Area boundary.  I would like to see a little more of The Promenade included in the boundary - though not to its current junction with Flamborough Road. I believe it is feasible to be run as far as	Support is welcomed.  PPS6 obliges the AAP to draw a Primary Shopping Area boundary to comprise the primary frontages and secondary areas contiguous to the primary frontage. Both sides of the

				the current Leisure World site, as when this site is redeveloped it seems very likely it would include new retail space. I also believe to leave out The Promenade would be even more detrimental to its current precarious state. It is a street in need of major TLC.	Promenade to the south of Princess Terrace and The Promenades are included. Excluding the rest of the Promenade up to Leisure World prevents the dilution of spending over too wide an area and provides a concentrated primary offer. The area can be distinguished from the shopping core and developed for other uses.  Recommendation: clarify the rationale for the town centre boundary, ensuring the reasoning for it is clear and justified.
6022	Sup	Mr Richard Hudson	Support proposed boundary.	Support the proposed Primary Shopping Area boundary.	Support is welcomed.
6023	Obj	Mrs Collette Tyler	Object to the proposed Primary Shopping Area boundary as the current centre will fall into disrepair.	Object to the proposed Primary Shopping Area boundary.  The current town centre will fall into disrepair and cause bigger problems for Bridlington and people's view of Bridlington.	The evidence shows that the only route to achieving solutions to the existing town centre involves raising the aggregate level of activity in the town centre, which requires new development of the type that will attract efficient and competitive 'anchor'-type retailers and a much more attractive public realm throughout the centre as a whole. The evidence also shows that there is sufficient prospective demand from shoppers and visitors to support both the new and the existing development. Therefore by accommodating this additional activity and connecting carefully to the existing town centre, the evidence from elsewhere shows there is the greatest possible chance of improving trading conditions in the existing town centre. The AAP also includes significant proposals to public realm in the existing centre, as well as significant improvement in pedestrian environment, traffic management and parking aimed at the existing centre. The under-used and poorly used land and poorly maintained buildings in the Burlington Parade area badly affect the appeal of the town.  Recommendation: no change, although it is essential that this reasoning is clear in the AAP.
6036	Sup	Bridlington Harbour Commissioners	Support proposed boundary.	Support the proposed Primary Shopping Area boundary.	Support is welcomed.

Your proposed alternative boundary for the Primary Shopping Area and your reasoning (if not already addressed in your reasons for objecting to the draft boundary as shown):

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
6004	Obvs	Mr Lance Cook	Promenade should be included in the Primary Shopping Area	It is essential that Promenade is included in the Primary Shopping Area as this street needs all the help it can get.	<p>PPS6 obliges the AAP to draw a Primary Shopping Area boundary to comprise the primary frontages and secondary areas contiguous to the primary frontage. Both sides of the Promenade to the south of Princess Terrace and The Promenades are included. Excluding the rest of the Promenade up to Leisure World prevents the dilution of spending over too wide an area and provides a concentrated primary offer. The area can be distinguished from the shopping core and developed for other uses.</p> <p>Recommendation: clarify the rationale for the town centre boundary, ensuring the reasoning for it is clear and justified.</p>
6023	Obvs	Mrs Collette Tyler	Retain the current town centre area.	Retain the current town centre area - details already given above.	<p>The evidence shows that the only route to achieving solutions to the existing town centre involves raising the aggregate level of activity in the town centre, which requires new development of the type that will attract efficient and competitive 'anchor'-type retailers and a much more attractive public realm throughout the centre as a whole. The evidence also shows that there is sufficient prospective demand from shoppers and visitors to support both the new and the existing development. Therefore by accommodating this additional activity and connecting carefully to the existing town centre, the evidence from elsewhere shows there is the greatest possible chance of improving trading conditions in the existing town centre. The AAP also includes significant proposals to public realm in the existing centre, as well as significant improvement in pedestrian environment, traffic management and parking aimed at the existing centre. The under-used and poorly used land and poorly maintained buildings in the Burlington Parade area badly affect the appeal of the town.</p> <p>Recommendation: no change, although it is essential that this reasoning is clear in the AAP.</p>

### ISSUE 3      Regeneration Priorities

**Question 3.1** The four proposed regeneration priorities for the Town Centre AAP are set out in Section 3 at paragraph 3.17. These are:

- the comprehensive development of Burlington Parade scheme as set out in Proposed Policy BridTC17 (discussed in detail in paragraphs 4.8-4.23);
- the Marina as shown in the Draft Town Centre AAP Proposals Map and as set out in Proposed Policy BirdTC18 (paragraphs 4.24-4.31);
- the strategic Public Realm Framework as set out in Proposed Policy BridTC19 (paragraphs 4.32-4.34); and
- the movement and parking proposals as set in Proposed Policies BridTC14 and BridTC15 (paragraphs 3.70-3.83)

Do you support or object to the proposed regeneration priorities. If you object what are your reasons and what are your proposed alternative regeneration priorities and your reasoning.

Your reasons for objecting to the proposed regeneration priorities:

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
6000	Obj	Mr Alex Thompson	Do not destroy / reduce your best asset with marina on South Beach.  Disagrees with the primary route linking Burlington Parade and the harbour using Beck Hill.	A marina on the South Beach – common sense says do not destroy / reduce your best asset – and why the marina first? The stated primary route linking Burlington Parade (a fancy new name) and the Harbour using Beck Hill, as indicated is nonsense.	Objection noted.  The design of the marina is being carefully worked up to minimise the impact on South Beach. The marina will only be built if the environmental impacts, all matters considered, are acceptable where measures cannot be taken to remove the impacts altogether. Whether a marina is built or not necessary works to re-construct part of the existing seawall will have a minor impact on South Beach in any case.  A route to link the old and new is standard good practice, ensuring that the two – the new development and the Harbour work together. The Gypsy Race, with adjoining landscaping, provides a logical spine and a very appealing pedestrian environment and development setting, making use of under- and ineffectively used land and property. Burlington Parade is no more than a working name, as the AAP text

					explains. Recommendation: Ensure the rationale for using Beck Hill as a route and the proposed changes are clear.
6001	Sup	Mrs Alexandra Grimshaw	Support the proposed regeneration priorities	Support the proposed regeneration priorities.	Support is welcomed.
6002	Sup	David Armstrong	Support the proposed regeneration priorities	Support the proposed regeneration priorities.	Support is welcomed.
6003	Sup	Mr David William Dowson	Support the proposed regeneration priorities	Support the proposed regeneration priorities.	Support is welcomed.
6004	Sup w con	Mr Lance Cook	Support the proposed regeneration priorities but object to BridTC14 & 15.	Support the proposed regeneration priorities but object to BridTC14 & 15.	Support for proposed regeneration priorities is welcomed.  Objection to BridTC 14 & 15 noted but insufficient information to provide detailed response and recommendation.
6005	Sup	Ms Maggie Walsh	Support the proposed regeneration priorities	Support the proposed regeneration priorities.	Support is welcomed.
6007	Sup	Mrs / Cllr Pamela Austin	Support the proposed regeneration priorities	Support the proposed regeneration priorities.	Support is welcomed.
6008	Sup	Mr Robert Harrison	Support the proposed regeneration priorities	Support the proposed regeneration priorities.	Support is welcomed.
6009	Sup	Mr Roger Othick	Support the proposed regeneration priorities	Support the proposed regeneration priorities.	Support is welcomed.
6010	Obj	Mr John	Object to the	Object to the proposed regeneration priorities.	Objection noted.

		Winterbottom	proposed regeneration priorities.	<p>See below – priority 3.17 (TC2 1.d) as per the reasoning in 3.5 &amp; 3.6 below.</p> <p>The proposal to encourage cycling is in direct contradiction to the alleged objectives of the regeneration plans principal idea to expand Bridlington’s shopping potential. Do the proposers of this scheme seriously expect infirm shoppers to cycle into town and carry home their purchases in saddle bags. Not to mention the impracticality of transporting purchases shop-to-shop or storing them securely on a cycle outside a shop.</p> <p>Extend short term on street parking and if there is to be charging for this then this should be available to shoppers in Bridlington outskirts including the adjacent villages (within possibly a 15 mile catchment area) at a nominal charge remembering that these people are already financing this regeneration scheme via their council tax.</p> <p>Park and Ride schemes are designed for and only suitable for tourists (need I define?). Shoppers from outlying villages physically can’t carry their weekly shopping form shop-to-shop and need the facility of on-street parking in order to shop in Bridlington. The alternative is to force people to utilise large supermarkets which would destroy the whole objective of the regeneration exercise.</p>	<p>The proposals to encourage cycling are one part of a package of integrated transport measures, designed to relieve traffic congestion and improve all forms of transport (including public transport, cycling and walking) within the Town Centre, linked by a new transport interchange. Parking provision is also very significantly enhanced with major new public car parks providing a net gain of approximately 750 spaces.</p> <p>Recommendation: no change needed.</p>
6011	Sup w cond	Miss Margaret (Meg) Gilpin	<p>Support the proposed regeneration priorities.</p> <p>Suggests use of the name ‘Lords Parade’ instead of ‘Burlington</p>	<p>Support the proposed regeneration priorities.</p> <p>I do not object to the regeneration priorities. I do object to the use of the name Burlington Parade. When I questioned one of the people who produced this (otherwise very sound) plan at the Town Hall she said ‘Burlington is a good name’. Yes it is and is the former name of Bridlington Old Town. May I suggest instead Lords Parade (referring to the Lord Feoffees</p>	<p>Support is welcomed.</p> <p>Comment on the name is noted and the suggestion is welcomed. The Council will take the suggestion forward in the further work that is underway on the details of the development project and the procurement strategy for. The AAP, however, makes clear that the name is no more than a working name – and, once the developer is selected, the issue of the actual name or names for the</p>

			Parade’.	not cricket)?	area will arise again. The Council will convey, as part of the development competition the fact that Burlington Parade is a working name only, and that others – including your suggestion of Lords Parade – have been suggested.  Recommendation: no change is needed.
6012	Obj	Mr Roy Lines	Object to the proposed regeneration priorities, Marina would be a white elephant.	Object to the proposed regeneration priorities.  Marina (ie large development) would be a white elephant. It is not yet known how many and what type of boats would possibly use the ‘wet’ area.	Objection noted.  The Council and Yorkshire Forward would not pursue a Marina in absence of the evidence – and thus are only pursuing it because of the confidence the evidence already in place provides. The detailed evidence will be set out in the Submission Draft of the AAP once the partners have agreed the exact extent of the Marina.  The Bridlington Marina Supply and Demand Study recommends 320 berths, with an initial investment in 250 berths. The existing harbour does not have sufficient space to accommodate these and its current uses.  Recommendation: no change needed.
6015	Sup	Mr William Denison Chapman	Support the proposed regeneration priorities	Support the proposed regeneration priorities.	Support is welcomed.
6016	Sup	Mr Peter Gleave on behalf of Tesco Store Ltd	Support the proposed regeneration priorities	Support the proposed regeneration priorities.	Support is welcomed.
6017	Sup	Captain Eric Casson	Support the proposed regeneration priorities	Support the proposed regeneration priorities	Support is welcomed.
6020	Sup	Mr Ian Stoddard	Support the proposed regeneration priorities	Support the proposed regeneration priorities	Support is welcomed.

6021	Sup	Mr Martyn Coltman	Support the proposed regeneration priorities	Support the proposed regeneration priorities	Support is welcomed.
6022	Obj	Mr Richard Hudson	<p>Object to the proposed regeneration priorities.</p> <p>Traffic proposals are not acceptable, particularly the north to south routes through the town.</p> <p>Improving employment prospects should be a top priority and should be stated as such.</p>	<p>Object to the proposed regeneration priorities.</p> <p>Traffic. The traffic proposals are not acceptable, particularly the north to south routes through the town. Trinity Road is physically a minor road compared to Promenade and not suitable for two way traffic now. It will be even worse with these plans. St Johns Street &amp; Quay Road feeds a lot of traffic into the town. There should be some plan to direct this traffic to the carparks and restrict out of town traffic from using this route. I'm sure I've read that the plan is to take traffic from Scarborough to Carnaby rather than down Hilderthorpe Road. This will require a roundabout at the link road just west of Carnaby. In fact this plan ought to be something that is tackled now. The B&amp;Q junction, Cardigan Road/Hilderthorpe road junction, and Savage Road/Hilderthorpe Road junction will mean three sets of traffic lights in close proximity. I feel these will aggravate traffic congestion. Sorting out traffic flows should be a priority. The joke is you need a packed lunch to get from one side of Brid to the other. These plans will make it worse if not changed.</p> <p>Employment. Improving employment prospects should be a top priority and should be stated as such. All other improvements to the town depend on this. I agree that the developments planned will be a draw, but we must also market the town to potential out of town employers. We should be pushing as well as pulling.</p>	<p>Objection noted.</p> <p>The AAP recognises the importance of reducing traffic congestion in Bridlington Town Centre. Whilst the AAP cannot reduce the traffic flow itself, changes are proposed to the directional signage in Bridlington, with the aim of separating, before it gets close to the Town Centre, the traffic that is destined for the Town Centre, from traffic that is destined to points north or south of the town. Provision is also made to divert traffic from the Town Centre to a park and ride facility at South Shore. The movement and access strategy is designed to reduce traffic congestion in the Town Centre and improve the pedestrian environment. The traffic circuit in Bridlington will include variable message signing. Trinity Road is capable of taking the proposed traffic if parking areas are adjusted. The proposals to improve movement and access form part of the Bridlington Integrated Transport Plan. Traffic models for the Town Centre have developed all scenarios that will improve movement and access.</p> <p>One of the main aims of the Town Centre AAP is to create the conditions to enable business growth in Bridlington, by removing the constraints to the market's ability to provide good quality office stock (which would meet the needs of both Bridlington's existing and prospective businesses). Whilst the AAP concentrates primarily on physical development, the Council recognises that to achieve the vision for Bridlington, these projects must be accompanied by other interventions such as skills training and other labour market initiatives.</p>

6023	Sup	Mrs Collette Tyler	Support the proposed regeneration priorities	Support the proposed regeneration priorities.	Support is welcomed.
6036	Obj	Bridlington Harbour Commissioners	Object to the proposed regeneration priorities.	Object to the proposed regeneration priorities. Please see attached report (included as appendix).	Objection noted. Discussions are ongoing with the Commissioners to agree relevant issues.

Your proposed alternative regeneration priorities and your reasoning (if not already covered by the reasons for you objection);

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
6000	Obj	Mr Alex Thompson	<p>Consider extending Wellington Road South directly to the Harbour.</p> <p>Use English not ERYC jargon.</p>	<p>Note my comments at 3.5 – page 8 (To even consider Beck Hill as a major route is pure nonsense as indicated. A more sensible approach would be to consider extending Wellington Road in a direct line to the Harbour, using a bridge (if necessary) over Beck Hill. If a major route is required for such a major development do it right.)</p> <p>Consider extending Wellington Road South directly to the Harbour in a straight line as the main highway connecting both shopping area and Harbour.</p> <p>AAP documents for public to comment on, use English not ERYC jargon. Plus, how do you expect 'Joe' public to seriously comment upon such a huge pile of paper?</p>	<p>Comments are noted.</p> <p>Beck Hill will be raised to provide a new bridge over the Gypsey Race. This will provide an improved vehicle route to the harbour and a high quality pedestrian route. Other approaches have been examined extensively and this provides the optimum route that does not cut through key development areas.</p> <p>The AAP necessarily, at this stage, needs to set out a full account of the proposals and the reasoning for them, together with the options which have been considered but rejected and why. The Council appreciate that it is time consuming to take part and is grateful for your participation and that of the rest of the Community. But the Council also does not want to omit information which the community requires in order to make informed comment on the proposals. More effort still will be made to ensure the AAP is in plain English and removes jargon.</p> <p>Recommendation: ensure the Submission Draft is a short as possible and written in Plain English, avoiding all jargon. Ensure the proposals for improving movement and access are clear.</p>
6012	Obj	Mr Roy Lines	<p>Develop a marina proper within the existing harbour.</p>	<p>Develop a marina proper (ie boats on water) within the existing harbour. Do not build on South Beach.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The Bridlington Marina Supply and Demand Study recommends 320 berths, with an initial investment in 250 berths. The existing harbour does not have sufficient space to accommodate these and its current uses.</p> <p>The design of the marina is being carefully worked up to minimise the impact on South Beach. The marina will only be built if the environmental impacts, all matters considered, are acceptable where measures cannot be</p>

					<p>taken to remove the impacts altogether. Whether a marina is built or not necessary works to re-construct part of the existing seawall will have a minor impact on South Beach in any case.</p> <p>Recommendation: no change needed.</p>
6022	Obvs	Mr Richard Hudson	Make Trinity / Wellington Road one-way southbound	Making Trinity / Wellington Road one-way southbound may help.	<p>Traffic modelling produced for the town centre has developed all scenarios that will improve movement and access within Bridlington. Excessive lengths of one-way streets have been found to produce unacceptable increases in vehicle speeds.</p> <p>Recommendation: no change needed.</p>
6036	Obj	Bridlington Harbour Commissioners	Please see attached report.	Please see attached report (included as appendix).	Discussions are ongoing with the Commissioners to agree relevant issues.

**Question 3.2** The proposed 'area of search' for Burlington Parade is illustrated in the Draft Town Centre AAP Proposals Map and explained in Section 4 at paragraph 4.8 to 4.12.

Do you support or object to the proposed area of search for Burlington Parade. If you object what are your reason and your proposed alternative area of search and your reasoning.

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
6000	Sup	Mr Alex Thompson	Support the proposed areas of search.	Support the proposed areas of search for Burlington Parade.	Support is welcomed.
6001	Sup	Mrs Alexandra Grimshaw	Support the proposed areas of search.	Support the proposed areas of search for Burlington Parade.	Support is welcomed.
6002	Sup	David Armstrong	Support the proposed area of search for Burlington Parade.  See comments in part 2.	Support the proposed area of search for Burlington Parade.  See comments in Part 2.	Support is welcomed.  Comments in Part 2 noted.
6003	Sup	Mr David William Dowson	Support the proposed areas of search.	Support the proposed areas of search for Burlington Parade.	Support is welcomed.
6005	Sup	Ms Maggie Walsh	Support the proposed areas of search.	Support the proposed areas of search for Burlington Parade.	Support is welcomed.
6007	Sup	Mrs / Cllr Pamela Austin	Support the proposed areas of search.	Support the proposed areas of search for Burlington Parade.	Support is welcomed.
6008	Sup	Mr Robert Harrison	Support the proposed areas of search.	Support the proposed areas of search for Burlington Parade.	Support is welcomed.
6009	Sup	Mr Roger Othick	Support the proposed areas of search.	Support the proposed areas of search for Burlington Parade.	Support is welcomed.

6011	Obj	Miss Margaret (Meg) Gilpin	I object to the name Burlington Parade and do not understand the term 'area of search'.	I object to the name Burlington Parade and do not understand the term 'area of search' and although I examined the document mentioned I cannot recall the details of section 4.	The objection to the name is noted, although it is a working name only and is bound to be changed when the actual developments take place.  Area of search means that the scheme will be somewhere within the boundaries of the site shown.  Recommendation: explain the term 'area of search' in the Submission Draft
6015	Sup	Mr William Denison Chapman	Support the proposed areas of search.	Support the proposed areas of search for Burlington Parade.	Support is welcomed.
6016	Sup	Mr Peter Gleave on behalf of Tesco Store Ltd	Support the proposed areas of search.	Support the proposed areas of search for Burlington Parade.	Support is welcomed.
6017	Sup	Captain Eric Casson	Support the proposed areas of search.	Support the proposed area of search for Burlington Parade	Support is welcomed.
6020	Sup	Mr Ian Stoddard	Support the proposed areas of search.	Support the proposed area of search for Burlington Parade	Support is welcomed.
6021	Sup	Mr Martyn Coltman	Support the proposed areas of search.	Support the proposed area of search for Burlington Parade	Support is welcomed.
6022	Sup	Mr Richard Hudson	Support the proposed areas of search.	Support the proposed area of search for Burlington Parade	Support is welcomed.
6023	Obj	Mrs Collette Tyler	As previously mentioned.  Believes that regeneration should concentrate around the existing town centre.	As previously mentioned.  It is my belief that regeneration should concentrate around the existing town centre and problems in this area should be solved in the first instance, before creating a new area. If this does not happen, the existing town centre will further degenerate, causing more eyesores and empty shops. The current town centre cannot be filled accordingly with shops.	Objection noted.  The evidence shows that the only route to achieving solutions to the existing town centre involves raising the aggregate level of activity in the town centre, which requires new development of the type that will attract efficient and competitive 'anchor'-type retailers and a much more attractive public realm throughout the centre as a whole. The evidence also shows that there is sufficient prospective demand from shoppers and visitors to support both the new and the existing development.

					<p>Therefore by accommodating this additional activity and connecting carefully to the existing town centre, the evidence from elsewhere shows there is the greatest possible chance of improving trading conditions in the existing town centre. The AAP also includes significant proposals to public realm in the existing centre, as well as significant improvement in pedestrian environment, traffic management and parking aimed at the existing centre. The under-used and poorly used land and poorly maintained buildings in the Burlington Parade area badly affect the appeal of the town.</p> <p>Recommendation: no change needed.</p>
6036	Obj	Bridlington Harbour Commissioners	Object to the proposed area of search.	<p>Object to the proposed area of search for Burlington Parade.</p> <p>The Burlington Parade area of search should exclude any land forming part of the harbour.</p>	<p>Discussions are ongoing with the Commissioners to agree relevant issues.</p> <p>A full response to the covering report supplied by the Harbour Commissioners is set out on page xxx.</p>

Your proposed alternative area of search and your reasoning (if not already covered by your reasons for objecting to all or part of the proposed site / area of search):

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
6036	Obj	Bridlington Harbour Commissioners	Please see attached report.	As above and please see attached report (included as appendix).  The Burlington Parade area of search should exclude any land forming part of the harbour.	Discussions are ongoing with the Commissioners to agree relevant issues.

**Question 3.3** The proposed development mix for Burlington Parade is detailed in Section 4 at paragraph 4.14; paragraph 4.13 explains the reasoning for this mix.

Do you support or object to the proposed development mix for Burlington Parade. If you object what are your reason and your proposed alternative development mix and your reasoning.

Your reasons for objecting to the proposed development mix for Burlington Parade:

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
6000	Obvs	Mr Alex Thompson	Will this not be determined by businesses?	Surely, this will be determined by those who choose to set up in business?	The plans need to be reasonable flexible, although testing the feasibility of the proposals and ensuring they will deliver the objectives set for them require that the development mix be broadly specified and the broad quanta indicated. It is essential, too, that the Council ensures the plan responds to evidence on need and demand for the uses proposed.  Recommendation: no change is needed.
6001	Sup	Mrs Alexandra Grimshaw	Support the proposed development mix	Support the proposed development mix for Burlington Parade.	Support is welcomed.
6002	Sup	David Armstrong	Support the proposed development mix	Support the proposed development mix for Burlington Parade.	Support is welcomed.
6003	Sup	Mr David William Dowson	Support the proposed development mix	Support the proposed development mix for Burlington Parade.	Support is welcomed.
6005	Sup	Ms Maggie Walsh	Support the proposed development mix	Support the proposed development mix for Burlington Parade.	Support is welcomed.
6007	Sup	Mrs / Cllr Pamela Austin	Support the proposed development mix	Support the proposed development mix for Burlington Parade.	Support is welcomed.
6008	Sup	Mr Robert Harrison	Support the proposed development mix	Support the proposed development mix for Burlington Parade.	Support is welcomed.
6009	Sup	Mr Roger Othick	Support the	Support the proposed development mix for Burlington	Support is welcomed.

			proposed development mix	Parade.	
6011	Sup w cond	Miss Margaret (Meg) Gilpin	I object to the inappropriate name not the development mix.	Probably support the proposed development mix for Burlington Parade. I object to the inappropriate name not the development mix.	Probable support is welcomed, and the objection to the name is noted. The name is working name only, and it is likely that it will change when the developments are actually delivered.  Recommendation: no change is needed.
6012	Obj	Mr Roy Lines	Object to the proposed development mix.  Unclear where the 500-600 dwellings are to be located and where are support services?	Object to the proposed development mix for Burlington Parade.  It is not clear where the 500-600 dwellings are to be located. Surely not on South Beach. Where are the extra support services – hospitals, dentists etc?	Objection noted.  The dwellings will be distributed throughout the scheme where it is possible to protect residential amenity – and will not be on South Beach.  The housing numbers respond to the Council's housing requirements for Bridlington. Support services will need to expand in line with population growth in the way they always have. There is scope in the Burlington Parade scheme for health facilities if there is a need.  Recommendation: no change is needed.
6015	Sup	Mr William Denison Chapman	Support the proposed development mix	Support the proposed development mix for Burlington Parade.	Support is welcomed.
6016	Sup	Mr Peter Gleave on behalf of Tesco Store Ltd	Support the proposed development mix	Support the proposed development mix for Burlington Parade.	Support is welcomed.
6017	Sup	Captain Eric Casson	Support the proposed development mix	Support the proposed development mix for Burlington Parade.	Support is welcomed.
6020	Sup	Mr Ian Stoddard	Support the proposed development mix	Support the proposed development mix for Burlington Parade.	Support is welcomed.
6021	Sup	Mr Martyn Coltman	Support the proposed development mix	Support the proposed development mix for Burlington Parade.	Support is welcomed.
6022	Sup	Mr Richard Hudson	Support the proposed	Support the proposed development mix for Burlington Parade.	Support is welcomed.

			development mix		
6023	Obj	Mrs Collette Tyler	<p>Object to the proposed development mix</p> <p>Believes that regeneration should concentrate around the existing town centre</p>	<p>Object to the proposed development mix for Burlington Parade</p> <p>As previously mentioned - It is my belief that regeneration should concentrate around the existing town centre and problems in this area should be solved in the first instance, before creating a new area. If this does not happen, the existing town centre will further degenerate, causing more eyesores and empty shops. The current town centre cannot be filled accordingly with shops.</p>	<p>Objection noted</p> <p>The evidence shows that the only route to achieving solutions to the existing town centre involves raising the aggregate level of activity in the town centre, which requires new development of the type that will attract efficient and competitive 'anchor'-type retailers and a much more attractive public realm throughout the centre as a whole. The evidence also shows that there is sufficient prospective demand from shoppers and visitors to support both the new and the existing development.</p> <p>Therefore by accommodating this additional activity and connecting carefully to the existing town centre, the evidence from elsewhere shows there is the greatest possible chance of improving trading conditions in the existing town centre. The AAP also includes significant proposals to public realm in the existing centre, as well as significant improvement in pedestrian environment, traffic management and parking aimed at the existing centre. The under-used and poorly used land and poorly maintained buildings in the Burlington Parade area badly affect the appeal of the town.</p> <p>Recommendation: no change needed.</p>
6036	Obj	Bridlington Harbour Commissioners	Should exclude any land within the harbour.	Should exclude any land within the harbour.	<p>Discussions are ongoing with the Commissioners to agree relevant issues.</p> <p>A full response to the covering report supplied by the Harbour Commissioners is set out on page xxx.</p>

Your proposed alternative area of search and your reasoning (if not already covered by your reasons for objecting to all or part of the proposed site / area of search):

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
6036	Obj	Bridlington Harbour Commissioners	Please see attached report.	Please see attached report (included as appendix).	Discussions are ongoing with the Commissioners to agree relevant issues.

**Question 3.4** The proposed maximum extent of the Marina is shown in the Draft Town Centre AAP Proposals Map and discussed in Section 4 at paragraphs 4.24-4.31.

Do you support or object to the proposed extent of the marina. If you object what are your reason and your proposed alternative extent and your reasoning.

Reasons for objecting to the proposed extent of the marina:

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
6000	Obj	Mr Alex Thompson	Object to the proposed extent of the marina, a marina within the Harbour (updated) is more desirable.	Object to the proposed extent of the marina.  See 3.1 bullet point two – my reason for objecting below.  'A marina on the South Beach – common sense says do not destroy/reduce your best asset – and why the marina first?'	Objection noted.  The evidence base highlights the interdependence of proposals to develop the town centre, and proposals for a marina. Development at the Harbour of a marina will help to create the conditions that will enable the transformation of the Town Centre. The marina will make it feasible to attract the scale, mix and quality of development in the Town Centre that otherwise would not be possible. Enhancement of the Harbour itself also has considerable potential to aid the Town Centre's regeneration; both enhancing Bridlington as a place where people want to live, work and visit, and improving the commercial prospects of the Harbour's working activities.  The Council and Yorkshire Forward would not pursue a Marina in absence of the evidence – and thus are only pursuing it because of the confidence the evidence already in place provides. The detailed evidence will be set out in the Submission Draft of the AAP once the partners have agreed the exact extent of the Marina.  Recommendation: ensure the AAP sets out the detailed evidence for the marina.
6001	Sup	Mrs Alexandra Grimshaw	Support the proposed extent of the marina.	Support the proposed extent of the marina.	Support is welcomed.
6002	Sup	David Armstrong	Support the proposed extent of the marina.	Support the proposed extent of the marina.	Support is welcomed.
6003	Sup	Mr David William	Support the	Support the proposed extent of the	Support is welcomed.

		Dowson	proposed extent of the marina.	marina.	
6004	Sup	Mr Lance Cook	Support the proposed extent of the marina.	Support the proposed extent of the marina.	Support is welcomed.
6005	Sup	Ms Maggie Walsh	Support the proposed extent of the marina.	Support the proposed extent of the marina.	Support is welcomed.
6007	Sup	Mrs / Cllr Pamela Austin	Support the proposed extent of the marina.	Support the proposed extent of the marina.	Support is welcomed.
6008	Sup	Mr Robert Harrison	Support the proposed extent of the marina.	Support the proposed extent of the marina. The bigger the better.	Support is welcomed.
6009	Sup	Mr Roger Othick	Support the proposed extent of the marina.	Support the proposed extent of the marina.	Support is welcomed.
6011	Sup	Miss Margaret (Meg) Gilpin	Support the proposed extent of the marina.	Support the proposed extent of the marina.	Support is welcomed.
6012	Obj	Mr Roy Lines	Object to the proposed extent of the marina.	Object to the proposed extent of the marina.  Too large a wet area. Too large a dry area.	Objection noted.  The evidence base highlights the interdependence of proposals to develop the town centre, and proposals for a marina. Development at the Harbour of a marina will help to create the conditions that will enable the transformation of the Town Centre. The marina will make it feasible to attract the scale, mix and quality of development in the Town Centre that otherwise would not be possible. Enhancement of the Harbour itself also has considerable potential to aid the Town Centre's regeneration; both enhancing Bridlington as a place where people want to live, work and visit, and improving the commercial prospects of the Harbour's working activities.  The Council and Yorkshire Forward would not pursue a Marina in absence of the evidence – and thus are only pursuing it because of the confidence the evidence already in place provides. The detailed evidence will be set out in the Submission Draft of the AAP once the partners have agreed the exact extent of the Marina.

					Recommendation: ensure the AAP sets out the detailed evidence for the marina.
6014	Sup	Mr Gordon George Vincent	Support the proposed extent of the marina.	Support the proposed extent of the marina.	Support is welcomed.
6015	Sup	Mr William Denison Chapman	Support the proposed extent of the marina.	Support the proposed extent of the marina.	Support is welcomed.
6017	Sup	Captain Eric Casson	Support the proposed extent of the marina.	Support the proposed extent of the marina	Support is welcomed.
6020	Sup	Mr Ian Stoddard	Support the proposed extent of the marina.	Support the proposed extent of the marina	Support is welcomed.
6021	Sup	Mr Martyn Coltman	Support the proposed extent of the marina.	Support the proposed extent of the marina	Support is welcomed.
6022	Sup	Mr Richard Hudson	Support the proposed extent of the marina.	Support the proposed extent of the marina	Support is welcomed.
6023	Sup	Mrs Collette Tyler	Support the proposed extent of the marina.	Support the proposed extent of the marina	Support is welcomed.
6036	Obj	Bridlington Harbour Commissioners	Object to the proposed extent of the marina.	Object to the proposed extent of the marina.  Please see attached report (included as appendix).	The Council, Yorkshire Forward and Harbour Commissioners have now agreed the Bridlington Harbour Supply and Demand Study.  Discussions are ongoing with the Commissioners to agree a proposed layout.

Proposed alternative extent for the marina and your reasoning (if not already covered in your reasons for objecting to the marina proposal):

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
6000	Obvs	Mr Alex Thompson	Marina in an updated harbour a good starting point. Expand at a later date if required.	A marina in an updated harbour makes good sense as a starting point – if and only if it is found that a genuine need to expand after completion and after a reasonable period of use then investigation and debate should ensure as to where any more berths would be best situated. Scott Wilson also indicate there is not current demand for 500 berths. That says it all.	<p>The Council and Yorkshire Forward would not pursue a Marina in absence of the evidence – and thus are only pursuing it because of the confidence the evidence already in place provides. The detailed evidence will be set out in the Submission Draft of the AAP once the partners have agreed the exact extent of the Marina.</p> <p>Recommendation: ensure the AAP sets out the detailed evidence for the marina.</p>
6003	Obvs	Mr David William Dowson	Commercial fishing should be furthest point from town centre and tourism at nearest point.	The commercial fishing should be on the point furthest for the town centre. Concentrate the tourism nearest point to the town centre.	<p>The indicative layout of the harbour agreed with the Harbour Commissioners shows the new fishing pier constructed at the furthest point from the town centre.</p> <p>Recommendation: no change needed.</p>
6014	Obvs	Mr Gordon George Vincent	Marina should be limited to 200 boats.	Note: Re marina - should be limited to hold an additional 200 boats. This is a figure that could be possibly self-sustaining. Any higher figure might prove a burden on the harbour and Council.	<p>The Council and Yorkshire Forward would not pursue a Marina in absence of the evidence – and thus are only pursuing it because of the confidence the evidence already in place provides. The detailed evidence will be set out in the Submission Draft of the AAP once the partners have agreed the exact extent of the Marina.</p> <p>Recommendation: ensure the AAP sets out the detailed evidence for the marina.</p>

**Question 3.5** The proposals for highways are set out at paragraph 3.70-3.73 and Proposed Policy BridTC14; the reasoning is set out in paragraph 3.71.

Do you support or object to the proposals for highways. If you object what are your reasons. What are you alternative proposals for highways and your reasoning.

Reasons for objecting to the proposals for highways:

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
6000	Obj	Mr Alex Thompson	To consider Beck Hill as a major route is pure nonsense	Object to proposals for highways.  To even consider Beck Hill as a major route is pure nonsense as indicated.	Objection noted  Beck Hill will be straightened and widened to provide the principle north-south link across the Burlington Parade development. These works will contribute to reducing traffic congestion within the town centre. Using Beck Hill also enables the route to be raised over the new pedestrian walkway along the Gypsy Race.  Recommendation: ensure proposals for movement and access improvements are clear.
6001	Sup	Mrs Alexandra Grimshaw	Support the proposals	Support the proposals for highways.	Support is welcomed.
6003	Sup	Mr David William Dowson	Support the proposals	Support the proposals for highways.	Support is welcomed.
6005	Sup	Ms Maggie Walsh	Support the proposals	Support the proposals for highways.	Support is welcomed.
6007	Sup	Mrs / Cllr Pamela Austin	Support the proposals	Support the proposals for highways.	Support is welcomed.
6008	Obj	Mr Robert Harrison	Objects to proposals.  Unsound and Park and Ride based.	Objects to proposals for highways.  Unsound and Park and Ride based.	Objection noted  Planning permission has been granted for the Park and Ride at South Cliff. This facility will divert traffic away from the town centre and reduce congestion. The detailed transport study which forms part of the Evidence Base shows that, all matters considered, South Cliff is the optimal location for achieving the aims of reducing congestion in the Town Centre, while also ensuring users of the Town Centre are in

					<p>easy reach of it. Furthermore, no alternative option for siting a park and ride performed as well given the balance of costs and benefits.</p> <p>Recommendation: ensure proposals for movement and access improvements are clear.</p>
6009	Sup	Mr Roger Othick	Support the proposals	Support the proposals for highways.	Support is welcomed.
6010	Obj	Mr John Winterbottom	<p>Object to proposals for highways.</p> <p>The proposal to encourage cycling is in direct contradiction to the principal idea to expand Bridlington's shopping potential.</p>	<p>Object to proposals for highways.</p> <p>The proposal to encourage cycling is in direct contradiction to the alleged objectives of the regeneration plans principal idea to expand Bridlington's shopping potential. Do the proposers of this scheme seriously expect infirm shoppers to cycle into town and carry home their purchases in saddle bags. Not to mention the impracticality of transporting purchases shop-to-shop or storing them securely on a cycle outside a shop.</p>	<p>Objection noted.</p> <p>The proposals to encourage cycling are one part of a package of integrated transport measures, designed to relieve traffic congestion and improve all forms of transport (including public transport, cycling and walking) within the Town Centre, linked by a new transport interchange. Parking provision is also very significantly enhanced with major new public car parks providing a net gain of about 750 spaces.</p> <p>Recommendation: ensure proposals for movement and access improvements are clear.</p>
6011	Sup	Miss Margaret (Meg) Gilpin	Support the proposals	Support the proposals for highways in principle.	Support is welcomed.
6014	Sup	Mr Gordon George Vincent	Support the proposals	Support the proposals for highways.	Support is welcomed.
6015	Obj	Mr William Denison Chapman	<p>Object to the proposals for highways.</p> <p>Too much emphasis on car access and not enough 100% pedestrianised areas.</p> <p>Cycle paths must form a</p>	<p>Object to the proposals for highways.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Still too much emphasis on car access.</li> <li>- Not enough 100% pedestrianised areas.</li> <li>- Having cycle paths in the centre that are not part of a comprehensive network out into all residential areas is a waste of time and money.</li> </ul>	<p>Objection noted.</p> <p>The AAP intends to enhance pedestrian priority in the Town Centre using a variety of techniques, including the widening of pavements or full pedestrianisation where warranted.</p> <p>Cycling will be encouraged by the provision of appropriate facilities for cyclists in the form of on-street cycle lanes and off-street cycle tracks.</p> <p>Recommendation: ensure proposals for movement and access improvements are clear.</p>

			comprehensive network.		
6017	Sup	Captain Eric Casson	Support the proposals	Support the proposals for highways.	Support is welcomed.
6020	Sup	Mr Ian Stoddard	Support the proposals	Support the proposals for highways.	Support is welcomed.
6021	Sup	Mr Martyn Coltman	Support the proposals	Support the proposals for highways.	Support is welcomed.
6022	Obj	Mr Richard Hudson	<p>Object to the proposed regeneration priorities.</p> <p>Traffic proposals are not acceptable, particularly the north to south routes through the town.</p> <p>Improving employment prospects should be a top priority and should be stated as such.</p>	<p>Object to the proposals for highways.</p> <p>See comments made above under priorities.</p> <p>Traffic. The traffic proposals are not acceptable, particularly the north to south routes through the town. Trinity Road is physically a minor road compared to Promenade and not suitable for two way traffic now. It will be even worse with these plans. St Johns Street &amp; Quay Road feeds a lot of traffic into the town. There should be some plan to direct this traffic to the carparks and restrict out of town traffic from using this route. I'm sure I've read that the plan is to take traffic from Scarborough to Carnaby rather than down Hilderthorpe Road. This will require a roundabout at the link road just west of Carnaby. In fact this plan ought to be something that is tackled now. The B&amp;Q junction, Cardigan Road/Hilderthorpe road junction, and Savage Road/Hilderthorpe Road junction will mean three sets of traffic lights in close proximity. I feel these will aggravate traffic congestion. Sorting out traffic flows should be a priority. The joke is you need a packed lunch to get from one side of Brid to the other. These plans will make it worse if not changed.</p>	<p>Objection noted.</p> <p>The AAP recognises the importance of reducing traffic congestion in Bridlington Town Centre. Whilst the AAP cannot reduce the traffic flow itself, changes are proposed to the directional signage in Bridlington, with the aim of separating, before it gets close to the Town Centre, the traffic that is destined for the Town Centre, from traffic that is destined to points north or south of the town. Provision is also made to divert traffic from the Town Centre to a park and ride facility at South Shore. The movement and access strategy is designed to reduce traffic congestion in the Town Centre and improve the pedestrian environment.</p> <p>Trinity Road is capable of taking the proposed traffic if parking areas are adjusted. Traffic lights will be linked by a computerised system will deal with the management of traffic flows. The proposals to improve movement and access form part of the Bridlington Integrated Transport Plan.</p> <p>Recommendation: ensure proposals for movement and access improvements are clear.</p>
6036	Sup	Bridlington Harbour Commissioners	Support the proposals	Support the proposals for highways.	Support is welcomed.

Your alternative proposals for highways and your reasoning (if not covered in your objection to the proposals for highways):

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
6000	Obvs	Mr Alex Thompson	Consider extending Wellington Road in a direct line to the Harbour, using a bridge (if necessary) over Beck Hill.	A more sensible approach would be to consider extending Wellington Road in a direct line to the Harbour, using a bridge (if necessary) over Beck Hill. If a major route is required for such a major development do it right.	<p>Observation noted.</p> <p>Beck Hill will be straightened and widened to provide the principle north-south link across the Burlington Parade development. These works will contribute to reducing traffic congestion within the town centre. Using Beck Hill also enables the route to be raised over the new pedestrian walkway along the Gypsy Race.</p> <p>Recommendation: ensure proposals for movement and access improvements are clear.</p>
6010	Obvs	Mr John Winterbottom	Extend short term on street parking and if there is to be charging this should be available to shoppers in Bridlington outskirts.	Extend short term on street parking and if there is to be charging for this then this should be available to shoppers in Bridlington outskirts including the adjacent villages (within possibly a 15 mile catchment area) at a nominal charge remembering that these people are already financing this regeneration scheme via their council tax.	<p>Observation noted.</p> <p>The disadvantage of retaining on-street car parking in the Town Centre is that it creates unnecessary traffic congestion, compromises pedestrian safety and harms the attractiveness of the core. It is more efficient and conducive to competitiveness to instead concentrate parking in a limited number of well-located car parks.</p> <p>Recommendation: no change needed.</p>
6015	Obvs	Mr William Denison Chapman	<p>Car parks on outer edge of town centre boundary.</p> <p>Major development permissions to provide integrated (multi level) parking.</p>	Push all car parks to outer edge of town centre boundary. Insist that major development permissions are predicated on providing integrated (multi level) parking.	<p>Observation noted.</p> <p>The AAP makes provision for additional car parking facilities within the Town Centre including multi-storey car parks.</p> <p>The AAP should ensure sufficient car parking is available, or will be made available, in the Town Centre to cater for all proposed new retail, office, leisure and residential developments.</p> <p>Recommendation: no change needed.</p>

**Question 3.6** The proposals for parking are set out in Section3 at paragraphs 3.76-3.83 and in Proposal Policy BridTC15.

Do you support or object to the proposal for parking. If you object to the proposals what are your reasons. What are your alternative proposals for parking and your reasoning.

Your reasons for objecting to the proposals for parking:

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
6000	Obvs	Mr Alex Thompson	Not clear enough to comment on. Where is the multi storey car park?	Not clear enough to comment on. Q. where is the missing link i/e a multi storey car park?	Observation noted.  The AAP makes provision for improved car parking facilities including multi-storey car parks.  Recommendation: ensure AAP makes proposals for parking clear.
6001	Sup	Mrs Alexandra Grimshaw	Support the proposals.	Support the proposals for parking.	Support is welcomed.
6002	Sup w cond	David Armstrong	Concern about the mix of traffic / pedestrianisation due to the lack of clarity on a topic.	Whilst not objecting at this stage, we have a concern about the mix of traffic / pedestrianisation due to the lack of clarity on a topic which is of great concern to the prosperity of the town.	The AAP intends to enhance pedestrian priority in the Town Centre using a variety of techniques, including the widening of pavements.  Recommendation: no change needed.
6003	Sup	Mr David William Dowson	Support the proposals.	Support the proposals for parking.	Support is welcomed.
6004	Obj	Mr Lance Cook	Objects to the proposals.	Object to the proposals for parking.	Objection noted.  Insufficient information to provide detailed response.
6005	Sup	Ms Maggie Walsh	Support the proposals.	Support the proposals for parking.	Support is welcomed.
6007	Sup	Mrs / Cllr Pamela Austin	Support the proposals.	Support the proposals for parking.	Support is welcomed.
6008	Obj	Mr Robert Harrison	Objects to proposals for parking as unsound and Park and Ride based.	Object to proposals for parking.  Unsound and Park and Ride based.	Objection noted.  The Park and Ride proposed at South Cliff has been granted planning permission. This facility will divert traffic away from the town centre and reduce congestion. The detailed transport study which forms

					<p>part of the Evidence Base shows that, all matters considered, South Cliff is the optimal location for achieving the aims of reducing congestion in the Town Centre, while also ensuring users of the Town Centre are in easy reach of it. Furthermore, no alternative option for siting a park and ride performed as well given the balance of costs and benefits.</p> <p>Recommendation: ensure the proposals for movement and access are clear.</p>
6009	Sup	Mr Roger Othick	Support the proposals.	Support the proposals for parking.	Support is welcomed.
6010	Obj	Mr John Winterbottom	<p>Object to proposals for parking.</p> <p>Park and Ride schemes are designed for and only suitable for tourists. Shoppers need on-street parking.</p>	<p>Object to proposals for parking.</p> <p>Park and Ride schemes are designed for and only suitable for tourists (need I define?). Shoppers from outlying villages physically can't carry their weekly shopping from shop-to-shop and need the facility of on-street parking in order to shop in Bridlington. The alternative is to force people to utilise large supermarkets which would destroy the whole objective of the regeneration exercise.</p>	<p>Objection noted.</p> <p>The AAP makes provision for additional car parking facilities within the Town Centre including multi-storey car parks providing a net gain of about 750 spaces.</p> <p>The AAP should ensure sufficient car parking is available, or will be made available, in the Town Centre to cater for all proposed new retail, office, leisure and residential developments.</p> <p>Recommendation: no change needed.</p>
6011	Obvs	Miss Margaret (Meg) Gilpin	I did not study this section in detail but parking provision and the enforcement of regulations is immensely important	I am not able to comment as I did not study this section in detail but parking provision is immensely important and the enforcement of parking regulations.	<p>Observation noted.</p> <p>The AAP makes provision for additional car parking facilities within the Town Centre including multi-storey car parks providing a net gain of about 750 spaces.</p> <p>Recommendation: no change needed.</p>
6012	Obj	Mr Roy Lines	<p>Object to the proposals.</p> <p>Appears to say that only ERYC can set parking charges and</p>	<p>Object to the proposals for parking.</p> <p>This appears to say that only ERYC can set parking charges (even in any privately owned parks) and that it will greatly increase all charges to move cars out of town.</p>	<p>Objection noted.</p> <p>The Council's aim is to set car park charges for short stay spaces in the Town Centre so as to discourage parking for more than four hours, and encourage the use of the Town Centre after shop and office hours.</p>

			these will greatly increase.		The Council's Car Parking Review Panel is looking at parking charges and how best to link parking into the overall transport strategy.  Recommendation: no change needed.
6014	Obvs	Mr Gordon George Vincent	Don't know	Don't know	Observation noted.  Insufficient detail to provide detailed response and recommendation.
6015	Obj	Mr William Denison Chapman	Object to the proposals for parking.  Too much emphasis on cars. Not enough pedestrianisation .	Object to the proposals for parking.  See answer to 3.5  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Still too much emphasis on car access.</li> <li>- Not enough 100% pedestrianised areas.</li> <li>- Having cycle paths in the centre that are not part of a comprehensive network out into all residential areas is a waste of time and money.</li> <li>- Push all car parks to outer edge of town centre boundary.</li> <li>- Insist that major development permissions are predicated on providing integrated (multi level) parking.</li> </ul>	Objection noted.  The AAP intends to enhance pedestrian priority in the Town Centre using a variety of techniques, including the widening of pavements or full pedestrianisation where warranted.  Cycling will be encouraged by the provision of appropriate facilities for cyclists in the form of on-street cycle lanes and off-street cycle tracks.  Recommendation: ensure the proposals for movement and access are clear.
6017	Sup	Captain Eric Casson	Support the proposals.	Support the proposals for parking.	Support is welcomed.
6019	Obj	Mr Jackson	Object to the proposals for parking.  The proposals for disabled parking means disabled users will have to pay for the reserved parking.	Object to the proposals for parking.  The proposals for disabled parking means that whereas disabled users currently enjoy free on-street parking they will have to pay for the reserved parking in the newly constructed car parks. The order of magnitude number given for the Bridge Street / Marina area is no greater than the capacity at the moment. In the light of the increased prominence given to the Harbour area and the anticipated increased attraction of the area the proposed	Objection noted.  The additional and replacement short-stay parking provision will be in new, gold standard, Disability Discrimination Act compliant, decked car parks to be constructed as part of the delivery of the Burlington Parade scheme. About 5% of the total parking provision will be reserved for disabled use. There will also be on-street provision disabled parking provision.  Recommendation: no change needed.

			Proposed capacity for the Bridge Street / Marina area should be substantially increased.	capacity should be substantially increased.	
6020	Sup	Mr Ian Stoddard	Support the proposals.	Support the proposals for parking.	Support is welcomed.
6021	Sup	Mr Martyn Coltman	Support the proposals.	Support the proposals for parking.	Support is welcomed.
6022	Obj	Mr Richard Hudson	The proposals will help but do not go far enough. Some thought should be given to residents parking permits or disc zones.	Object to the proposals for parking.  Parking is a big problem in Bridlington now. The proposals will help but do not go far enough. Some thought to residents parking permits or disc zones (free for residents) should be given particularly in areas that adjoin the regeneration zone.	Objection noted.  The AAP makes provision for additional car parking facilities within the Town Centre including multi-storey car parks.  The issue of residents' permits does not form part of this AAP but is being reviewed by the Council's Parking Review Panel. This will also look at how best to link parking with the Park & Ride and the benefits arising from the overall strategy.  Recommendation: no change needed.
6036		Bridlington Harbour Commissioners	Object to the proposals.	Object to the proposals for parking.  Please see attached report (included as appendix).	Objection noted.  Parking provision will be significantly enhanced in the Town Centre and provision will be made for all new developments. Discussions with the Harbour Commissioners will ensure the provision of adequate parking for operational purposes.

Alternative proposals for parking and your reasoning (if not already covered in your objection to the parking proposals):

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
6003	Obvs	Mr David William Dowson	Multi storey would be good.  Has a monorail link been considered?	A multi storey in the town centre would be good (if possible) Palace car park or Leisure World site.  Has a monorail link for the new park and ride been considered and costed – it has been previously suggested.	The AAP makes provision for additional car parking facilities within the Town Centre including multi-storey car parks.  Provision of a monorail/electro-magnetic transport is unlikely to be feasible, given current funding availability.  Recommendation: no change needed.
6007	Obvs	Mrs / Cllr Pamela Austin	Perhaps it could be clearer on the parking available to people coming down the Flamborough Road from the Northside.  Parking rates should be reviewed downwards.	Agree proposals for areas of parking. Perhaps it could be clearer on the parking available to people coming down the Flamborough Road from the Northside where there are now an extra 1,300 houses. Also parking rates should be reviewed downwards not upwards and to be in line with other areas e.g. Driffield otherwise shoppers will go elsewhere.	Observation noted.  The Council's aim is to set car park charges for short stay spaces in the Town Centre so as to discourage parking for more than four hours, and encourage the use of the Town Centre after shop and office hours.  The Council's Car Parking Review Panel is currently looking at parking charges and how best to link this to the overall transport strategy.  Recommendation: no change needed.
6010	Obvs	Mr John Winterbottom	Extend short term on street parking and if there is charging this should be available to shoppers in Bridlington outskirts at nominal charge.	Extend short term on street parking and if there is to be charging for this then this should be available to shoppers in Bridlington outskirts including the adjacent villages (within possibly a 15 mile catchment area) at a nominal charge remembering that these people are already financing this regeneration scheme via their council tax.	The disadvantage of retaining on-street car parking in the Town Centre is that it creates unnecessary traffic congestion, compromises pedestrian safety and harms the attractiveness of the core. It is more efficient and conducive to competitiveness to instead concentrate parking in a limited number of well-located car parks.  Recommendation: no change needed.
6012	Obvs	Mr Roy Lines	Build a large multi storey car park. Do not try	Build a large multi storey car park eg. In area denoted C.69 of figure 3.5.	Observations noted.  The AAP makes provision for additional car parking

			to control private enterprise.	Do not try to control private enterprise.	facilities within the Town Centre including multi-storey car parks.  Recommendation: ensure the proposals for parking are clear.
6015	Obvs	Mr William Denison Chapman	Car parks on outer edge of town centre boundary.  Major development permissions to provide integrated (multi level) parking.	See answer to 3.5  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Push all car parks to outer edge of town centre boundary.</li> <li>- Insist that major development permissions are predicated on providing integrated (multi level) parking.</li> </ul>	The AAP makes provision for additional car parking facilities within the Town Centre including multi-storey car parks.  The AAP should ensure sufficient car parking is available, or will be made available, in the Town Centre to cater for all proposed new retail, office, leisure and residential developments.  Recommendation: ensure the proposals for parking are clear.
6019	Obvs	Mr Jackson	The reserved parking for disabled users should be free up to the time limits. Parking capacity for the Bridge St / Marina area be increased to +250	The reserved parking for disabled users within the newly constructed car parks should be free up to the time limits stipulated for other users. The car parking capacity for the Bridge St / Marina area be increased to +250	The AAP makes provision for additional car parking facilities within the Town Centre including multi-storey car parks.  About 5% of the total parking provision will be reserved for disabled use. This will include on-street provision disabled parking provision.  Recommendation: ensure the proposals for parking are clear.
6036		Bridlington Harbour Commissioners	Please see attached report.	Please see attached report (included as appendix).	Parking provision will be significantly enhanced in the Town Centre and provision will be made for all new developments. Discussions with the Harbour Commissioners will ensure the provision of adequate parking for operational purposes.

## ISSUE 4 Other Matters

**Question 4.1** The detailed planning considerations that the council will take into account within the AAP area are set out in Section 3 at paragraph 3.40.

Do you support the detailed planning considerations or object to one or more of the detailed planning considerations. If you object what are your reasons. What are your proposed alternative planning considerations.

Your reasons for objecting to the proposed planning considerations:

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
6000	Obvs	Mr Alex Thompson	How may the public consider planning considerations for a concept?	How may the public consider planning considerations for a concept? That is of course if the ERYC have been honest with us & it is only a concept?	The AAP sets planning policy. It does not grant planning permissions for any proposed scheme/s.
6001	Sup	Mrs Alexandra Grimshaw	Supports the detailed planning considerations.	Support the detailed planning considerations.	Support is welcomed.
6002	Sup	David Armstrong	Supports the detailed planning considerations.	Support the detailed planning considerations.	Support is welcomed.
6003	Sup	Mr David William Dowson	Supports the detailed planning considerations.	Support the detailed planning considerations.	Support is welcomed.
6005	Sup	Ms Maggie Walsh	Supports the detailed planning considerations.	Support the detailed planning considerations.	Support is welcomed.
6007	Sup w cond	Mrs / Cllr Pamela Austin	Support the detailed planning considerations.  Objects to TC 4	Support the detailed planning considerations.  Object to detailed planning considerations of TC 4 – neighbouring uses. Amenity – swimming pool and gym.	Support is welcomed.  Leisure World recognised as an important community facility as well as a rainy day activity for visitors. The Council's options for the replacement of a swimming pool are: redevelopment on the current site, a new facility on the edge of the Town Centre or a new facility at South Shore near the new Park and Ride and Land Train.

					Recommendation: no change needed.
6008	Obj	Mr Robert Harrison	Objects to the detailed planning considerations because they are Park and Ride based.	Object to the detailed planning considerations.  The plan is Park and Ride based. It should not be!	Objection noted.  The Park and Ride proposed at South Cliff has been granted planning permission. This facility will divert traffic away from the town centre and reduce congestion. The detailed transport study which forms part of the Evidence Base shows that, all matters considered, South Cliff is the optimal location for achieving the aims of reducing congestion in the Town Centre, while also ensuring users of the Town Centre are in easy reach of it. Furthermore, no alternative option for siting a park and ride performed as well given the balance of costs and benefits.  Recommendation: ensure proposals for movement and access are clear.
6009	Sup	Mr Roger Othick	Supports the detailed planning considerations.	Support the detailed planning considerations	Support is welcomed.
6010	Obj	Mr John Winterbottom	The town centre should not be used for residential development. Sufficient existing affordable accommodation.	The town centre should not be utilised for increasing permanent residential development. The area within the AAP proposals contains sufficiently affordably-priced accommodation for the locally based community. Short stay accommodation should only be built within the constraints outlined in TC6.	Objection noted.  Not encouraging further Town Centre residential does not acknowledge the evidence base, which explains that the AAP must ensure there is an adequate provision of housing to meet the different types and tenures of dwellings required to meet new household formation and demand arising during the plan period. The AAP conforms to national planning policy which encourages town centre residential development that contributes to the formation of sustainable communities.
6011	Obvs	Miss Margaret (Meg) Gilpin	No comment as I did not study this section in detail.	I am not able to comment as I did not study this section in detail.	Observation noted.  Insufficient information given to provide detailed response and recommendation.
6014	Obvs	Mr Gordon George Vincent	Don't know.	Don't know.	Observation noted.  Insufficient information given to provide detailed response and recommendation.
6015	Sup	Mr William	Supports the	Support the detailed planning considerations.	Support is welcomed.

		Denison Chapman	detailed planning considerations.		
6017	Sup	Captain Eric Casson	Supports the detailed planning considerations.	Support the detailed planning considerations.	Support is welcomed.
6020	Sup	Mr Ian Stoddard	Supports the detailed planning considerations.	Support the detailed planning considerations.	Support is welcomed.
6021	Sup	Mr Martyn Coltman	Supports the detailed planning considerations.	Support the detailed planning considerations.	Support is welcomed.
6036		Bridlington Harbour Commissioners	Object to the detailed planning considerations.	Object to the detailed planning considerations. Please see attached report (included as appendix).	Objection noted. Discussions with the Harbour Commissioners to agree relevant issues are ongoing.

Your proposed alternative planning considerations (if your reasons are not covered by your objection):

<b>ID</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Summary of Representation</b>	<b>Full Representation</b>	<b>Response and recommendation</b>
6008	Obvs	Mr Robert Harrison	Consult West Yorkshire stakeholders who play a huge part in the town.	You should consult West Yorkshire stakeholders – ie caravan owners. They play a huge part in the town. Any policies which don't are unsound.	Observation noted.  This is outside the scope of consultation on this report. Council tax payers will all be consulted.
6036	Obj	Bridlington Harbour Commissioners	Please see attached report.	Please see attached report (included as appendix).	Objection noted.  Discussions with the Harbour Commissioners to agree relevant issues are ongoing.

**Question 4.2** The proposals for the standardised S106 charge to create a pooled fund to help finance the Strategic Public Realm Framework are set out in Appendix 5, paragraphs 7-10.

Do you support or object to the proposals for the standardised charge. If you object what are your reasons. What are your alternative proposals and your reasoning.

Your reasons for objecting to the proposals for the standardised charge:

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
6000	Obvs	Mr Alex Thompson	Gobbledegook	Gobbledegook	Observation noted.  Recommendation: More effort to ensure AAP meets plain English standards
6001	Sup	Mrs Alexandra Grimshaw	Supports the proposals	Support the proposals for the standardised charge.	Support is welcomed.
6002	Sup	David Armstrong	Supports the proposals	Support the proposals for the standardised charge.	Support is welcomed.
6003	Sup	Mr David William Dowson	Supports the proposals	Support the proposals for the standardised charge.	Support is welcomed.
6007	Obj	Mrs / Cllr Pamela Austin	Objects to standardised charge.  It must be decided what part of the public realm framework should be part of the normal community charge and what parts are extra	Object to standardised charge.  The s.106 is an overall charge. It must be decided what part of the public realm framework should be part of the normal community charge and what parts are extra to that charge and thus require an additional charge.	Objection noted.  The Council proposes to use a standardised charge on development to create a fund to help finance the Strategic Public Realm Framework in Bridlington. The standard charge is calculated on the basis of a contribution per square metre of the gross floor area of the 'eligible' development, with the aim of not exceeding, but being broadly equivalent to, 10% of the average land values in Bridlington for each of the Use Classes to which the S106 charge applies.  Recommendation: no change needed.
6008	Sup	Mr Robert Harrison	Supports the proposals	Support the proposals for the standardised charge.	Support is welcomed.
6009	Sup	Mr Roger Othick	Supports the	Support the proposals for the standardised charge.	Support is welcomed.

			proposals		
6011	Obvs	Miss Margaret (Meg) Gilpin	I did not study appendix 5 and do not understand the term 'standardised s106 charge'	I am not able to comment as I did not study appendix 5 and do not understand the term 'standardised s106 charge'.	Observation noted.  The Council proposes to use a standardised charge on development to create a fund to help finance the Strategic Public Realm Framework in Bridlington. The standard charge is calculated on the basis of a contribution per square metre of the gross floor area of the 'eligible' development, with the aim of not exceeding, but being broadly equivalent to, 10% of the average land values in Bridlington for each of the Use Classes to which the S106 charge applies.
6014	Sup w cond	Mr Gordon George Vincent	Support the proposals for the standardised charge in principle only, require more details.	Support the proposals for the standardised charge in principle only.  More details would be needed to sell this idea.	Support in principle is welcomed.  More details on the operation of the standardised charge will be included in the submission draft of the AAP.
6015	Sup	Mr William Denison Chapman	Supports the proposals	Support the proposals for the standardised charge.	Support is welcomed.
6016	Obj	Mr Peter Gleave on behalf of Tesco Store Ltd	Object to the proposals for the standardised charge.  Remind the Council that side agreements must be reasonable and related to the proposal	Object to the proposals for the standardised charge.  Rates proposed are unlikely to bring inward investment and we would remind the Council that S.106 agreements must be reasonable and related to the proposal as set out in Circular 05/05	Objection noted.  The Council proposes to use a standardised charge on development to create a fund to help finance the Strategic Public Realm Framework in Bridlington. The standard charge is calculated on the basis of a contribution per square metre of the gross floor area of the 'eligible' development, with the aim of not exceeding, but being broadly equivalent to, 10% of the average land values in Bridlington for each of the Use Classes to which the S106 charge applies.  Recommendation: no change needed.
6017	Sup	Captain Eric Casson	Supports the proposals	Support the proposals for the standardised charge.	Support is welcomed.
6020	Sup	Mr Ian Stoddard	Supports the proposals	Support the proposals for the standardised charge.	Support is welcomed.
6021	Sup	Mr Martyn Coltman	Supports the proposals	Support the proposals for the standardised charge.	Support is welcomed.

6032	Obj	Mr Richard Frudd on behalf of National Grid Property Ltd	<p>Object to the proposals for the standardised charge.</p> <p>Indigo act on behalf of National Grid Property Ltd (“NGP”) and representations are submitted on their behalf relating to their landholdings off Quay Road, to the north west of Bridlington town centre.</p> <p>NGP object to the blanket requirement to seek developer contributions from all new development above relatively modest thresholds within the town centre.</p> <p>NGP recommend flexibility is incorporated within the wording of the policy in accordance with</p>	<p>Object to the proposals for the standardised charge.</p> <p>Indigo act on behalf of National Grid Property Ltd (“NGP”) and the following representations are submitted on their behalf relating to their landholdings off Quay Road, to the north west of Bridlington town centre.</p> <p>Council Officers are aware that NGP are seeking to promote a housing led scheme on this site as a means by which to secure prestige redevelopment of this gateway brownfield location. The development will catalyse regeneration of the area in line with the wider aspirations of the Bridlington Town Centre Area Action Plan (AAP).</p> <p>NGP object to the blanket requirement to seek developer contributions from all new development above relatively modest thresholds within the town centre.</p> <p>Circular 05/2005 provides Central Government guidance on planning obligations and reaffirms the long established principle that planning obligations should only be used to make acceptable development which would otherwise be unacceptable in planning terms. The Circular also retains the tests against which the acceptability of a planning obligation should be assessed; i.e. they should only be sought where they meet all the following tests:</p> <p>“(i) Relevant to planning;  (ii) Necessary to make the proposed development acceptable in planning terms;  (iii) Directly related to the proposed development;  (iv) Fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the proposed development; and  (v) Reasonable in all other respects.”</p> <p>It will not be reasonable, or directly related to the proposed development, nor necessary to require the contribution, or at least the full extent of the contribution in all cases. Paragraph 3.97 to the consultation document does acknowledge that the level of contributions sought in each case should be</p>	<p>Objection noted.</p> <p>The Council proposes to use a standardised charge on development to create a fund to help finance the Strategic Public Realm Framework in Bridlington. The standard charge is calculated on the basis of a contribution per square metre of the gross floor area of the 'eligible' development, with the aim of not exceeding, but being broadly equivalent to, 10% of the average land values in Bridlington for each of the Use Classes to which the S106 charge applies.</p> <p>Recommendation: no change needed.</p>
------	-----	--	---	---	---

			Circular 05/2005.	considered on the individual merits of the application. However, this is not reflected within the wording of the draft policy itself, and NGP would therefore recommend that such necessary flexibility is incorporated within the wording of the policy.	
6036	Obj	Bridlington Harbour Commissioners	Object to the proposals for the standardised charge.	Object to the proposals for the standardised charge.  Please see attached report (included as appendix). Any S.106 agreement should relate directly to the proposal.	Objection noted.  Discussions with the Harbour Commissioners to agree relevant issues are ongoing.

Your alternative proposals and your reasoning (if your reasons are not covered by your objection to the proposals for the standardised charge):

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
6007	Obvs	Mrs / Cllr Pamela Austin	Review Public Charge Framework in line with present charges and responsibilities – not a standard new tax	Review Public Charge Framework in line with present charges and responsibilities – not a standard new tax as many people in Bridlington are on very low incomes.	<p>Observation noted.</p> <p>The standardised charge deals with development which gains benefits from public investment. The charge is applied to new developments and is not a form of new tax.</p> <p>Recommendation: no change needed.</p>
6016	Obvs	Mr Peter Gleave on behalf of Tesco Store Ltd	Each development should be looked at individually rather than applying a blanket approach.	Each development should be looked at on its merits and its actual effects of that development rather than applying a blanket approach.	<p>Observation noted.</p> <p>Recommendation: no change needed.</p>
6036	Obj	Bridlington Harbour Commissioners	Please see attached report.	Please see attached report (included as appendix).	<p>Objection noted.</p> <p>Discussions with the Harbour Commissioners to agree relevant issues are ongoing.</p> <p>Recommendation: no change needed.</p>

**Question 4.3** The proposals for year-round use of the Town Centre Seafront are set out in paragraphs 4.35-4.57.

Do you support or object to the proposals for year-round use of the Town Centre Seafront. If you object what are your reasons. What are your alternative proposals and your reasoning.

Reasons for objecting to the proposals for year-round use of the Town Centre Seafront:

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
6000	Obvs	Mr Alex Thompson	When does the sea front close?	I always believed the sea front was open all year round?  When did it close?	Observation noted.  The Seafront is currently an under-used asset outside of the tourist season. Proposed Policy BridTC20 The Town Centre Seafront aims to return the Seafront to year round use – recovering the special historic character of the area, restoring the better historic buildings and inserting new, well-designed, contemporary buildings, and accommodating in them the kinds of uses that will ensure the area is active and appealing all year round, not just for visitors but for people who live and work in Bridlington.  Recommendation: no change needed.
6001	Sup	Mrs Alexandra Grimshaw	Supports the proposals	Supports the proposals for year round use of the Town Centre Seafront.	Support is welcomed.
6002	Sup	David Armstrong	Supports the proposals	Supports the proposals for year round use of the Town Centre Seafront.	Support is welcomed.
6003	Sup	Mr David William Dowson	Supports the proposals	Supports the proposals for year round use of the Town Centre Seafront.	Support is welcomed.
6005	Sup	Ms Maggie Walsh	Supports the proposals	Supports the proposals for year round use of the Town Centre Seafront.	Support is welcomed.
6007	Sup	Mrs / Cllr Pamela Austin	Supports the proposals.  BridTC5 2c – 3.39	Supports the proposals for year round use of the Town Centre Seafront.  BridTC5 2c – 3.39: As previously stated the swimming pool must be retained as it is essential for the health of residents especially if a gym could be built within it. We cannot remove our only public fitness centre in easy reach. The sports centre down Gypsy Road is for gym games like badminton also	Support is welcomed.  Leisure World recognised as an important community facility as well as a rainy day activity for visitors. The Council's options for the replacement of a swimming pool are: redevelopment on the current site, a new facility on the edge of the Town Centre or a new facility at South Shore near the new Park and Ride and Land Train

				many residents will not go to it because it is in a dangerous area of town.	
6008	Sup	Mr Robert Harrison	Supports the proposals. Seafront needs cycling provision.	Supports the proposals for year round use of the Town Centre Seafront.  Needs cycling provision on seafront.	Support is welcomed.  Recommendation for cycling provision on the seafront is noted. Proposed Policy BridTC14: Access and Movement aims to encourage cycling through the provision of appropriate facilities for cyclists in the form of on-street cycle lanes and off-street cycle tracks, and secure cycle parking facilities at key destinations and individual facilities/businesses.
6009	Sup	Mr Roger Othick	Supports the proposals	Support the proposals for year round use of the Town Centre Seafront.	Support is welcomed.
6010	Obj	Mr John Winterbottom	Object to the proposals for year round use of the Town Centre Seafront.  Leisure World needs updating and should incorporate an Olympic sized swimming pool	Object to the proposals for year round use of the Town Centre Seafront.  It is recognised that the present Leisure World facilities need updating. However when this occurs the most important requirement is to incorporate an Olympic sized swimming pool thus facilitating its use for national and international events and with the ongoing capability of itself being a tourist attraction rather than (at present) just a facility for diversionary use in inclement weather.	Objection noted.  Suggestion on an Olympic sized swimming pool is noted although the cost implications of such a facility could prove prohibitive. Leisure World recognised as an important community facility as well as a rainy day activity for visitors. The Council's options for the replacement of a swimming pool are: redevelopment on the current site, a new facility on the edge of the Town Centre or a new facility at South Shore near the new Park and Ride and Land Train.  Recommendation: no change needed.
6011	Sup	Miss Margaret (Meg) Gilpin	Supports the proposals	Support the proposals for year round use of the Town Centre Seafront.	Support is welcomed.
6012	Obj	Mr Roy Lines	Object to the proposals. Moving the fun fair away from the town centre will greatly reduce footfall in the town.	Object to the proposals for year round use of the Town Centre Seafront.  Moving the arcade / fun fair area away from town centre will greatly reduce footfall in the town to the detriment of shops, museums etc.	Objection noted.  The AAP recognises the important contribution that tourism makes to the economy of Bridlington. The AAP does not aim to reduce tourist spending in the town, but to better manage the seasonal surge, and encourage additional types of tourist activity, in particular non-seasonal visitor markets. Any relocation of traditional tourist attractions (such as the fun fair) would be accompanied by improved transport links to ensure visitor spending is still captured by Bridlington Town Centre.  Recommendation: no change needed.
6014	Obj	Mr Gordon	Weather	Weather conditions in December, January and February make	Objection noted.

		George Vincent	conditions in winter make this a non starter	this a non starter except for undercover leisure.	<p>The proposals recognise the impact of adverse weather conditions in the winter months. New development on the Seafront will return the area to non-seasonal and a wider mix of activities, including hotel use, housing and year round leisure activities, cafés and restaurants taking advantage of the exceptional position over the sea and Harbour. The Town Centre SPD will set out one comprehensive option for responding to the changes and opportunities in the area showing an approach to redevelopment which creates a mix of residential, hotel and ground floor leisure uses, centred on a new 'winter garden' in the Garrison Square area.</p> <p>Recommendation: no change needed.</p>
6015	Sup	Mr William Denison Chapman	Supports the proposals	Support the proposals for year round use of the Town Centre Seafront.	Support is welcomed.
6017	Sup	Captain Eric Casson	Supports the proposals	Support the proposals for year round use of the Town Centre Seafront.	Support is welcomed.
6019	Sup	Mr Jackson	Supports the proposals	Support the proposals for year round use of the Town Centre Seafront.	Support is welcomed.
6020	Sup	Mr Ian Stoddard	Supports the proposals	Support the proposals for year round use of the Town Centre Seafront.	Support is welcomed.
6021	Sup	Mr Martyn Coltman	Supports the proposals	Support the proposals for year round use of the Town Centre Seafront.	Support is welcomed.
6022	Sup	Mr Richard Hudson	Supports the proposals	Support the proposals for year round use of the Town Centre Seafront.	Support is welcomed.
6036	Obj	Bridlington Harbour Commissioners	Supports the proposals	Support the proposals for year round use of the Town Centre Seafront.	Support is welcomed.

Your alternative proposals for the Town Centre Seafront and your reasoning (if your reasons are not already covered by your objection to the proposals for the Town Centre Seafront):

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
6007	Obvs	Mrs / Cllr Pamela Austin	The swimming pool must be retained as it is essential for the health of residents especially if a gym could be built within it.	As previously stated the swimming pool must be retained as it is essential for the health of residents especially if a gym could be built within it. We cannot remove our only public fitness centre in easy reach. The sports centre down Gypsey Road is for gym games like badminton also many residents will not go to it because it is in a dangerous area of town.	Leisure World is recognised as an important community facility. The Council's options for the replacement of a swimming pool are: redevelopment on the current site, a new facility on the edge of the Town Centre or a new facility at South Shore near the new Park and Ride and Land Train  Recommendation: no change needed.
6010	Obvs	Mr John Winterbottom	An updated Leisure World with Olympic sized swimming pool would transform the AAP into a year-round facility.	An updated Leisure World with Olympic sized swimming pool would transform the AAP into a year-round facility in a manner which is not feasible in the present proposals. The site could actually be the present south side car park if a suitable Park and Ride site is provided in the appropriate place (Carnaby).	Suggestion on an Olympic sized swimming pool is noted although the cost implications of such a facility could prove prohibitive. Leisure World recognised as an important community facility as well as a rainy day activity for visitors.. The Council's options for the replacement of a swimming pool are: redevelopment on the current site, a new facility on the edge of the Town Centre or a new facility at South Shore near the new Park and Ride and Land Train.  Recommendation: no change needed.
6014	Obvs	Mr Gordon George Vincent	None – weather conditions make this a non starter.	None	Observation noted. The proposals recognise the impact of adverse weather conditions in the winter months. New development on the Seafront will return the area to non-seasonal and a wider mix of activities, including hotel use, housing and year round leisure activities, cafés and restaurants taking advantage of the exceptional position over the sea and Harbour. The Town Centre SPD will set out one comprehensive option for responding to the changes and opportunities in the area showing an approach to redevelopment which creates a mix of residential, hotel and ground floor leisure uses, centred on a new 'winter garden' in the Garrison Square area.  Recommendation: no change needed.

## PART 2: Comments on the Plan's Details and Policies

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
6000	Obvs	Mr Alex Thompson	<p>Suggests opening of the Gypsy Race (The Beck) would cause rodent problem and require all year round care.</p> <p>Will the creation of 1,900 jobs be at the expense of jobs lost in redevelopment period?</p> <p>Studying the AAP documents is a long and arduous task, most people will not be able to understand such lengthy and ERYC jargon orientated paperwork?</p> <p>Would be interested to know the number of public comments on this section and numbers who quote plan refs and cross referencing.</p>	<p>The opening of the Gypsy Race (in town jargon The Beck) would, I suggest open the town up to rodents. The filling in of Clough Hole highlighted the rodent situation for all to see. Opening up more could create a costly health hazard. A created water feature would also require care and maintenance all year round.</p> <p>Will the creation of 1,900 jobs not be at the expense of lost jobs during the lengthy period of demolition and rebuilding?</p> <p>Having spent 2/3 hours reading (most) of the AAP documents and as a person genuinely interested I found the task arduous. How do you justify 'consultation' when most people will not be able to understand such lengthy and ERYC jargon orientated paperwork?</p> <p>You will not get sufficient genuine feedback in quantity from a town of approx 34/36,000 people.</p> <p>It would be interesting to know the number of public comments on this section. Particularly those who quote plan refs and cross referencing.</p>	<p>Observations noted.</p> <p>Gypsy Race - The advantage of re-opening the Gypsy Race in full is that it provides an opportunity to use the Race to both link the station to the town centre core, and provide a pedestrian spine and park-like setting for redevelopment. The re-opened Gypsy Race will be carefully designed to ensure development of a high-quality amenity feature, which will meet all required safety and flood defence standards. More detail on the design criteria of the Race will be provided in a Town Centre SPD. Concerns regarding the design and upkeep of the Gypsy Race are noted and will be addressed. The AAP outlines the Section 106 Agreement Charges, which will help to finance the development and maintenance of public realm improvements in the Town Centre.</p> <p>Job creation - The proposals will create 1,930 net jobs. Jobs gained through the development proposed will lead to further job creation in the local economy, both through the spending by the new employees of their wages in Bridlington and the procurement by the new and expanding businesses of their services and supplies from other businesses in the town.</p> <p>Length of document - The AAP necessarily, at this stage, needs to set out a full account of the proposals and the reasoning for them, together with the options which have been considered but rejected and why. The Council appreciate that it</p>

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
					<p>is time consuming to take part and is grateful for your participation and that of the rest of the Community. But the Council also does not want to omit information which the community requires in order to make informed comment on the proposals. More effort still will be made to ensure the AAP is in plain English and removes jargon.</p> <p>The public comments on the APP are fully documented in this report.</p> <p>Recommendation: ensure the Submission Draft is as short as possible and written in Plain English, avoiding all jargon.</p>
6003	Sup	Mr David William Dowson	<p>Support for all the plan as is.</p> <p>Any compulsory purchase orders should be actioned quickly.</p>	<p>Support for all the plan as is.</p> <p>General note: Any compulsory purchase orders should be actioned quickly and reasonably to avoid rumour and confusion.</p>	<p>Support is welcomed.</p> <p>Whilst no CPO order is in existence property is being acquired in key areas as it becomes available in order to minimise disruption.</p>
6004	Obj	Mr Lance Cook	<p>Object to BridTC15</p> <p>Concentrating all the new parking areas in the Burlington Parade area ignores the parking requirements of the local population out of summer.</p>	<p>Object to BridTC15</p> <p>Concentrating all the new parking areas in the Burlington Parade area is fine for the visitors in the six week summer rush period. However this totally ignores the parking requirements of the local population during the remaining (quiet) part of the year. Most development in Bridlington is to the north side of the town. All these residents access Bridlington down Flamborough Road and Promenade and not down the A165. There is no provision for them in this scheme. Approx 33% of Bridlington's residents are retired. Out of season they will not be diverted to the Hilderthorpe Road area and then walk to Promenade and Cliff Street where most shop at M&amp;S. To say the solution is to move M&amp;S is not realistic.</p>	<p>Objection noted.</p> <p>The proposals for parking provide a net gain of approximately 750 public parking spaces with the Town Centre.</p> <p>The Council is fully aware of the implications of withdrawing the Cliff Street area which includes M&amp;S from the primary retail core. The re-designation provides the conditions for the improvement of this area, recognising that it has – for compelling reasons as explained in the AAP – lost its way as a primary shopping area.</p> <p>Recommendation: no change needed.</p>

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
6007	Sup w cond	Mrs/Cllr Pamela Austin	<p>Support 1.1 – 1.25</p> <p>Support 1.26 &amp; 1.27 - good place for expansion of berths, need to consult with all yacht clubs in Great Britain. Need facilities at Wilsthorpe.</p> <p>Support 1.32, 3.78,3.79 – BridTC14 – how will disabled persons will access the centre and where the disabled parking will be?</p> <p>Support in general 1.34 &amp; 2.111 – BridTC5 2c – however a swimming pool and gym should be kept on the seafront for visitors, conference visitors and inhabitants.</p> <p>Support 1.35 – BridTC4 2e – Strongly support this as the shop fronts of Bridlington are appalling.</p> <p>Support 1.38 iv – BridTC3 4h – strongly support the opening of Gypsy Race and an associated linear park.</p>	<p>Support 1.1 – 1.25</p> <p>Support 1.26 &amp; 1.27 TC1, 1b – good place for expansion of berths, need to consult with all yacht clubs in Great Britain to advertise the venue so we could get more competitive regattas as Bridlington Bay is great for this purpose. Also will there be facilities built at Wilsthorpe for boarding &amp; sand racing etc. As your report says the beaches and water are our best asset.</p> <p>Support 1.32, 3.78,3.79 – BridTC14 – I support the removal of cars from the centre but there is no mention in this paragraph of how disabled persons will access the centre and where the disabled parking will be? Also if they are expected to walk from car parks at least they should be able to park with no charge. Fewer car parks will be a problem for them.</p> <p>Support in general 1.34 &amp; 2.111 – BridTC5 2c – however a swimming pool and gym should be kept on the seafront for visitors, conference visitors and inhabitants. It is an attraction for conference visitors and essential for the health of residents. Plus a wet weather venue – a subject you have not addressed in this plan ie. need for formal as well as informal recreation.</p> <p>Support 1.35 – BridTC4 2e – Strongly support this as the shop fronts of Bridlington are appalling. I have visitors that will not go into the town because of its run down and dirty appearance. One point – ERYC will need to address cleanliness as the amount of dirt on pavements and roads plus bird droppings is the worst I have ever seen.</p> <p>Support 1.38 iv – BridTC3 4h – strongly support the opening of Gypsy Race and an associated linear park. The less culvert flow of the river as possible because enclosure increases the risk of flooding. A removal of rubbish and silt build up would also help this.</p>	<p>Support for 1.1 – 1.25 is welcomed</p> <p>Support for 1.26 – 1.27 is welcomed</p> <p>Support for 1.32, 3.78 &amp; 3.79 (BridTC14) is welcomed. Disabled parking-The Town Centre will retain some short stay parking for disabled provision in the Primary Shopping Area.</p> <p>Support for 1.34 &amp; 2.111 (BridTC5 2c) is welcomed. Leisure World is recognised as an important community facility as well as a rainy day activity for visitors. . The Council anticipates having to replace the swimming pool and the current options being considered for the replacement are: redevelopment on the current site, a new facility on the edge of the Town Centre or a new facility at South Shore near the new Park and Ride and Land Train</p> <p>Support 1.35 – BridTC4 2e is welcomed.</p> <p>Support 1.38 iv – BridTC3 4h is welcomed.</p>

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
				Ref 1.2 - sustainability appraisal. All other sections I agree with and support.	
6008	Sup w cond	Mr Robert Harrison	<p>Support and object to elements of 1.32 – any proposal not addressing the nightmare that is Chapel Street does not result in a ‘sound plan’.</p> <p>Support and object to elements of 1.33 – the policy does not give realistic alternative to on-street parking. The park and ride has now been booted and these polices are no longer relevant.</p> <p>The illuminated sign boards would be a good idea if free/cheap car parks on the town centre periphery.</p> <p>The cycling provision should however be linked to a secure cycle storage area and a cycle lane on the seafront.</p> <p>Support 1.38 – to actively encourage the watersports market the Council should reduce its horrendous launching fees at Belvedere.</p> <p>Object to 3.63 – Bridlington</p>	<p>Support and object to elements of 1.32 – any proposal not addressing the nightmare that is Chapel Street does not result in a ‘sound plan’. The street results in all of the symptoms mentioned in this para. This plan should restore Chapel Street and undo the complete hash this council and partnership has made of our town centre which leads to unsustainable congestion which is unnecessary and leads to the town centre appearing more congested than ever. This policy response is unsound as it does not address this issue.</p> <p>Object to 1.33 – the policy does not give realistic alternative to on-street parking. The park and ride has now been booted and these polices are no longer relevant or justified. The plan is therefore unsound, (no alternative sites are suggested).</p> <p>1.33 - The illuminated sign boards would be a good idea if the Council actually provided free/cheap car parks on the town centre periphery.</p> <p>1.33 - The cycling provision is an excellent idea. It should however be linked to a secure cycle storage area and most importantly a cycle lane on the seafront which although illegal is still a very important (and well used) cycle route into town for all ages.</p> <p>Support 1.38 – to actively encourage the watersports market the Council should reduce its horrendous launching fees at Belvedere and have after tea launching during the summer months. The existing facility is extremely expensive and as such gentrified and restrictive.</p> <p>Object to 3.63 – Bridlington does not have sufficient town</p>	<p>The alterations to Chapel Street have now been in place for 12 months and following refinements are now broadly accepted. Improvements to the signalling have now alleviated the initial problems. Accidents have been significantly reduced and a safer pedestrian environment created.</p> <p>The AAP anticipates that improvements to car parking provision within the Town Centre will help to alleviate traffic congestion, primarily through reducing the amount of visitor/resident traffic circulating to find parking spaces. More car parking places will also be required to meet the needs of new development projects proposed as part of the AAP.</p> <p>Support and object to elements of 1.33- On-street car parking in the Town Centre creates unnecessary traffic congestion, compromises pedestrian safety and harms the attractiveness of the core. It is more efficient and conducive to competitiveness to instead concentrate parking in a limited number of well-located car parks as proposed by the AAP.</p> <p>Support for ‘variable message signing’ to alert drivers of available parking spaces is welcomed. The parking proposals in the AAP will provide a net additional 750 spaces.</p> <p>The AAP recognises the requirements for the provision of cycle lanes and secure cycle parking facilities located at convenient access points to</p>

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
			<p>does not have sufficient town centre decent jobs to support decent town centre living. There is insufficient parking for those who will need to drive to work.</p> <p>Support and object to elements of TC13 – night-time economy proposals for the younger generation are good but imaginative policies are not.</p> <p>Object to 3.72 – The Park and Ride has been rejected therefore delete this policy and have policy responses that go with, not fight our traffic dependency.</p> <p>Closing Bridge Street is not an option; Beck Hill should be improved without compromising the stability of the centre</p> <p>Support 3.72 – substantially increasing car parking is necessary and should be within walking distance of town centre.</p> <p>Object to 3.81 and other – strongly object to price reviews.</p>	<p>centre decent jobs to support decent town centre living. As such anyone who lives there will need to drive by car to work. There is insufficient parking for this. This is unsustainable as there is no realistic public transport links. You are in effect building the slums of tomorrow.</p> <p>Support and object to elements of TC13 – although night-time economy proposals for the younger generation are mentioned which is good. Imaginative policies are not.</p> <p>Object to 3.72 – This joke has been booted and rightly so. Please therefore delete this policy and come up with more policy responses that go with, not fight our traffic dependency. Any plan still based on the park and ride is unsound.</p> <p>Object to 3.72 - Closing Bridge Street is not an option; Beck Hill should be improved without compromising the stability of the centre with road closures.</p> <p>Support 3.72 – support but comments - substantially increasing car parking is necessary. However this should be within walking distance of town centre not park and ride.</p> <p>Object to 3.81 and other – strongly object to price reviews. This policy is based on park and ride. It is no longer relevant and will kill our town centre. As such it is fundamentally unsound.</p>	<p>the Town Centre and its principal focus points.</p> <p>Support for 1.38 is welcomed – launching fees at Belvedere are not within the remit of this plan.</p> <p>Objection to 3.63 is noted.</p> <p>The proposals in BridTC13 aim to develop an evening economy within a safe environment that attracts all of the Town Centre’s users, regardless of age or lifestyle, all year round.</p> <p>Objection to 3.72 is noted.</p> <p>The introduction of different uses to the town centre can only be achieved is Bridge Street is pedestrianised. Extensive traffic modelling has been undertaken to ensure that the proposed changes result in improved movement and access arrangements.</p> <p>Support for 3.72 is welcomed - The AAP makes provision for additional car parking facilities within the Town Centre including multi-storey car parks.</p> <p>The AAP should ensure sufficient car parking is available, or will be made available, in the Town Centre to cater for all proposed new retail, office, leisure and residential developments.</p> <p>Objection to 3.81 and other noted. The Park and Ride Scheme has planning permission and will help reduce traffic congestion in the Town Centre. The Council’s Car Parking Review Panel is currently examining parking charges.</p> <p>Recommendation: ensure proposals for</p>

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
					movement and access are clear.
6010	Obvs	John Winterbottom	Points covered above.	The above comments cover all sensible points of consultation.	Observation noted
6011	Obvs	Miss Margaret (Meg) Gilpin	<p>Town Hall Exhibition was immensely interesting and impeccably presented but the representatives from the consultant team who I spoke to seemed to have little understanding of Bridlington's history.</p> <p>would have liked to see more precise information on the costings, priorities for funding and probable timescale.</p> <p>Past responses supported protecting and celebrating the town's distinctive historic character.</p>	<p>I thought the Town Hall Exhibition was immensely interesting and impeccably presented (maps, drawings, photographs, text). However the representatives from the consultant team who I spoke to seemed to have little understanding of Bridlington's history and no knowledge at all of the relationship between Burlington (the historic old town) and Quay (the fishing port/new town).</p> <p>I would have liked to see more precise information on the costings of the development proposals, also the priorities for funding and probable timescale.</p> <p>NB: The responses to the Issues and Options report supported protecting and celebrating the town's distinctive historic character.</p>	<p>The regeneration strategy for Bridlington takes into account the historical context of the town and surrounding area.</p> <p>More precise information on the costings of the development proposals will be provided at a later stage when the proposals are developed further.</p> <p>Protecting historic character. The production of the detailed design guidance will have regard to the distinctive character and architecture of the Town Centre. The AAP recognises that the historic character of Bridlington should be preserved and enhanced, and not compromised by the regeneration strategy.</p> <p>Recommendation: no change needed.</p>
6012	Obvs	Mr Roy Lines	This is an overlong and confusing document written in PR speak / jargon.	This is (perhaps intentionally) an overlong and confusing document written in PR speak / jargon with warm and fuzzy generalities and little tangible detail.	<p>The AAP necessarily, at this stage, needs to set out a full account of the proposals and the reasoning for them, together with the options which have been considered but rejected and why. The Council appreciate that it is time consuming to take part and is grateful for your participation and that of the rest of the Community. But the Council also does not want to omit information which the community requires in order to make informed comment on the proposals. More effort still will be made to ensure the AAP is in plain English and removes jargon.</p> <p>Recommendation: ensure the Submission Draft</p>

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
					is a short as possible and written in Plain English, avoiding all jargon.
6014	Obvs	Mr Gordon George Vincent	Notes on 3.4 – I put forward an alternative marina to ERYC's plan at the Public Inquiry at the town for 200-250 boats.  Infill beach development on a large scale is almost impossible to insure.	Notes on 3.4 – I put forward an alternative marina to ERYC's plan at the Public Inquiry at the town. My plans for a much smaller marina of around 200-280 boats (according to size) and costing at year 2000 costs around £18.1m with only a small development on infill beach. My proposed marina covered similar boundaries to your present plan.  Please note - Infill beach development on a large scale is almost impossible to insure unless the infill has lain for at least 10 years – hence developer have difficulty borrowing money on the freehold.	The Council and Yorkshire Forward would not pursue a Marina in absence of the evidence – and thus are only pursuing it because of the confidence the evidence already in place provides. The detailed evidence will be set out in the Submission Draft of the AAP once the partners have agreed the exact extent of the Marina.  The development proposed at the Marina will not involve any significant infill development.  Recommendation: no change needed.
6015	Obvs	Mr William Denison Chapman	BridTC 20 – The budget hotel idea – I think the rationale fails to take account of the demand that could be generated by a sizeable 4/5 star hotel. A budget hotel would merely compete with the B&B's and would not add to the quality of the 'Bridlington conference offer'.  BridTC 9 – The shopping centre growth is needed but will it succeed given constraints of population / growth / catchment / attractiveness (both environment and shopping experience) / drive time.	Object to BridTC 20 – The budget hotel idea – I think the rationale for this is entirely misplaced. It fails to take account of the demand that could be generated by a sizeable 4/5 star hotel. Clearly there is very limited business demand in Bridlington which is not a major industrial city like Leeds or London or even York. However such a hotel with some luxurious facilities (pool, meeting facilities etc all complementary to the Spa development) could achieve high occupancy levels. A budget hotel would merely compete with the host of B&B's already available in abundance and would not add one jot to the quality of the 'Bridlington conference offer'. In fact it would dumb down the offer.  BridTC 9 – The shopping centre growth – Yes it is needed. Will it succeed given all the other plan constraints is the big issue. The constraint is population / growth / catchment / attractiveness (both environment and shopping experience) / drive time. Brid pop 36k currently unattractive but potentially very attractive, 10-15 minutes; Scarborough pop 106k attractive 30-35 minutes; York extremely attractive pop 181k and growing 45-55 minutes; Hull unattractive but has	A hotel demand study is on-going. This will link to the marina and newly reopened spa.  The evidence base indicates that there is potential to 'claw back' for Bridlington retail spending that is currently lost to competing centres. The AAP aims to improve Bridlington's retail offer, through provision of up to 21,660 sq.m gross comparison retail floorspace over the plan period  Population growth predictions are based on current forecasts.  The AAP makes provision for additional car parking facilities within the Town Centre including multi-storey car parks. There will not be a linear car park. The AAP intends to enhance pedestrian priority in the Town Centre using a variety of techniques, including the widening of pavements or full pedestrianisation where

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
			<p>Object to BridTC 17 – population growth assumptions are un-ambitious. Would prefer to see a range of development options for trend growth.</p> <p>Object to BridTC 14 – Linear car park – Not a good idea. Get the place pedestrianised as much as possible. Ensure that all developments are mandated to deliver multi storey parking (below and above ground).</p> <p>Winter charges for car parking. Has made no difference to me. The big issue is lack of parking and congestion.</p>	<p>all the large shops 243k 40 minutes; Beverley very attractive but limited shopping. The AAP surveys expressed surprise that York took a large slice of the shopping budget. That is naïve. Bridlington’s core problem is its low relative population/catchment. A fundamental balancing question then becomes ‘at what pop / catchment would all the big names form an orderly queue?’ or ‘ how to grow the population to say 60,000 within 20 years?’ or ‘what shopping experience, given the current local constraints, would drive a high (Beverley like) demand? And which retail developer could be trusted to deliver it?’</p> <p>Object to BridTC 17 – population growth assumptions are un-ambitious. I would prefer to see a range of development options for trend growth ‘as is’ – this plus say 10,000 to 2020, plus 20,000 to 2020. More ambition would pull through retail and job growth.</p> <p>Object to BridTC 14 – Linear car park – Not a good idea. Get the place pedestrianised as much as possible. Keep cars out and let light, trees, parks, pavement cafes in. ensure that all developments/developers are mandated to deliver substantial multi storey (below and above ground) as part of the development conditions. There are 2 obvious candidates for this. The shopping / hotel / housing complex and the marina/ the latter is an ideal site for a large underground multi level park below the existing small surface parks and potentially below the water of the new marina.</p> <p>Winter charges for car parking. Has made no difference to me. The big issue is lack of parking and congestion of a very complex road layout not charging.</p>	<p>warranted.</p> <p>The issue of winter charges for parking will be covered by the Council’s Car Parking Review Panel. A public consultation on this ran until mid September 2008.</p> <p>Recommendation: no change needed.</p>
6016	Obj	Mr Peter Gleave on behalf of Tesco Stores Ltd.	Object to 3.51 –the figure of 3,800 sq m of cross convenience floorspace should be used, regardless	Object to 3.51 – We feel that the figure of 3,800 sq m of cross convenience floorspace should be used, regardless of the size of the supermarket. Larger stores will enable the ‘claw back’ of trade that is being lost to centres outside of	<p>Objection to 3.51 noted.</p> <p>The AAP recognises the need to claw back’ of trade that is being lost to centres outside of</p>

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
			of the size of the supermarket to 'claw back' lost trade.	Bridlington and will also attract more shoppers to the town.	<p>Bridlington and the needed to attract more shoppers to the town.</p> <p>The figures for cross convenience floorspace are based on the Bridlington Retail Study which provides guideline estimates of the capacity for additional convenience goods floorspace. As smaller convenience store operators have a lower floorspace efficiency rate the floorspace figure is higher.</p> <p>Recommendation: no change required.</p>
6017	Obsvs	Captain Eric Casson	<p>The statement is too short and restrictive and needs to lead the AAP aims from the outset. Suggests 'A great place to live, work and thrive in at Yorkshire's Premier destination. Visitors are welcome throughout the year'.</p> <p>Point 1.55: The South Pier's ramp down to the beach is to be retained, how? Surely this is going to be in the way of the new Marina Development unless it is incorporated into the design acting either as small boat launch/recovery facility at the end of one of the marina's access waterway arms or as vehicular access down onto the marina itself? The marina should be seen as an asset all round and</p>	<p>The statement is too short and restrictive and needs to lead the AAP and its overall strategy and aims from the outset. To ensure that Bridlington makes this important 'step change' for the future provided by this AAP. Expand the Vision Statement to perhaps 'A great place to live, work and thrive in at Yorkshire's Premier destination. Visitors are welcome throughout the year'.</p> <p>Point 1.55: The South Pier's ramp down to the beach is to be retained, how? Surely this is going to be in the way of the new Marina Development unless it is incorporated into the design acting either as small boat launch/recovery facility at the end of one of the marina's access waterway arms or as vehicular access down onto the marina itself? I know that there have been comments about the loss of the rocks/rock pools on the south side by the harbour wall and along the front of the Spa's sea wall these can easily be replicated after the new marina is built on the south side of the marina's sea wall and the existing south promenade seawall. Minimum take up of the beach? Therefore does this allow for further reclamation or extent to seaward if deemed necessary to ensure that the full range of facilities are incorporated into the marina ensuring that it is an economic success? It should be remembered that this area of the beach is the last to be uncovered by a falling tide and the</p>	<p>The Vision - The Council emphasise that a key purpose of the vision is to indicate a better balance between Bridlington's responsibilities to meet the needs of its residents and businesses and its appeal as a visitor destination. The evidence shows that if Bridlington makes a step change in its appeal as a place to live and work, it will also be a more desirable place to visit. But the first change needed is enabling Bridlington to be a more competitive town centre for its residents and businesses.</p> <p>The ramp to launch boats will be incorporated into the design of the marina.</p> <p>Support for a glass Winter Garden in 1.59 is welcomed.</p> <p>The importance of providing youth facilities in Bridlington is recognised. The suggestion of involving local schools is noted.</p> <p>The Council's current policy on the provision of affordable housing (set out in the adopted Local Plan) will be saved, and is complemented by</p>

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
			<p>not limited out of misconceived sentimentality to both the marina's and the town's cost.</p> <p>Point 1.59: A Glass Winter Garden - a great idea.</p> <p>Youth Facilities - not to be forgotten and they should be involved in this project.</p> <p>Affordable Housing especially for young adults.</p> <p>Integrated Area Transport Plan: A Fast-Cat passenger service duly allowed for in the marina design.</p> <p>Point 4.27(ii): The costs to the 'Environment' in not developing a Marina that is all encompassing providing a full range of facilities are considerable because this is the one development that allows everyone to both appreciate and interact with the Marine Environment.</p> <p>Point 5.58: Timescales 'Phase 1' Marina 2012? This is the Burlington Parade development I take it? Following on from which Phase 2 is the Marina itself, if not how many phases to</p>	<p>first part to be covered by a rising tide. Therefore it is hardly seen or used on a regular basis. This part of the beach will not be missed and is the ideal location for the marina, incorporating slightly more of the beach at this point is going to have no effect what so ever. Therefore in line with comment 4.27(ii) the marina should be seen as an asset all round and not limited out of misconceived sentimentality to both the marina's and the town's cost.</p> <p>Point 1.59: A Glass Winter Garden - a great idea.</p> <p>Youth Facilities - not to be forgotten and they should be involved in this project at some point perhaps running a competition in the Town's schools to design either a sculpture or an iconic fountain at the heart of the project. This will have many associated benefits to both them and the town.</p> <p>Affordable Housing especially for young adults who have just started their working lives for the first time.</p> <p>Integrated Area Transport Plan: A Fast-Cat passenger service duly allowed for in the marina design. Located at the Marina the benefit being that both residents and visitors will leave their cars at home and it saves building a separate jetty/pier at Wilsthorpe at significant capital cost - unless it was included as part of the Marina development's overall cost whilst the specialist marine reclamation and piling equipment was on site?</p> <p>Point 4.27(ii): The costs to the 'Environment' in not developing a Marina that is all encompassing providing a full range of facilities to all its potential users both private and commercial are considerable. Why? Because this is the one development that allows everyone to both appreciate and interact with the Marine Environment which in the process will highlight what its many benefits are to our society. As a result of which this in itself will have an impact throughout</p>	<p>guidance provided in the Council's Affordable Housing SPG. The Council hopes to update its borough-wide policy on affordable housing as part of Core Strategy preparation process. Once an updated policy has been agreed, the Town Centre AAP will be updated and brought into line with this policy</p> <p>The planning proposals will not prevent a Fast Cat Passenger service operating commercially.</p> <p>Support for point 4.27(ii) is welcomed. The marina will be subject to a full SA</p> <p>Point 5.58 – specific marina timescales are not appropriate at this stage.</p> <p>Discussions with relevant parties to the collaboration agreements are ongoing.</p> <p>Recommendation: no change required.</p>

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
			<p>the marina development itself are there and what is the approximate full-time scale.</p> <p>at what point are collaboration agreements with the relevant parties ie: Tesco, Network Rail, the Harbour Commissioners and the Lord Feoffees tied into the scheme thus avoiding any further unnecessary delays?</p>	<p>our community to respect it and help preserve it across a broader sphere for future generations. In short we cannot afford not to develop this marina for the Environment's sake.</p> <p>Point 5.58: Timescales 'Phase 1' Marina 2012? This is the Burlington Parade development I take it? Following on from which Phase 2 is the Marina itself, if not how many phases to the marina development itself are there and what is the approximate full-time scale to 'start of works' [Year] and 'completion' of the Marina [Year] in association with the Burlington development?</p> <p>With reference to the 'collaboration agreements' The 'Sign-up' of the relevant parties ie: Tesco, Network Rail, the Harbour Commissioners and the Lord Feoffees, at what point are they tied into the scheme thus avoiding any further unnecessary delays? Obviously the earlier the better for all concerned?</p>	
6018	Obvs	Dr Paul Beal	<p>Comment from British Sub-Aqua Club in Yorkshire.</p> <p>I do not object in principal to the plans. I have been contacted by a member who is concerned about the possible lack of consideration for supporting SCUBA diving activities from Bridlington.</p> <p>If these regeneration plans took divers into account and provided a dedicated slipway, changing areas etc there would be a significant influx of divers to the town which would increase</p>	<p>I do not object in principal to the plans outlined on the document currently being consulted on. However, as the representative for the British Sub-Aqua Club in Yorkshire I have been contacted by a member who is concerned about the possible lack of consideration for supporting SCUBA diving activities from Bridlington. This activity is undertaken either from commercial vessels operating from Bridlington harbour or private/ club boats launched locally. Bridlington is an excellent base for SCUBA diving as there is a significant amount of wrecks within range of the town and excellent underwater scenery just off the coast. There are 3000 British Sub-Aqua club members in Yorkshire in 80 clubs (or branches). Many of these clubs own Rigid Inflatable Hulled (RIBS) boats which are currently launched at sites such as Bridlington (from the harbour slip or the beach slip), Hornsea, Whitby and Grimsby. Many of these slipways do not provide toilets or changing facilities for divers. If these regeneration plans took divers into account and provided a dedicated slipway, changing areas etc there would be a</p>	<p>The Bridlington Marina Supply and Demand Study signed off by Yorkshire Forward and East Riding of Yorkshire Council makes recommendations for marina activity connected to leisure including SCUBA diving activities.</p> <p>There will be spare capacity in the lock water areas. The marina will also be fitted with all that is needed to accommodate the proposed uses.</p> <p>The marina consultation has not been biased towards any group or use. However there is a need to protect the existing sustainable commercial fishing industry. The business case for the marina will examine the profit elements from all marina activity.</p> <p>Recommendation: no change required.</p>

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
			<p>visitors and hence local revenue.</p> <p>Support the above general objectives but would like to voice my concern as to the lack of specific mention of supporting SCUBA diving activities from Bridlington.</p>	<p>significant influx of divers to the town which would increase visitors and hence local revenue. Divers are frequently in the higher wage bracket and therefore have disposable income available to support local businesses. In addition, I would like to see support for local diving charter vessels. There is currently just one vessel that is booked up many months in advance; showing how popular the area is for diving. I have received feedback that the marina consultation has been biased towards the fishing fleet rather than an all inclusive policy (to all currently users) as described in your preferred options document.</p> <p>Support the above general objectives but would like to voice my concern as to the lack of specific mention of supporting SCUBA diving activities from Bridlington. I would like to think that divers are included in the 'other pleasure craft' bracket. I would like to see the following to support diving activities from Bridlington: * Berths available to diving charter vessels * Slipway available to Rigid Inflatable Hulled boats (RHIB) * Provision for trailer parking * Early and late access to facilities (divers will often leave early morning or return late evening depending on tides and slack water) * Changing and toilet facilities provided which are accessible to divers. I have given 2 other pieces of feedback on this policy so do not want to repeat myself again (for fear of appearing to give the same comments several times). Divers can bring the following to Bridlington. The advantages of providing top-class facilities for divers are that: * 3000 divers and 80 branches in Yorkshire would look very favourably at using Bridlington over other launch sites. * Divers would bring their money into the area (many divers are in the top wage bracket) by using cafes, car parks, slipways, shops etc. * Non-diving partners will often spend the day in the town while family members are at sea. * Charter boats would add to the diversity and vibrancy of the harbour. The ideal for all divers would be the provision of an air filling station on the harbour. Such facilities run very successfully at harbours such as St Abbs in southern</p>	

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
				Scotland.	
6024	Sup w cond	Mr Adrian Brown	<p>We support the A165 redirected as shown in Fig 3.2, however could this be implemented of immediately?</p> <p>A multi storey car parking facility in my opinion is required within the main or adjacent to the primary shopping area.</p> <p>The detailed planning of the bus and coach interchange must negate any reversing of vehicles to exit their parking areas.</p>	<p>We support the A165 redirected as shown in Fig 3.2, however could this be implemented of immediately are currently queuing over Bessingby railway bridge to negotiate the tight roundabout at B&amp;Q for heavy goods and caravans etc.</p> <p>A multi storey car parking facility in my opinion is required within the main or adjacent to the primary shopping area which could include retail and business units. Assuming the scheme is successful, it will take the place of the park and ride for the out of season months etc.</p> <p>Regarding the bus and coach interchange at the railway station, the detailed planning must negate any reversing of vehicles to exit their parking areas. This is happening in other towns and is a danger point.</p>	<p>The movement and access strategy is subject to extensive modelling by traffic consultants. Work has been undertaken to test all scenarios for Town Centre traffic.</p> <p>The AAP makes provision for improved car parking facilities including multi-storey car parks.</p> <p>Comment on the bus and coach interchange regarding the need to negate any reversing of vehicles to exit their parking areas is noted.</p> <p>Recommendation: no change required.</p>
6025	Obvs	Mr Brian Meadows	<p>The local authority has made numerous efforts to attract alternative businesses into the Town and all have failed. There are 3 main sources of income into the Bridlington, the 1st is Tourism, the 2nd is State Benefits, the 3rd is Manufacturing. To make a statement that tourism is no longer the mainstay of the local economy is naive and provocative. It would make more sense to build on this success and therefore existing businesses should be encouraged to further develop their services.</p>	<p>In an effort to re-invigorate Business in Bridlington, the local authority has made numerous efforts to attract alternative businesses into the Town and all have failed. The logistical positioning of Bridlington to the UK restricts risk investment by Companies as the cost of transporting manufactured goods and raw materials in and out of Bridlington has proven costly and unsuccessful and no matter which industry attempts to set up business in Bridlington will find it impossible to compete with its competitors who are situated inland, close to Cities and the motorway network. Bridlington is a seaside Town, with a working harbour, which has seen it's fishing industry decimated by legislation against it, which has left it in an a pitiful and uneconomical state. There are 3 main sources of income into the Bridlington, the 1st is Tourism, the 2nd is State Benefits, the 3rd is Manufacturing. To make a statement that tourism is no longer the mainstay of the local economy is naive and provocative. I have yet to see another business sector in Bridlington which is a £100 million industry. Bridlington has a wealth of extremely</p>	<p>There are significant shortcomings in the ability of Bridlington Town Centre to serve competitively its residents and businesses and to drive the local economy.</p> <p>The seaside will always remain at the heart of Bridlington's appeal and tourism will always be important. However Bridlington needs to diversify and strengthen its economy to give it new sources of wealth-creation, prosperity and jobs. Bridlington also needs to retain and attract a higher proportion of young and skilled people.</p> <p>Bridlington needs to reduce the amount of business lost to the town by residents who are unable to meet their retail and leisure needs in the Town Centre. Businesses need to be able to grow faster and be able to meet more of their supplier needs in Bridlington. A greater</p>

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
				<p>talented business people who have invested much time and money into improving the quality of its Hotels, Guest Houses and entertainment venues all of which enhance the attraction of Bridlington to a worldwide audience. In this current highly competitive market, it would make more sense to build on this success, rather denigrate it! Therefore existing businesses should be encouraged to further develop their services, which will increase employment and inward investment.</p>	<p>proportion of tourism income needs to be generated by year round activities appealing to higher spending markets.</p> <p>All of the objectives of the AAP seek to build on Bridlington's key strengths whilst addressing the deficiencies which currently cause it to under-perform.</p>
6025 (a)	Obvs	Mr David Morton	<p>Better provision for cyclists, 'Green' transport should be encouraged.</p> <p>Bridlington has an excellent harbour but its surroundings are tatty and need updating.</p> <p>More provision of cycle lanes is a must, especially along the seafront.</p> <p>Perhaps more flexibility should be adopted in the provision of cycle lanes, making them seasonal.</p>	<p>Better provision for cyclists : present provision inadequate, lack of cycle lanes in the centre and on the wide promenades which for much of the year are empty. 'Green' transport should be encouraged.</p> <p>Bridlington has an excellent harbour but its surroundings are tatty and need updating, perhaps with more up-market cafes and boutiques to raise its profile, especially if the marina is to attract visiting yachts etc. Plenty of good examples can be seen on the continent and we are lagging far behind.</p> <p>More provision of cycle lanes is a must, especially along the seafront which is wide enough to facilitate this. At the moment no cycling signs prevent the sensible cyclists from using their discretion to use an often empty promenade rather than having to dismount and walk. Of course the inconsiderate cyclists ignore the signs anyway. Continental seaside promenades nearly always allow cyclists to share the facilities. In fact even Cleethorpes has a well-marked cycle lane along the front from one end to the other which seems well-used. It seems that the footpath along Sewerby cliffs manages to provide for cyclists whilst also being popular with pedestrians and used by the land-train.</p> <p>Perhaps more flexibility should be adopted in the provision of cycle lanes, making them seasonal. Obviously it may not be suitable for cyclists to use central seafront sites at the height of the season while at quieter times of the year the</p>	<p>The AAP aims -through the provision of better cycle paths/routes, better crossing facilities, and better signage - to make cycling safer, easier and more attractive (for residents and visitors). Enhancing cycle links also conforms to national planning policy, which encourages the development of more sustainable forms of transport.</p> <p>The Town Centre AAP, based on the Regeneration Strategy for Bridlington, provides a bespoke vision for Bridlington Town Centre, which aims to encourage sensitive development (incorporating high standards of design) that will both build on the town's distinctive assets, and create new landmark developments, in line with the aspirations of the town's residents and businesses</p> <p>The proposals to encourage cycling will incorporate an enhanced provision of cycle lanes.</p> <p>Recommendation: no change required.</p>

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
				situation is different. Cyclists should be encouraged to make sensible choices. As previously mentioned inconsiderate cyclists ignore restrictions.	
6026	Obvs	Mr Garry Hudson	Owns a dive centre in Shipley West Yorkshire and in the summer months brings many divers over to Bridlington to go diving in some of the best waters in the UK. Hindered by the harbour been tidal and because there is no air filling station we often cant stay over night and make it a weekend diving trip. Needs communication to maximise this jewel.	I own a dive centre in Shipley West Yorkshire and in the summer months we bring many divers over to Bridlington to go diving, We believe that when the diving is good its some of the best in the UK we are hindered by the harbour been tidal and when we can get the boat in and out we often have to set off for a trip 4 hours early which also stops us bringing families over that could use Bridlington's facilities whilst we are out at sea diving. Because there are no air filling station we often cant stay over night and make it a weekend diving trip that would bring in a great deal of money for local bed and breakfasts, restaurants and bars, 12 divers for a weekend would generate at least Â£2500 per trip for the local community, If they was a harbour with facility's I would even consider putting a dive shop in there too help divers that come too Bridlington and help to bring more divers too the area. You are sat on a very big jewel in Bridlington and the sea and marina could bring in so much revenue it just needs you chaps to communicate with people like myself that can help the regeneration.	The Bridlington Marina Supply and Demand Study signed off by Yorkshire Forward and East Riding of Yorkshire Council makes recommendations for marina activity connected to leisure including SCUBA diving activities.  The marina will also be fitted with all that is needed to accommodate the proposed uses.  Recommendation: no change required.
6027	Obvs	Mr Graham Barker	Bridlington is well-placed as a venue for SCUBA Divers. The Marina development should be extended to offer facilities for Dive Boats, the launching of Dive Club owned craft and on-shore facilities to service the divers. It should also include recreational facilities for many sea-based water-sports.	Bridlington as also well-placed as a venue for SCUBA Divers. The North Sea off Bridlington has much of interest to divers, in particular a rich history of shipwrecks. The Marina development is to be supported but should be extended to offer facilities for Dive Boats and the launching of Dive Club owned craft. On-shore facilities to service the divers, such as toilets/showers/changing areas/car parks and a retail establishment offering air-charging facilities would make diving out of Bridlington, one of the premier venues on the North Sea coast.  The marina should also include recreational facilities for many sea-based water-sports including the provision of berths and launching facilities for Dive Boats other Personal Watercraft.	The Bridlington Marina Supply and Demand Study signed off by Yorkshire Forward and East Riding of Yorkshire Council makes recommendations for marina activity connected to leisure including SCUBA diving activities.  The marina will also be fitted with all that is needed to accommodate the proposed uses.  Recommendation: no change required.

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
6028	Sup	Mr Martyn Coltman	<p>I fully support all aspects and every single point of the Area Action Plan preferred options document. The following individual comments are simply to add points for consideration. This process has been superb and I believe an extremely democratic way of encouraging as many local people as possible to take part in the change that is absolutely crucial to the town's very survival.</p> <p>I fully support the rationale behind the desire to create a year-round economy for Bridlington.</p> <p>i - I would wish to see creation of,, THE VERY HIGHEST QUALITY offer in terms of new town centre residential and public realm developments.</p> <p>iii - Stylish indicates to me a much more upmarket feel that Bridlington needs.</p> <p>v - Easily accessible new spaces through easily accessed new multi-level car parking on the periphery of the town centre.</p> <p>I would like to see special maritime themed public art</p>	<p>I fully support all aspects and every single point of the Area Action Plan preferred options document. My following individual comments are simply to add points for consideration along the way, having been involved in the town's regeneration for many years I care passionately and do so much want the town to thrive once again. I want the townspeople to be proud of their home town and for it to be a symbol of how to turn around a resort which has been struggling for some thirty years to find itself a new identity and civic pride. This process has been superb and I believe an extremely democratic way of encouraging as many local people as possible to take part in the change that is absolutely crucial to the town's very survival.</p> <p>I fully support the rationale behind the desire to create a year-round economy for Bridlington and the desire to reduce the seasonality of the local economy and the ways to create a higher spending economy for the town.</p> <p>i - I would wish to see creation of, along with many residents who speak to me, THE VERY HIGHEST QUALITY offer in terms of new town centre residential and public realm developments - buildings and spaces that excite and delight.</p> <p>iii Stylish indicates to me a much more upmarket feel - which is exactly what Bridlington needs and what its residents want to achieve through this plan</p> <p>v. Easily accessible new spaces for shopping, living and visiting, through easily accessed new multi-level car parking on the periphery of the town centre, for those of all abilities, whether physically or visually impaired, young mothers with pushchairs or the fully able bodied residents or visitors.</p> <p>I would like to see special maritime themed public art incorporated into new public realm schemes where appropriate and affordable. Public art is one thing Bridlington's public spaces lack. It would help to give the town a sense of identity and would strengthen and celebrate the town's proud maritime heritage.</p>	<p>Support for the AAP preferred options is welcomed.</p> <p>Support for the creation of a year-round economy is welcomed.</p> <p>Support for the creation of the very highest quality offer in terms of new town centre residential and public realm developments is welcomed. The AAP objectives are to provide a high quality scheme delivered by an equally high quality developer. The additional and replacement short-stay parking provision will be in new, gold standard, Disability Discrimination Act compliant, decked car parks to be constructed as part of the delivery of the Burlington Parade scheme.</p> <p>Further guidance on public art will be incorporated into the SPD. The design approach will reveal and enhance the special and defining characteristics of the town and its Harbour.</p> <p>The AAP acknowledges that the Old Town is a key asset for Bridlington, and that its special character should be protected.</p> <p>Support for the production of a SPD for the seafront area to give this area a new lease of life and improved public realm is welcomed.</p> <p>Support for the zoning of the seasonal activities is welcome. The AAP recognises the role creative lighting schemes in the provision of high quality public realm and the observation of the boost they can give to an appropriate evening economy is welcomed.</p>

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
			<p>incorporated into new public realm schemes.</p> <p>I fully support and encourage the scaled back version of the AAP and this point and totally understand the reasoning behind it. I would like to suggest a similar process for Bridlington's conservation area Old Town in the near future.</p> <p>I fully support the production of a SPD for the town centre seafront area to include Royal Princes Parade and the Esplanade.</p> <p>I fully support the zoning of the seasonal activities form the heart of the town centre. Also better and creative lighting could be used to give an appropriate evening economy a boost.</p> <p>I fully support this principal based on sound evidence with the creation of the hugely successful Business Centre and subsequent 'Grow on' units on the outskirts of the town centre. This will help create the employment sought from SMEs.</p>	<p>I fully support and encourage the scaled back version of the AAP and this point in time and totally understand the reasoning behind it. I would like to suggest however that a similar process for Bridlington's conservation area Old Town be undertaken in the near future, as I know that the Old Town Association, of which I am a member, would be very keen on being actively involved in something similar for that part of town.</p> <p>Once again I fully support the production of a SPD for the town centre seafront area to include Royal Princes Parade and the Esplanade - to help bring these areas back to something approaching their former glory and historical importance to the town. To give these areas a new lease of life, dramatically improved public realm and restore and enhance the fine architecture would create a new asset for the town centre, instead of a it giving a currently poor first impression for visitors. This is one of the most highly used areas in Bridlington and demands a whole new upmarket approach.</p> <p>I fully support the zoning of the seasonal activities form the heart of the town centre. Also better and creative lighting could be used to give an appropriate evening economy a boost ( ie not one that relies on 24 hour bars and the anti-social behaviour associated with this). The recently completed Chapel Street refurbishment has proved that better lighting and high quality public realm can turn an 'intimidating' and 'ordinary street into a vibrant, safe and attractive place in which to shop, walk or sit and enjoy.</p> <p>Again I fully support this principal based on sound evidence with the creation of the hugely successful Business Centre and subsequent 'Grow on' units on the outskirts of the town centre that an existing strong entrepreneurial culture in Bridlington would be encouraged to take up high quality, contemporary office and business unit accommodation in</p>	<p>Support for provision of office space is welcomed. One of the main aims of the Town Centre AAP is to create the conditions to enable business growth in Bridlington, by removing the constraints to the market's ability to provide good quality office stock. The AAP should also ensure sufficient car parking is available to cater for all proposed new office developments.</p> <p>The success of the shopping culture of Old Town is recognised and this is something the AAP will build on.</p> <p>The proposals intend to bring life back to King Street and revitalise the market in this space with an open air market. The APP does not preclude private development of an indoor market.</p> <p>The AAP recognises the importance of enhancing Prince Street with development more appropriate to the town's heritage.</p> <p>The provision of street trees and landscaping will be considered as part of the SPD.</p> <p>The SPD will provide guidance on the built form of development and recognise the Edwardian, Victorian and Georgian heritage.</p> <p>Observations on boarded up properties are noted. Demolition will occur as soon as possible to prevent areas of blight. The observation for the branding of boarded properties is noted.</p> <p>The AAP recognises the adverse impact of the fun fair in its current location. It may prove feasible in time to concentrate the seasonal seaside activity elsewhere creating an alternative</p>

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
			<p>This successful shopping culture is already evidenced in the Old Town.</p> <p>With regards to the suggestion of one or more new public buildings in the town centre it would be more sustainable if they were to incorporate a new striking indoor Market Hall for Bridlington.</p> <p>I strongly support this point. The sooner the town centre seafront operation can change to a much more upmarket, quality, year-round operation the sooner we will change the public's perception of Bridlington as a dated seaside town.</p> <p>To take advantage of spectacular views across the south bay and Holderness coast the removal of the ugly 1960s box type buildings on the south side of Prince Street would help to achieve the objective of point 1.28.</p> <p>Taking away on-street parking ONCE THE PROVISION OF NEW OFF-STREET PARKING IS</p>	<p>the heart of Bridlington, providing it was easily accessible and in stylish, desirable locations. We are aiming to create a great deal of employment from SMEs and this would help that process tremendously.</p> <p>This successful shopping culture is already evidenced in the Old Town - where businesses support one another, shop from one another and create a critical mass for residents and visitors to shop in one location at one time.</p> <p>With regards to the suggestion of one or more new public buildings in the town centre - the possibility of a new IT library and young persons space and the suggestion for a Winter Gardens type development (which I fully support) I would like to suggest that it would make these buildings more sustainable if they were to incorporate a new striking indoor Market Hall for Bridlington. This would solve so many current problems associated with the market currently struggling to survive in King Street. I fully support a regular market in Bridlington town centre and to provide a building to house this would benefit the traders tremendously, add sustainability to the new public building(s) and solve the major problems of huge amounts of wind-blown litter spoiling the streets on the three market days in the town. This in turn would allow us to create a lovely new public space with King Street which we can not currently achieve with the market in its present location</p> <p>I strongly support this point. The sooner the town centre seafront operation can change to a much more upmarket, quality, year-round operation the sooner we will change the public's perception of Bridlington as a dated seaside town. Bridlington had a very sophisticated seafront along Royal Princes Parade and the Esplanade and some of that style and elegance needs to return perhaps with the development of sheltered pavement cafe areas set amongst landscaped public realm. This would solve some of the problems of its exposure in the winter months and once again the evidence</p>	<p>critical mass and visitor destination with good links to the town centre.</p> <p>The proposals intend to bring life back to King Street and revitalise the market in this space with an open air market. The APP does not preclude private development of an indoor market.</p> <p>Support for public art as the Gypsey Race enters the Harbour is welcomed.</p> <p>Support for the Marina development is welcomed.</p> <p>Regarding a new hotel an on-going demand study will examine these issues.</p> <p>The AAP recognises the role creative lighting schemes in the provision of high quality public realm and observations for the potential at the Spa are welcomed.</p> <p>The APP does not preclude private development of an indoor market.</p> <p>Support for the establishment of a café culture is welcomed.</p> <p>Support for points 1 &amp; 4 under 3.50 is welcomed.</p> <p>Comments on the risk of creating a 'clone town' are noted. The AAP aims to enhance and complement Bridlington's character and provide, drawing on evidence and best practice, a trading environment in the town centre that will make it possible for individual small businesses to prosper. Anchor multiples are a means of creating this environment – and the absence of</p>

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
			<p>UNDERWAY is a superb opportunity to bring back quality public realm - we must include as many new street trees as we can. I believe restricting deliveries to before 10am and after 4pm would also help reduce congestion.</p> <p>Creation of a Design Code is vital to help guide all new development and raise standards.</p> <p>Strongly support restoration and renovation of the town's traditional architecture wherever possible and appropriate.</p> <p>i - To avoid large areas of boarded up properties, I would like to see either early demolition and/or temporary branding of the boarded properties with the Regeneration Partnership logo.</p> <p>iv. Maintaining the 'new' Gypsy Race to the highest possible standards will achieve enhanced pride</p> <p>vii The linking of the Old Town, Sewerby Hall and town centre is vital for the future success of all three areas.</p>	<p>is already there in the form of The Floral Pavilion and Jeromes - hugely successful year round business right in the heart of this area.</p> <p>To take advantage of spectacular views across the south bay and Holderness coast the removal of the ugly 1960s box type buildings on the south side of Prince Street would help to achieve the objective of point 1.28. If redeveloped with superb quality town housing/apartments in a style more appropriate to the town's heritage it would help strengthen the new town centre. Prince Street, up to the second world war had a fine collection of tall Georgian properties, which were lost due to enemy action. Restoring something approaching this kind of quality in design would recreate a real sense of place in the heart of town.</p> <p>Taking away on-street parking ONCE THE PROVISION OF NEW OFF-STREET PARKING IS UNDERWAY is a superb opportunity to bring back quality public realm to the main town centre streets - where we must include as many new street trees as we can accommodate, of an appropriate scale. Once again Bridlington was famous for its avenues of Dutch Elms, almost all of which have been lost through disease in the last 20 years or so. Trees of course have the added benefit of absorption of CO2. I believe restricting deliveries to before 10am and after 4pm (as in York for example) would also help to free up a great deal of the current road congestion during daylight hours.</p> <p>Creation of a Design Code is vital to help guide all new development, whatever scale, and gradually raise the standard of the built environment throughout the town centre.</p> <p>Strongly support restoration and renovation of the town's traditional architecture wherever possible and appropriate - ie the stuccoed frontages of the Edwardian and Victorian seaside terraces is vital to engender that seaside quality</p>	<p>sufficient critical mass in the multiple sector is, in Bridlington's particular circumstances, one of the reasons the shopping offer very seriously underperforms at present.</p> <p>Support for 'window shopping' and the shifting of the retail circuit away from the seafront area.</p> <p>Regarding a new hotel an on-going demand study will examine these issues.</p> <p>Comments on the enforcement of S.215s on landlords are noted although law enforcement is not within the remit of the AAP.</p> <p>Support for 3.71 is welcomed.</p> <p>Support for proposed position and layout of car parking is welcomed.</p> <p>Workers parking is being examined as part of the Council's Parking Review Panel.</p> <p>Support for public realm schemes is welcomed.</p> <p>Recommendation: no change required.</p>

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
			<p>x. Wilsthorpe would make an ideal venue for a centre of watersports excellence</p> <p>Strongly support the introduction of integrated transport links based around the area of the railway station that will encourage a major reduction in through traffic. Also the year-round usage of the seafront is vital to change and enhance this well used but dated and tired area. The exposed location needs to be broken down and areas of shelter created.</p> <p>The need for a beautiful town square is already proven through the various street festivals held over the last 4 or 5 years. Including an indoor market hall and freeing up King Street would provide the opportunity to do something special with the public realm.</p> <p>Public art, as the Gypsy Race enters the harbour, is an excellent idea.</p> <p>The Marina is arguably the most important part of the whole strategy. Creating a waterfront development</p>	<p>feeling. Also much of the town centre was rich with Georgian frontages until the second half of the 20th century - replication of a similar (pastiche) style of architecture would help to restore this quality (once again evidenced in much of the excellent rebuilding work done by The Lords Feoffees in recent years)</p> <p>i. To avoid large areas of boarded up properties, as they are purchased, creating a blight in the Hilderthorpe Road area I would like to see either demolition as soon as is possible and/or temporary painting of the boarded properties and branding with the Regeneration Partnership logo - which will at least indicate to visitors WHY these properties are boarded up! iv. Maintaining the 'new' Gypsy Race to the highest possible standards is the only way to achieve the enhanced pride which we all want to see. vii The linking of the Old Town, Sewerby Hall and town centre is vital for the future success of all three areas - both in marketing and physically by an easy means of (public?) transport. x. Wilsthorpe would make an ideal venue for a centre of watersports excellence, perhaps in a woodland / lakeside setting, which would also accommodate relocated rides from the town centre seafront site.</p> <p>Strongly support the introduction of integrated transport links based around the area of the railway station. Bus, train, taxi, cycle, mobility and car parking all within a short distance from one another will encourage a major reduction in through traffic in the town centre, and hasten the possibility of freeing up this area to do something striking with the public realm. Also the year-round usage of Esplanade, Royal Princes Parade and Prince Street/Cliff Street is vital to change and enhance this well used but dated and tired area. The seafront rides set the wrong tone and give a bad first impression for visitors to the centre, and give no continuity of trading for the businesses currently there. The exposed location needs to be broken down and areas of shelter created, with a year round cafe culture type environment to</p>	

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
			<p>which sets new standards nationally would elevate Bridlington's standing beyond measure. I have continued to get strong support from members of the public and boat owners throughout the long period of its planning. There is evidence of tremendous demand for a facility.</p> <p>I strongly support the need for much better hotel accommodation. The opening of the newly refurbished Spa and Conference Centre is creating a lot of interest form new conference delegates, but good quality accommodation is an issue. I would like to see a study into the purchase and complete remodelling of Ebor House into high quality hotel accommodation.</p> <p>Point 7 of 3.27 refers to lighting schemes. Bridlington's night time economy could only benefit from such improved creative lighting schemes.</p> <p>I fully support this item - in particular the Wellington Road proposal, the station</p>	<p>make best use of the spectacular views.</p> <p>The need for a beautiful town square is already proven through the various street festivals held over the last 4 or 5 years. When freed of traffic residents and visitors love the space created and the freedom to wander around or gather for public events, festivals, gatherings etc. During the 3 day festival 'The Green' on Prince Street over 90% of hundreds of people questioned on site supported the creation of this kind of space and wanted to see more of it. In addition if a new public building is be designed for this space, If it were to include an indoor market hall the benefits for the traders, the public and the freeing up of King Street to do something special with that public realm, would be immeasurable.</p> <p>The possibility of celebrating the Gypsy Race through a fantastic piece of new public art, as it enters the harbour, is an excellent idea.</p> <p>The Marina is arguably the most important part of the whole strategy in terms of regional and national importance for the town. To create a waterfront development which sets new standards nationally would elevate Bridlington's standing beyond measure. Once again the amount of support I get personally for this scheme from members of the public and boat owners has never diminished throughout the long period of its planning. There is tremendous demand for a facility of this kind from the boating fraternity across Yorkshire which is evidenced in the exhaustive data collected over the years.</p> <p>I strongly support the need for much better hotel accommodation within Bridlington. The opening of the newly refurbished Spa and Conference Centre is already creating a lot of interest form new conference delegates, but the first question they ask is that of good quality accommodation nearby in a large hotel, with all the modern break-out and associated facilities delegates need to network whilst away</p>	

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
			<p>plaza and the new Town Square.</p> <p>Fully support the idea that Bridlington needs more iconic contemporary architectural features, in the form of public building, particularly a new market hall. I also fully support the idea of 'The Bridlington Diamond'.</p> <p>I believe this is a particularly important point.</p> <p>Fully support the establishment of a cafe culture in a specific area so as to concentrate the appeal to residents and visitors alike.</p> <p>Particularly support points 1 &amp; 4 under 3.50 - the current situation is town centre viability.</p> <p>Very strongly agree as to the need for more national retailing names but be careful of becoming a 'clone town'. I would like to see specialist retailers thrive and grow. Buildings should help recreate the town's Edwardian, Victorian and Georgian heritage lost</p>	<p>at a conference. I appreciate it may be some time before space could be found to create brand new hotel accommodation of the scale required and I would like to see a study into the purchase and complete remodelling of Ebor House, overlooking the harbour and 500yds from the Spa, into high quality hotel accommodation, to see if it is a viable alternative in the short term.</p> <p>Point 7 of 3.27 refers to lighting schemes. I have always supported the idea of far more creative lighting schemes for the town centre area. There are already a number of focal point attractive buildings which would benefit. The Spa is also a prime candidate for create/flood lighting, as many of its customers will arrive during evening hours and it sets the theme for the whole experience of going to the theatre or an evening's entertainment. Bridlington's night time economy could only benefit from such improved creative lighting schemes.</p> <p>I fully support this item - in particular the Wellington Road proposal, the station plaza and the new Town Square - however this principal also applies to the Royal Princes Parade and the Floral Pavilion sited on this stretch of seafront.</p> <p>Fully support the idea that Bridlington needs more iconic contemporary architectural features, in the form of public buildings. I would particularly like to see a new market hall as part of any proposed new public buildings. This would solve a number of problems associated with the current street market and allow King Street to become a fine public space with appropriate street furniture, landscaping and access. I also fully support the idea of 'The Bridlington Diamond' - to take advantage of that spectacular position on the town centre seafront, and create a striking, iconic new public building as a focal point for the community to use for any number of purposes</p>	

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
			<p>during the war years.</p> <p>Strongly support the concept of the 'window shopping' idea. Also strongly in support of shifting the retail circuit away from the seafront area due to weather in winter and seafront attractions.</p> <p>Very much support the need for a far better selection of hotel accommodation to complement the Spa Bridlington refurbishment programme. Bridlington lacks a hotel of distinction with Victorian splendour. The new building(s) must attempt to put back into Bridlington some of the lost style and elegance, along with facilities and service that are second to none.</p> <p>I strongly support point 3.63 but in particular points i, ii and vi within. I would like a more active approach to the serving of Section 215s to force landlords to re-invest in their properties or have the Local Authority take them on. This links with points vii, viii and ix which are vital to allow the LA to force investment to take</p>	<p>I believe this is a particularly important point.</p> <p>Fully support the establishment of a cafe culture in a specific area so as to concentrate the appeal to residents and visitors alike. This can be strictly licensed and controlled for square footage outside premises and creation of non-smoking areas for instance, but also very much easier to enforce no drinking zones which already exist in some of these areas and where currently the police are struggling to enforce contradictions in new laws etc as to nature of usage of frontages onto streets.</p> <p>Particularly support points 1 &amp; 4 under 3.50 - as the current situation is extremely detrimental to the long term viability of the town centre.</p> <p>Very strongly agree as to the need for more national retailing names, however we must be careful not to push the balance too far the other way and risk creating a 'clone town'. Bridlington has a good number of specialist retailers whom I would like to see thrive and grow and hopefully expand into larger units. We must take great care to create buildings which provide for this and enhance and help recreate the town's Edwardian, Victorian and Georgian heritage, much of which was lost during the war years.</p> <p>Strongly support the concept of the 'window shopping' idea - as far too many of the current shops have solid shutters and the town looks ugly and uninviting at present to the evening economy. Also the pedestrian environment, where it HAS been improved is a much more pleasant experience already. Also strongly in support of shifting the retail circuit away from the seafront area as the weather in winter and the seafront attractions do not sit well with a high quality retail environment we seek to create.</p> <p>Very much support the need for a far better selection of hotel accommodation to complement the Spa Bridlington</p>	

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
			<p>place. Without this proposed new legislation any changes in property prices easily see the progress stalled and reversed.</p> <p>Strongly support all aspects of point 3.71, to help us create a high quality environment however users travel.</p> <p>This kind of extra provision, easily accessible and on the periphery of the new retail core is absolutely vital to the new Bridlington centre. I strongly support the proposed car parking areas</p> <p>Once again strongly support this proposal and in particular the idea of 'banding' of areas of car parking to encourage a certain type of usage. I would also like to see the creation or designation of a car park for town centre workers, at an affordable rate to encourage them not to park on residential streets or clog up town centre car parks. I also believe strongly that echelon parking on the South Marine Drive could serve the refurbished Spa.</p>	<p>refurbishment programme. Once we have the finest conference and events centre on the East Coast we will need the same quality and size of accommodation to host new delegates and visitors. What Bridlington really lacks is a hotel of distinction. Unlike many other seaside towns we really need a new building with status to make a statement - pillars, columns, cupolas, domes, balustrades, architectural detail - all the things that made the Victorian splendour of a seaside resort is missing from Bridlington's hotel sector since the demolition in the 1970s of our one grand French chateau styled Alexandra Hotel (after a series of fires) . The new building(s) must attempt to put back into Bridlington some of that lost style and elegance, along with facilities and service that are second to none.</p> <p>I strongly support point 3.63 but in particular points i, ii and vi within. I would like to see a far more active approach to the serving of Section 215s to force landlords to re-invest in their properties or have the Local Authority take them on and refurbish them for re-sale. This needs to happen to stimulate investment in certain parts of the resort. This links strongly to my support for points vii, viii and ix which are vital to allow the LA to force this kind of investment to take place. The reason it hasn't happened in the past I believe has added to the town's decline, and subsequent attraction of the wrong ends of the social scale into these areas. Though I believe this situation is already beginning to improve dramatically in some parts of town it must be sustained for the overall benefit of the town centre. Without this proposed new legislation any changes in property prices or the housing market could easily see the progress stalled and reversed once again.</p> <p>Strongly support all aspects of point 3.71, to help us create a high quality environment for all users of the town, whatever way they choose to travel to or through and around the resort.</p>	

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
			<p>This is an excellent idea to ensure that public realm works materialise. Developers will benefit greatly from investment so it seems appropriate that the townspeople benefit from investment in public realm.</p>	<p>This kind of extra provision, easily accessible and on the periphery of the new retail core is absolutely vital to all aspects of achieving the overall look, viability and workability of the new Bridlington centre. I strongly support the proposed position and layouts of the various new car parking areas. They are logical and will help to create a balance of many new spaces mainly for locals to park in, whereas the new park and ride system will be aimed at visitors to the resort.</p> <p>Once again strongly support this proposal and in particular the idea of 'banding' of areas of car parking to encourage a certain type of usage. Those nearer the town centre to be more expensive for shorter stay usage and equally away from the centre to be less expensive and for longer stay. I would however like also to see the creation or designation of a car park for town centre workers, at an appropriate affordable daily rate (or season pass) to encourage them not to park on residential streets or clog up town centre car parks designed for visiting shoppers. I also believe strongly that echelon parking on the South Marine Drive would greatly help in providing a number of new spaces to serve the refurbished Spa, before these new car parks are built. This would probably require South Marine Drive to become one way inbound and the removal of parking on the opposite side of the road, however it would still create a net gain of many new spaces, would be much safer and allow freer access for park and ride shuttle buses along the seafront, itself a real attraction to new visitors.</p> <p>This is an excellent idea to ensure that planned public realm works materialise. We have seen in recent years a great deal of benefit from 'commuted sums' from developers of green field sites round the town and this is just as logical and just as workable. It also relieves pressure on Yorkshire Forward always needing to come up with match funding for public realm schemes, by sharing the load. Developers will benefit greatly from investment in the town and so it seems</p>	

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
				appropriate that the townspeople benefit from investment in fantastic new public realm.	
6032	Obj	Mr Richard Frudd on behalf of National Grid Property Ltd	<p>Object to Policy BridTC5</p> <p>Indigo act on behalf of National Grid Property Ltd (“NGP”) and the following representations are submitted on their behalf relating to their land holdings off Quay Road, to the north west of Bridlington town centre.</p> <p>Draft Policy TC5 requires a development brief to be prepared for all major schemes in the AAP area.</p> <p>NGP’s view is that this is unduly onerous in relation to smaller scale schemes, such as redevelopment of the Quay Road site.</p> <p>Recommend that the requirement be restricted to only the most strategic of redevelopment proposals.</p>	<p>Draft Policy BridTC5 - Indigo act on behalf of National Grid Property Ltd (“NGP”) and the following representations are submitted on their behalf relating to their land holdings off Quay Road, to the north west of Bridlington town centre.</p> <p>Council Officers are aware that NGP are seeking to promote a housing led scheme on the site as a means by which to secure prestige redevelopment of this gateway brownfield location. The development will catalyse regeneration of the area in line with the wider aspirations of the Bridlington Town Centre Area Action Plan (AAP).</p> <p>Draft Policy TC5 requires a development brief to be prepared for all major schemes (i.e. involving 10 or more dwellings or 250 sq m or more of other development) in the AAP area setting out in detail the design and sustainability criteria against which the major schemes are to respond at planning application stage. Therefore the development brief must be prepared, subjected to public consultation and approved, prior to consideration of a planning application which must be submitted in accordance with that development brief.</p> <p>It is NGP’s view that whilst such an approach may be justified in relation to truly significant large-scale regeneration projects within the town centre, it would appear to be unduly onerous in relation to smaller scale schemes, such as redevelopment of the Quay Road site. It is clear that the approach advocated by BridTC5 is likely to stymie regeneration within the town centre rather than contribute to it, due to the implications for the timescales and delivery of the respective projects.</p> <p>NGP therefore recommend that the requirement to prepare</p>	<p>Objection noted.</p> <p>Development Briefs are a key tool for ensuring that land is used optimally and the best standard of design, access and environmental sustainability are achieved.</p> <p>Within the AAP area every site, building and public space has an effect on the design integrity, character, appeal and function of the whole. Therefore Development Briefs are entirely appropriate to schemes of 10 or more dwellings or 250 sq m or more of other development within the AAP area.</p> <p>In any case the Quay Road site lies outside the AAP area and therefore is not affected by the implications of BridTC5 which only applies to buildings or sites within the AAP area.</p>

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
				development briefs be restricted to only the most strategic of redevelopment proposals within the town centre.	
6030	Obvs	Susan Wilson on behalf of Natural England	<p>Natural England suggests alternative wording for Policy BridTC 3 – k. contributions to biodiversity.</p> <p>Natural England advises an additional point for 4.26 Marina SPD for details of any environment impacts.</p> <p>Natural England advises that it should be stated clearly how the costs and benefits of the proposed marina will be measured in 4.27 ii.</p> <p>4.31 – advise that the development of the Marina should be undertaken with full consideration of environmental impacts and mitigation plans put in place where necessary.</p> <p>Advise that the following wording would be more appropriate in Policy BridTC 19 Public Realm in the Town Centre and the Strategic Realm Framework: <i>‘planting to increase wildlife habitat in order to enhance biodiversity’</i></p>	<p>Policy BridTC 3 – k. contributions to biodiversity, Natural England suggests the following alternative wording: <i>‘identification of designated habitats and protected species that might be affected by the proposed plan and avoidance or mitigation of any adverse effects as well as where possible biodiversity enhancements in the area’</i>.</p> <p>4.26 Marina SPD – Natural England advises that an additional point is added: <i>‘Details of any environment impacts, including effects on coastal processes and how these can be avoided or mitigated against’</i>.</p> <p>4.27 - <i>‘ii the benefits arising from the delivery of the Marina should outweigh the costs to the environment’</i>. Natural England advises that it should be stated clearly how the costs and benefits of the proposed marina will be measured.</p> <p>4.31 – Natural England advises that the development of the Marina should be undertaken with full consideration of environmental impacts and mitigation plans put in place where necessary. There should be particular consideration of the effects on coastal processes and any impacts on the internationally important nature conservation sites at Flamborough Head.</p> <p>Policy BridTC 19 Public Realm in the Town Centre and the Strategic Realm Framework d. <i>‘planting to increase habitat and biodiversity to encourage wild fowl, insects and other fauna’</i>. – do you actually mean ‘wildfowl’ (ie ducks, geese and swans)? We advise that the following wording would be more appropriate: <i>‘planting to increase wildlife habitat in order to enhance biodiversity’</i>.</p>	<p>Observations noted.</p> <p>The suggested alternative wording to BridTC3-k will be considered in the next draft of the AAP.</p> <p>Environmental impacts and effects on coastal processes and mitigation will be considered.</p> <p>The costs and benefits of the proposed marina will be clearly measured.</p> <p>Full consideration of the environmental impacts of the marina will be made.</p> <p>The suggested revised wording to Policy BridTC 19 is accepted.</p>

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
6036		Bridlington Harbour Commissioners	Please see attached report.	Please see attached report (included as appendix).	Discussions with the Harbour Commissioners are ongoing to agree relevant issues.

### PART 3: Sustainability Appraisal

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
6003	Obvs	David William Dowson	Wants confirmation of Town Council support.	Obtain confirmation that the Bridlington Town Council is supportive of regeneration and it is happy that its representation on the partnership is a true reflection of the Council's views.	The regeneration partnership seeks to reflect the views of everyone within the town and welcomes all views.
6007	Obvs	Mrs/Cllr Pamela Austin	Transport by bus is very poor.  The railway at Carnaby is unutilised.	Transport by buses in this town is very poor, there are no buses to get to work – they mostly serve pensioner bus passes. The bus route are tortuous because a single route serves so many estates. For most people their timetable is unknown and the fares for most people especially to other areas are too expensive to encourage bus uses. The railway line / station at Carnaby is also unutilised.	The proposed new bus station would be complemented by improvements in the bus circuit and in bus services, with better links provided between the railway station, the Town Centre, and the Old Town.  The issue of the railway line / station at Carnaby falls outside the area covered by the AAP. Comment to be taken into account in preparation of the Core Strategy and Site Allocations Development Plan Documents.
6008	Obj	Mr Robert Harrison	Park and Ride has been dismissed so the appraisal should be started again.	The sustainability appraisal should be started again now the Park and Ride has been dismissed. Otherwise unsound. It should be based on new policies not based around Park and Ride.	Planning permission has been granted for the Park and Ride at South Cliff. This facility will divert traffic away from the town centre and reduce congestion. The detailed transport study which forms part of the Evidence Base shows that, all matters considered, South Cliff is the optimal location for achieving the aims of reducing congestion in the Town Centre, while also ensuring users of the Town Centre are in easy reach of it.  Recommendation: ensure the proposals for movement and access are clear.
6015	Obvs	Mr William D Chapman	Would like more ambitious growth.	Worried about lack of ambition in attracting growth. Whole plan seems to me to have a flaw in that there is no integration of required growth objectives that would sustain the overall plan.	The AAP is set within the current growth forecasts and the development plan.
6032	Obvs	Mr Richard Frudd on behalf of National Grid Property Ltd	Given the locational and sustainability merits of the NG site at Quay Road, it is evident	See letter below sent to Paul Leeming of Atkins on 3 October 2007  Bridlington AAP & Town Centre Redevelopment and Marina and Harbour SPDs – Sustainability Appraisal / Strategic Environmental Assessment	Observations noted.  The site in question does not form part of the town centre and is physically and

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
			<p>that it could provide a significant contribution to the draft sustainability objectives set out at Section 5 of the Scoping Report.</p> <p>The site's exclusion from the AAP boundary prejudices its ability to maximise its contribution to the objectives of the Council for Bridlington town centre, to be promoted through the LDF process. NG would therefore recommend that the scope and extent of the respective AAP / SPDs are amended to incorporate the Quay Road site.</p>	<p>Scoping Report.</p> <p>I refer to the above document received by National Grid (NG) during the course of last month, and have set out below some general comments regarding its content on their behalf. These comments relate specifically to NG's landholdings within Bridlington, off Quay Road. The Quay Road site extends to some 0.44 hectares, and is located to the north west of the town centre, adjoining the Hull to Scarborough railway line, as shown on the attached plan. The site is previously developed (i.e. "brownfield"), vacant and cleared. The site could be made available for redevelopment within a reasonable timeframe. The site adjoins both residential and retail / commercial properties, is located within 150 metres direct walking distance of the Bridlington train station, fronts one of the two main arterial road routes into the town centre from Scarborough Road (A614 / 165), and is within a commodious walking distance of the other services and facilities of the town centre. Given these locational and sustainability merits, it is evident that the site could provide a significant contribution to the draft sustainability objectives set out at Section 5 of the Scoping Report. For instance, the scale and shape of the site lends itself to residential development. The residential redevelopment of the site could contribute towards draft SA objectives 5 (improving housing affordability through increased provision) and 8 (facilitating the more efficient use of land through increasing the proportion of new residential development constructed on previously developed land – the existing target for housing development on previously developed land is particularly low at 30%). These merits are further evidenced through the fact that the site adjoins the AAP Boundary, the Town Centre Boundary, the Town Centre Redevelopment Area and the Primary Shopping Area (see attached plan which comprises an extract of figure 1.1 of the Scoping Report). However, the site's exclusion from these boundaries prejudices its ability to maximise its contribution to the objectives of the Council for Bridlington town centre, to be promoted through the LDF process. NG would therefore recommend that the scope and extent of the respective AAP / SPDs are amended to incorporate the Quay Road site, therefore enabling it to provide a positive contribution to meeting the objectives for the regeneration of the town centre. These modifications should apply to at least the AAP Boundary and the Town Centre Boundary, although it is evident given the planning benefits of the site that it could perform a key</p>	<p>functionally divorced from it.</p> <p>Whilst no formal planning has been submitted for this site planning will look at the land as part of the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.</p> <p>Recommendation: no change needed.</p>

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
				<p>role in contributing to the retail / town centre redevelopment function of the centre. I trust that the above is of assistance and look forward to receiving further updates on the progress of these documents in due course. In the meantime, should you require any clarification on the matters raised please do not hesitate to contact me.</p>	
	Obvs	Susan Wilson on behalf of Natural England	<p>Support opening of the Gypsy Race as a new town centre pedestrian spine and 'park'.</p> <p>Support the SA objective 14.</p> <p>Disappointed that our comments on the Scoping Report in our letter of 10 October have not been fully incorporated.</p> <p>Table 4.1 does not mention the existing Shoreline Management Plan or the Integrated Coastal Zone Management Plan.</p> <p>'Lowland grazed bog' should read 'lowland raised bog'.</p> <p>It is likely that Natural England will require specific measures in place to monitor the effects on the European designated sites at</p>	<p>1.18 Objectives of the Town Centre Scheme: Natural England supports the opening of the Gypsy Race as a new town centre pedestrian spine and 'park', thereby creating a new 'heart' for the town centre.</p> <p>Natural England supports the SA objective 14: To protect and enhance biodiversity and important wildlife habitats, and to conserve geology.</p> <p>Natural England is disappointed that our comments on the Scoping Report in our letter of 10 October have not been fully incorporated. As the marina is a significant development in the marine environment, the SA should have been more targeted to address the issues in the specific location of this Area Action plan and included a Sustainability Objective in relation to ensuring that coastal processes (such as sediment transport) are not adversely affected. We do not feel that this issue is sufficiently addressed in SA Objective 13 or 14.</p> <p>Table 4.1 Relevant plans and projects, this section does not mention the existing Shoreline Management Plan or the Integrated Coastal Zone Management Plan.</p> <p>5.8 Reference to LBAP habitat 'Lowland grazed bog' should read 'lowland raised bog'.</p> <p>5.93 Reference to LBAP species and habitats is out of date, update with recent information (as in 5.80)</p> <p>Table 12.1 Proposed Monitoring Programme</p> <p>'Effect on protecting and enhancing biodiversity and important wildlife habitats, and to conserve geology'; a number of these indicators do not appear to be relevant to this issue, we advise that the consultants should agree the indicators with Natural England and possibly other</p>	<p>Support for the opening of the Gypsy Race is welcomed.</p> <p>Support for SA objective 14: To protect and enhance biodiversity and important wildlife habitats, and to conserve geology is welcomed.</p> <p>The SA will include a Sustainability Objective in relation to ensuring that coastal processes are not adversely affected.</p> <p>The Shoreline Management Plan and Integrated Coastal Zone Management Plan will be incorporated into Table 4.1.</p> <p>5.8 Reference to LBAP habitat 'Lowland grazed bog' will be changed to read 'lowland raised bog'.</p> <p>5.93 Reference to LBAP species and habitats will be updated with recent information.</p> <p>Specific measures will be put in place to monitor the effects on the European designated sites at Flamborough Head and the Humber Estuary.</p> <p>'Effect on protecting and enhancing heritage asset and their settings', the listing of Natural England as one of the organisations</p>

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
			<p>Flamborough Head and the Humber Estuary which may include monitoring sea bird populations and monitoring the effects on sediment transport along the coast for instance.</p> <p>Mitigation</p> <p>Natural England is disappointed that no mitigation has been suggested at this stage for the significantly negative effects of the Marina development on many of the environmental SA objectives.</p>	<p>organisations such as RSPB. For example a suggested indicator could be; the number of planning conditions / agreements which protect and enhance biodiversity and important wildlife habitats and conserve geology. It is likely that Natural England will require specific measures in place to monitor the effects on the European designated sites at Flamborough Head and the Humber Estuary which may include monitoring sea bird populations and monitoring the effects on sediment transport along the coast for instance. It would not be adequate to use the condition of designated sites on the Magic website as an indicator.</p> <p>‘Effect on protecting and enhancing heritage asset and their settings’, Natural England is listed as one of the organisations that can provide data in relation to this issue, we advise that English Heritage would be a more appropriate organisation to provide this advice.</p> <p>Mitigation</p> <p>Natural England is disappointed that no mitigation has been suggested at this stage for the significantly negative effects of the Marina development on many of the environmental SA objectives. We will expect to see a full EIA for the Marina and we advise that as well as general ecological specialists the consultants will need to employ marine ecologists, and coastal process specialists.</p> <p>We also advise that this plan should be considered under the Habitat Regulations with specific reference to the potential effects on the European designated sites at Flamborough Head Special Protection Area and Special Areas of Conservation and Humber Estuary Special Protection Area and Special Area of Conservation.</p>	<p>that can provide data in relation to this issue, will be replaced with English Heritage.</p> <p>There will be a full EIA for the Marina prepared by appropriate consultants.</p> <p>The potential effects on the European designated sites at Flamborough Head Special Protection Area and Special Areas of Conservation and Humber Estuary Special Protection Area and Special Area of Conservation will be considered.</p>
6036	Obvs	Bridlington Harbour Commissioners	Sa needs to reflect the Bridlington Harbour supply and demand study and the results of the AA Reports.	SA needs to reflect up to date evidence base including the Bridlington Harbour supply and demand study and the results of the AA Reports.	Discussions with the Harbour Commissioners are ongoing to agree relevant issues.

## GENERAL COMMENTS

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
6028	Obj	Bridlington Harbour Commissioners	The Commissioners must ensure that the final Marina/Harbour improvement scheme does not adversely affect the present or future operation of the Harbour and are minded therefore to lodge a holding objection to the draft Area Action Plan until details are agreed.	<p>The Commissioners have had a preliminary look at the draft Area Action Plan and are now awaiting a presentation from the Council on the implications of the draft Area Action Plan for the Harbour and the proposed Marina. In the meantime the Commissioners must ensure that the final Marina/Harbour improvement scheme does not adversely affect the present or future operation of the Harbour prior to agreeing to any proposals or policies which may affect their estate and water area. The Commissioners are minded therefore to lodge a holding objection to the draft Area Action Plan which can be withdrawn once all details of any proposals and/or policies have been agreed.</p> <p>See attached report (included as appendix).</p>	Discussions with the Harbour Commissioners are ongoing to agree relevant issues. The final scheme will minimise any impacts on the operations of the Harbour.
6029	Obvs	EYMS Group Ltd	We have some serious reservations about the effect that the Plan would have on local bus services. A very quick glance through the document suggests that very little attention has been given to public transport requirements.	<p>We will consider the document in detail and respond to you before the deadline which I note is 10 December 2007.</p> <p>I understand our Group Projects Manager, Barrie Marsden, has already had some discussions about the Bridlington Town Centre Area Action Plan, and that as a result we have some serious reservations about the effect that the Plan would have on local bus services.</p> <p>Indeed, a very quick glance through the document you have sent suggests that very little attention has been given to public transport requirements, and if this is borne out by detailed examination then we shall indeed have some serious concerns.</p>	<p>Observations noted.</p> <p>Further discussions have been undertaken and will continue to take place with EYMS Group to resolve issues relating to local bus services.</p>
6035	Obvs	David Armstrong – RYYC	<p>Plan reference – 4.16, 4.18, 4.19</p> <p>Pleased to see reference in the document to the importance the Inspector attached to the marina, but it does not reflect the force of his view that this was the</p>	<p>Plan reference – 4.16, 4.18, 4.19</p> <p>We are pleased to see reference in the document to the importance the Inspector attached to the marina, but it does not reflect the force of his view that a marina of the size (500 berths) and in the location proposed was the only scheme put before him which would contribute significantly to the regeneration of the town. We also support the earlier Scoping report in the contention that town centre refurbishment and a marina are the 2 major factors to achieve this</p>	<p>The major development concentrated within the Town Centre will contribute to the marina.</p> <p>The proposals have been designed and development with a comprehensive scheme in mind.</p>

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
			<p>only scheme put before him which would contribute significantly to the regeneration of the town. Also support scoping report that town centre and marina are inter-dependent.</p> <p>The project must be developer led and that market confidence is paramount.</p> <p>We now express concern that the marina is seemingly being put on the 'back-burner' – see 4.16.iii.</p> <p>Any shift in the profitable element of the marina to Burlington will erode developer interest in the marina.</p> <p>We urge that whatever it takes the procedures referred to at 4.19 must take place simultaneously.</p> <p>Weakening in any way the value and timing of the marina should not happen.</p>	<p>aim –and that they are inter-dependent.</p> <p>Further, it has always been our view that the project must be developer led and that market confidence is paramount. Indeed by common consent this lack of confidence was at the heart of the previous failure, as reflected by the Inspector in his report conclusions.</p> <p>It is against this background that we now express concern that the marina is seemingly being put on the 'back-burner' – see 4.16.iii – on the grounds, which we do not accept (because of the positive conclusions by the Inspector), that its scale makes timing uncertain. Further, that parts of its profitable elements may be allocated to the Bridge Street section of Burlington (in particular the hotel which apart from any other consideration must, as it always has been, remain associated with the Spa complex).</p> <p>There are two reasons for our concern; any shift in the profitable element of the marina to Burlington will erode developer interest in the marina which is and must continue to be the lead component of the regeneration process. The argument advanced in 4.18. We are unsure in the light of past experience how ant terms now being discussed can be binding, especially following harbour facilities improvements.</p> <p>For this reason, and to create developer confidence in the marina, we urge that whatever it takes the procedures referred to at 4.19 must take place simultaneously.</p> <p>We are conscious of the underlying issue of attracting a developer to Burlington but weakening in any way the value and timing of the marina should not happen.</p>	
6040	Obvs	Bethan Stagg – Yorkshire Wildlife Trust	Suggests changing wording of Proposed Policy BridTC3 4k so more in line with PPS9 and the revised draft RSS.	<p>Proposed Policy BridTC3</p> <p>Change wording of 4k to: 'Potential harm to biodiversity and geological conservation interests, following site surveys for designated and protected habitats and</p>	<p>Observations noted.</p> <p>The wording of 4k will be changed to place greater emphasis on mitigation to potential harm.</p>

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
			<p>3.23 and proposed policy BridTC19(d) – Need to specify ‘native planting and creation or enhancement of semi-natural habitats’.</p> <p>4.33 – Need to specify ‘planting of native trees and native planting schemes’</p> <p>Suggests additional objective for proposed policy BridTC18.</p> <p>Supports the proposals to increase provision of greenspace and cycleways.</p>	<p>species. Extent to which development retains and incorporates biodiversity into development or provides appropriate habitat creation or mitigation elsewhere.’</p> <p>I would consider this wording more in line with PPS9 (see Key Principles lvi.) and the revised draft RSS (see policy ENV8) than ‘contribution to biodiversity’.</p> <p>3.23 and proposed policy BridTC19(d) – Need to specify ‘native planting and creation or enhancement of semi-natural habitats’ to ensure positive contribution to biodiversity.</p> <p>4.33 – Need to specify ‘planting of native trees and native planting schemes’ to ensure positive contribution to biodiversity.</p> <p>Proposed policy BridTC18 – Add an objective: ‘minimise damage to habitats and biodiversity including appropriate mitigation for loss of wader habitats. Improve overall nature and conservation value of site.’</p> <p>I support the proposals to increase provision of greenspace and cycleways detailed in the AAP.</p>	<p>3.23 and proposed policy BridTC19(d) will specify ‘native planting and creation or enhancement of semi-natural habitats.</p> <p>4.33 will specify ‘planting of native trees and native planting schemes’.</p> <p>BridTC18 will include an objective to minimise damage to habitats and biodiversity.</p> <p>Support for the proposals to increase provision of greenspace and cycleways is welcomed.</p>
6045	Obvs	M D Mckie – Francis Johnson and Partners	<p>Primary Shopping Area – clause 3.13: consider incorporating the block of buildings between Cliff Street and Prince Street into the Primary Shopping Area. Could M&amp;S expand adjacent to present site.</p> <p>Access and Movement – clause 3.71: there is a need to restrict traffic flow through the town centre but if some limited restricted on-street parking for residents</p>	<p>There are a few points I would like to make:</p> <p>Primary Shopping Area – clause 3.13 I would ask consideration be given to incorporating the block of buildings between Cliff Street and Prince Street into the Primary Shopping Area as I suspect the ultimate proposals for the Sea Front Area may be one of the last areas to be completed. Furthermore if a firm such as Marks and Spencer could be allowed to expand adjacent to their present site this could have many advantages.</p> <p>Access and Movement – clause 3.71 It is accepted there is a need to restrict traffic flow through the town centre but if some limited restricted on-street parking could be provided for residents – other than during the main 6-8 week summer period – this would undoubtedly be popular. Perhaps it could be</p>	<p>Observations noted.</p> <p>The Council is fully aware of the implications of withdrawing Cliff Street and Prince Street from the primary retail core. The definition of the core in this way does not preclude the continuation of these operations in any way. Instead the re-designation provides the conditions for the improvement of this area, recognising that it has – for compelling reasons as explained in the AAP – lost its way as a primary shopping area.</p> <p>The disadvantage of retaining on-street car parking in the Town Centre is that it creates</p>

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
			<p>outside the summer period would be popular.</p> <p>The First Phase of the Marina – clauses 4.16 to 4.19: a great deal more emphasis should be given to the second phase of the Marina to prevent a “second best” solution.</p>	<p>controlled by some form of residents “pass” similar to the provision made for disabled car users.</p> <p>The First Phase of the Marina – clauses 4.16 to 4.19 Whilst the reasons for this are understandable as much is made of the sea and harbour being our major assets a great deal more emphasis should be given to the second phase of the Marina. If we don't we shall finish up with a “second best” solution which will impact on the whole of the other proposals.</p> <p>I could say much more but as a long term resident and with an interest in the built environment I will merely add that I wish all those working on the project every success.</p>	<p>unnecessary traffic congestion, compromises pedestrian safety and harms the attractiveness of the core. It is more efficient and conducive to competitiveness to instead concentrate parking in a limited number of well-located car parks.</p> <p>Further work on the phasing of the marina will be completed following the Bridlington Harbour Supply and Demand Study.</p> <p>Recommendation: no change needed.</p>
	Obvs	Susan Wilson on behalf of Natural England	<p>Disappointed that this plan does not put greater emphasis on the location of Bridlington to the south of Flamborough Head.</p> <p>East Riding is the leader on Integrated Coastal Zone Management for this coast, this plan does not appear to take account of the ICZM</p>	<p>Natural England is disappointed that this plan does not put greater emphasis on the location of Bridlington to the south of Flamborough Head which is an internationally important nature conservation site as well as a stunning coastal landscape feature. Flamborough Head should be recognised as a key asset to Bridlington within the plan and opportunities could then be identified for sustainable tourism focused around Flamborough Head, attracting more people to the area throughout the year. The Area Action Plan must be integrated into the wider management of the coast through the Flamborough Head Management Group and the Flamborough Head Environmental Assets Partnership. There are opportunities for providing better access and interpretation to Flamborough Head within the Area Action Plan which are so not incorporated in the plan.</p> <p>East Riding is the leader on Integrated Coastal Zone Management for this coast, this plan does not appear to take account of the ICZM and we would therefore welcome the opportunity to discuss how the Bridlington AAP including the proposal for a new marina and ICZM plan can be more closely integrated.</p>	The impact of the AAP on Flamborough Head and integration with the Integrated Coastal Zone Management Plan will be fully considered.
	Obvs	Mrs/Cllr Pamela Austin	How are local population supposed to understand this form?	NB Comment: As stated in your AAP most of the population of this town have low educational attainment. How on earth are they supposed to understand this form? It presumes people have paid for the CD or £20 book in order to reference answers. Most people will	The Council appreciate that it is time consuming to take part and is grateful for the participation of the Community. But the Council also does not want to omit

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
				not access or fill in such a large complex form. Is this intentional?	information which the community requires in order to make informed comment on the proposals. More effort still will be made to ensure future AAP consultation forms are as accessible as possible. The AAP CD is available free of charge from the Council.

## LETTERS & REPORTS

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
6031	Sup w cond	The Lords Feoffees & Assistants of the Manor of Bridlington	<p>The Lords Feoffees want more detailed consideration of their landholdings and the need to protect their income.</p> <p>Concern that the parking facilities they provide have not been recognised.</p> <p>Some concern over the property on the north side of Bridge Street, adjacent to the Brunswick Hotel.</p> <p>This should not be regarded as a negative response, it just raises issues to address before the plan is finalised.</p>	<p>Further to our letter dated 8<sup>th</sup> November 2007, the Lords Feoffees have now had an opportunity to consider the possible implications of the proposals set out in your Area Action Plan. As you are aware, the Lords Feoffees have since the seventeenth century always looked after the interests of Bridlington and its people. In fact the Lords Feoffees were the forerunners of Local Government as we know it today. With this historical background, there is no doubt that there is good support from the Lords for the redevelopment of the town that will benefit all sectors of the community and increase its economic viability and attractiveness as a resort town. The Lords Feoffees have always actively supported the local authorities in their efforts and in response to a request to bring residential life into the town centre, have provided a large number of town centre residential flats in the upper floors of the commercial premises that they own. The development of 'Beside the Seaside – The Bridlington Experience' was undertaken by the Lords to provide a much needed town centre visitor attraction.</p> <p>It would be easy to tick all the 'support' boxes in your consultation form for that is what we all envisage for the future. Achieving that future is rather more complicated and as your consultant stated at our meeting, the whole scheme relies on the transfer of Tesco to the coach park and the development of the harbour area including the marina. To use your consultant's words "the rest [the area between these two important sites] will fall naturally into place".</p> <p>The Lords Feoffees have made a large and valuable investment in the ownership and management of a sizeable area of the town centre and for this organisation to become a partner to the proposals as now revealed, there has to be far more detailed consideration given to those areas within the redevelopment proposals that affect their landholding. The value of that landholding and the level of income that it accrues through rents must be protected at all costs as it is only through this income that the Charity is able to meet its objective to benefit Bridlington and its people.</p>	<p>The large and valuable contribution the Lords Feoffees have made in Bridlington is recognised.</p> <p>The proposals of the AAP will protect the value of the Lords Feoffees landholdings and income where possible and provide compensation if necessary.</p> <p>The support of the Lords Feoffees is welcomed and consultation will continue to ensure that concerns are dealt with.</p> <p>Recommendation: no change needed.</p>

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
				<p>The Lords Feoffees own and manage the Beck Hill Pay and display Car Park, a facility that provides shoppers who visit our shops with economic short term parking. It is the only car park in the town that is manned and supervised throughout its opening hours, totally funded by the Lords for the benefit of the town. As a Charity, the income from the car park provides a large proportion of the overall income of the organisation. The Lords Feoffess will wish to continue to provide this service to the public and will not willingly agrees to relinquish their own parking facility in favour of a substitute local authority managed car park in the same area with associated parking fees that are set high to discourage people from bringing their cars into the town centre.</p> <p>If it is taken into account that the Lords Feoffees own the ERYC car park at the bottom of Beck Hill, the Beck Hill shop car park, the garages and parking spaces on Ice House Lane and the warehouses, stores, garages and parking spaces in Sawmill Yard it can be seen that the Lords have a great influence over parking facilities in a large part of your proposed development area. These parking and garaging facilities have been provided, over many years, for the benefit of the Lords Feoffee's residential tenants and lessees of the commercial properties who require parking facilities adjacent to their shop premises. Again, the income accrued from these permanent long term parking facilities provides good income for the Charity and this must be protected. We have the impression that these car parking facilities have not been recognised in your proposals and we are concerned that this is a serious omission that needs to be addressed.</p> <p>Whilst it would appear from your plans that the Lords' properties in Manor Street will not be affected by the redevelopment proposals there is some concern over the property on the north side of Bridge Street, adjacent to the Brunswick Hotel. As we predicted at our meeting, some of our tenants have now become worried about their security of tenure of their property and they need to be reassured as a matter of urgency.</p> <p>This letter should not be regarded as a negative response to your consultation as the Lords Feoffess have always been optimistic about the future of Bridlington. This letter simply raises the concerns that the Lords have on the proposals before them, concerns that must be</p>	

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
				addressed before the final plan is put out to potential developers on the basis of international competition.	
6033	Obvs	Councillor John Wilkinson	<p>The most valuable asset in Bridlington is the harbour and seafronts. Wants immediate provision of an inner harbour marina, which can then be extended.</p> <p>The funfair is an eyesore and should be relocated.</p> <p>Concerns over the loss of the Coach Park.</p> <p>Firm proposals needed for Prince Street/Cliff Street.</p> <p>More definite proposals for King Street, Queen Street, Chapel Street and the Promenade up to Leisure World.</p> <p>More definite proposals for traffic management and pedestrian zones.</p> <p>More definite proposals for Leisure World.</p> <p>Need comprehensive timetable for each element.</p>	<p>The single most valuable asset in Bridlington is the harbour and the adjacent seafronts. The proposal should provide for the immediate provision of an inner harbour marina, which can then be extended to form part of the bigger project to reclaim land for development and increased facilities for fishermen and leisure craft. This would demonstrate to the people of Bridlington that the regeneration is serious.</p> <p>The single most unpopular eyesore in Bridlington is the funfair adjacent to the harbour, which apart from the café and the 'Eye', is a disgrace to the town. The proposal must include for the early relocation of the facility and restoration of this area, along with the Pier Buffet site and Garrison Street, which together with the Esplanade, form the heart of the holiday area and are badly in need of refurbishment.</p> <p>The Bridlington Coach Park is a valuable public open space and whilst it may be a little underused at the moment, it is still there for future generations. When it is gone, it is gone.</p> <p>Any new proposals must address:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Where will the coaches go? – Full details of alternative coach parking should be included</li> <li>2. Identification of adequate designated dropping off and picking up points; alternative arrangements for lorry parking</li> <li>3. Identification of alternative arrangements for the annual fair</li> <li>4. The inclusion of an equivalent area of public open space.</li> </ol> <p>Developers should not be asked to address the above, but they could suggest alternative solutions to them in the design brief for our consideration.</p> <p>Taking Marks and Spencers and Woolworths out of Prince Street/Cliff Street will take the life out of the area. Firm proposals should be drawn up otherwise the area will be a wilderness for many years.</p>	<p>The serious disadvantage of a marina within the existing harbour is that it adds no further land to support the needs of these new users and thus would very substantially constrain the appeal of a new marina to the very target markets which justify the investment in the marina in the first place. This more modest approach would also not have the same valuable effect on the town centre development market.</p> <p>The AAP recognises the adverse impact of the fun fair in its current location. It may prove feasible in time to concentrate the seasonal seaside activity elsewhere creating an alternative critical mass and visitor destination with good links to the town centre. Meanwhile, policy will seek to achieve a better balance between the seasonal use of the Seafront area and the need to use the Town Centre's best assets all year round.</p> <p>Alternative sites for the coach park are under consideration that will link to the town centre. Alternative spaces will also be identified for the annual fair. The AAP proposes a significant increase in high quality public space.</p> <p>The Council is fully aware of the implications of withdrawing Cliff Street and Prince Street from the primary retail core. The definition of the core in this way does not preclude the</p>

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
				<p>More definite proposals should be included for the area including King Street, Queen Street, Chapel Street and the Promenade up to Leisure World, as this area is in great need of refurbishment and there is a danger of it deteriorating further.</p> <p>Definite proposals should be included for traffic management and pedestrian zones. It is not acceptable to ask a potential developer to do this.</p> <p>More definite proposals should be formulated for Leisure World. If the swimming pool is to be relocated then a new facility must be built before it is closed.</p> <p>The final document must include a comprehensive timetable for each element. The proposals cannot focus only on the Hilderthorpe Road corridor, and must include FIRM proposals for the existing town centre, seafront and Leisure World.</p>	<p>continuation of these operations in any way. Instead the re-designation provides the conditions for the improvement of this area, recognising that it has – for compelling reasons as explained in the AAP – lost its way as a primary shopping area.</p> <p>The movement and access strategy and Bridlington Integrated Transport Plan included detailed traffic management and pedestrian proposals.</p> <p>Further details on the proposals for King Street, Queen Street, Chapel Street and the Promenade will be provided in the SPD.</p> <p>Leisure World recognised as an important community facility as well as a rainy day activity for visitors. The Council is looking at new sites for Leisure World. The options for the replacement of a swimming pool are: redevelopment on the current site, a new facility on the edge of the Town Centre or a new facility at South Shore near the new Park and Ride and Land Train.</p> <p>The final AAP will include a comprehensive timetable for delivery.</p> <p>Recommendation: no changed needed.</p>
6034	Supw cond	Sport England – Robert Deanwood	Support Objective 2 and 5, Enabling Objective x, Town Centre Development Scheme, The Marina, Access and Movement, Town Centre Movement and Parking	Thank you for consulting Sport England on the above document. Sport England is the Government agency responsible for delivering the Government's sporting objectives. Maximising the investment into sport and recreation through the land use planning system is one of our national and regional priorities. You will also be aware that Sport England is a statutory consultee on planning applications affecting playing fields.	Support for the positive impact on sport of Objective 2 and 5, Enabling Objective x, Town Centre Development Scheme, The Marina, Access and Movement, Town Centre Movement and Parking Strategy and S.106 Obligations is welcomed.

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
			<p>Strategy and S.106 Obligations which have positive impact on sport.</p> <p>Have produced guides on design which encourages physical activity and structured approach to contributions.</p> <p>Would like greater clarity on Leisure World.</p> <p>Unsure as to the treatment of wider sport and recreation issues in the plan as a whole.</p>	<p>Sport England welcome the opportunity to make comments on this important DPD, and which offers significant opportunities for addressing sport and active recreation issues within the plan area. In this context, I would wish to make comments on the following aspects of the consultation document:</p> <p>Strategic Objectives to achieve the vision:</p> <p>Objective 2: Create a Marina – support this objective and the significant opportunities for the enhancement of sport related activity that this will bring.</p> <p>Objective 5: Create an enhanced and new public realm, public spaces and related public infrastructure – support this objective and aspirations for the creation of an environment which encourages greater physical activity through increased opportunities for walking and cycling for example.</p> <p>Enabling Objective x: Actively investigate the watersports market – support this objective as a means of creating opportunities for residents and visitors to be actively engaged in sport.</p> <p>Town Centre Development Scheme: para 1.40 – support the proposals for open space provision and other public realm improvements, particularly the proposal for a new pedestrian walk and cycleway spine and new open space.</p> <p>The Marina: para 1.53 – the proposals for the expansion and enhancement of the marina are welcomed as they offer to provide the opportunity for greater access to water-related sports and recreational activity. The Sport England Watersports: Planning Policy Objective 25 may help to guide the production of detailed policy and masterplanning on this aspect of the AAP.</p> <p>On a point of information, has the Royal Yachting Association been consulted? They can advise on the details of design relating to the provision of ancillary facilities, for example.</p> <p>Town Centre Movement and Parking Strategy: para 1.60 – the proposals for provision of cycling facilities are supported as an important contribution to encourage greater physical activity amongst</p>	<p>The Royal Yachting Association have been consulted as part of the Bridlington Harbour Supply and Demand Study.</p> <p>Support for the provision of cycling facilities in 1.60 is welcomed.</p> <p>Guidance to assist the development of environmental design which encourages physical activity is welcomed.</p> <p>Support for encouragement of cycling and the provision of facilities in BridTC14 iv is welcomed.</p> <p>Guidance on structured approach to contributions for the enhancement and provision of sport and recreation facilities is welcomed.</p> <p>The need for clarity on the future of facilities at Leisure World is noted. The Council's options for the replacement of a swimming pool are: redevelopment on the current site, a new facility on the edge of the Town Centre or a new facility at South Shore near the new Park and Ride and Land Train.</p> <p>Wider sport and recreation issues whilst not appropriate for an AAP will be dealt with under other Council policies and strategies.</p> <p>Recommendation: no change needed.</p>

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
				<p>residents and visitors to the town.</p> <p>Policy BridTC4: Design in the Built Environment – Attention on the importance of good design is welcomed. In relation to Sport England’s particular interests, we have produced a guide to assist the development of environmental design which encourages physical activity. Taking widely accepted principles of good design (character, continuity, quality, legibility etc) as a starting point, the guidance uses three objectives to frame advice on positive design; improving accessibility, enhancing amenity and increasing awareness. Using the three design objectives, the guidance explores their application to three activity settings: everyday activity destinations (shops, homes, schools ,workplaces), informal activity and recreation (play areas, parks &amp; gardens) and formal sports and leisure activities (sports pitches, swimming pools etc). All three of these activity settings are relevant to the Bridlington AAP. Active Design poses a number of questions for masterplanners to consider. The Guidance contains a number of case studies which could help to inform the proposals being made for the AAP area. The full guidance is available at <a href="http://www.sportengland.org">www.sportengland.org</a> &gt;get resources &gt;downloads &gt;design guidance &gt;active design.pdf.</p> <p>Policy BridTC14 Access and Movement: point vi – More investment to encourage cycle use – the proposals for the provision of cycling facilities and encouraging cycling generally are supported as an important contribution to encouraging greater physical activity amongst residents and visitors to the town.</p> <p>Policy BridTC16: S.106 Obligations – support the specification of 106 contributions in the AAP. However in order to meet Sport England’s policy objective on this topic we seek clarification of precisely how s.106 monies will be used to support the enhancement and provision of sport and recreation facilities in addition to outdoor playing space and children’s playspace. This is particularly important in respect of Leisure World. See Sport England Planning Policy Objective 8: Providing for sport through new development.</p> <p>Sport England welcomes reference (s.7.8) to seeking contributions to off-site recreation/sporting facilities as part of residential development. There is clearly synergy with the proposals for the re-development of leisure facilities on Millennium Park. Sport England advocates as</p>	

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
				<p>structured approach to assessing an appropriate level of contribution to new sport and recreation facilities and has developed detailed guidance on these matters, available at <a href="http://www.sportengland.org">www.sportengland.org</a> &gt;get resources &gt;planning for sport &gt;planning contributions.</p> <p>Policy BridTC20: Town Centre Seafront – Leisure World – support the attention paid to the re-development of swimming facilities, but we would expect to see greater clarity on how the facilities which are currently provided in addition to the swimming pool will be protected and enhanced. Para 4.54 is not clear on this matter and before any changes to provision, including re-location are made there needs to be a full understanding of their implications based on robust evidence. Cross referencing to the emerging Sport &amp; Active Recreation Strategy for the District is important in this respect, along with a foundation in a PPG17 compliant assessment of facility provision and needs. In addition, Sport England would like to see more clarity on the role of Planning Obligations in supporting the re-development of this facility. Sport England advocates a structured approach to assessing an appropriate level of contribution to new sport and recreation facilities and has developed detailed guidance on these matters available at: <a href="http://www.sportengland.org">www.sportengland.org</a> &gt;get resources &gt; planning for sport &gt; planning contributions</p> <p>The emerging Sport &amp; Active Recreation Strategy should identify whether the District and Bridlington in particular, has adequate open space, sport and recreation facilities and other key issues arising from this work and how these are to be addressed. Accessible and high quality open space and recreation facilities are important not only to meet the immediate objectives of the AAP, but also to contribute to improving the health and well-being of the community. They are key tools in delivering increased opportunities for physical activity, as required for sustainable communities in PPS1.</p> <p>General Observations</p> <p>We are unsure as to the treatment of wider sport and recreation issues in the plan as a whole, notwithstanding attention to open space and children’s play areas identified in BridTC19 &amp; 20 which are supported.</p>	

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
				<p>Any increased in population, both residential and seasonal, bring additional pressures on sport and recreation facilities. We recognise that they have been addressed as part of the evidence base (para 2.110 – 2.114) but it is unclear how this intelligence has been specifically translated into the plan and its policies, in particular how the policies and proposals of the AAP fit into the planning of the wider area in respect of facility provision for both residents and visitors.</p> <p>I hope that you will find these comments a positive contribution to the evolution of the AAP. I should be happy to discuss them in more detail if you would find that helpful.</p>	
6037	Obvs	Cllr Linda Chamber	<p>The consultation form is complicated.</p> <p>Concerned that CPO warnings have been sent.</p> <p>Contemporary architecture not in keeping with the area.</p> <p>Park and Ride Carnaby and a multi-storey car park on Palace car park.</p> <p>We do not need any high rise flats and won't homes add to traffic?</p> <p>Concerned over housing at Harbour.</p> <p>Why is there no suggestion to move the fairground?</p>	<p>I am sorry but I cannot manage to complete the consultation form as it is far too complicated and impossible to cross reference unless you have the £20 hard copy. I would appreciate you talking my following comments into account when discussing the AAP.</p> <p>I am very concerned that compulsory purchase order warnings have been sent out long before the end of the public consultation process; the cynics amongst us would assume this means that the AAP will happen come what may.</p> <p>Bridlington has mainly late Victorian and Edwardian buildings. The plan proposes for new build to be contemporary architecture which would not be in keeping with this.</p> <p>There is a proposal for a Park and Ride scheme at South Cliff which has already been rejected by ERYC councillors. One should be provided at Carnaby for visitors and a multi-storey car park built on the current Palace car park for residents to use (as the plan greatly reduces on-street parking) many of whom are elderly and do not qualify for a disabled badge.</p> <p>There is a proposal for 600 dwellings in the Town Centre; I can only assume that they will have to be flats as 600 buildings are not due to be demolished. We already have one dreadful eyesore in the shape of Ebor Flats – why not CPO this? We do not need any high rise flats and</p>	<p>The AAP necessarily, at this stage, needs to set out a full account of the proposals and the reasoning for them, together with the options which have been considered but rejected and why. The Council appreciate that it is time consuming to take part and is grateful for your participation and that of the rest of the Community. But the Council also does not want to omit information which the community requires in order to make informed comment on the proposals. More effort still will be made to ensure the AAP is in plain English and removes jargon.</p> <p>No 'warnings' or any letters mentioning CPO have been sent out.</p> <p>The Council is very concerned to ensure that Bridlington's historic character is enhanced, not damaged, by the regeneration proposals in the Town Centre AAP, and proposes specific policies to ensure this will be the case. The AAP proposes well designed contemporary buildings that both meet the economy's</p>

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
			<p>Leisure World facilities must be replaced.</p> <p>Why is a bridge over Beck Hill being suggested?</p> <p>The 'Town Square' in the wrong place.</p> <p>Leave South Cliff Gardens as open space.</p>	<p>won't they add to the traffic in the town centre?</p> <p>On the Harbour plan, it looks as if a housing estate is planned for the west end of the Harbour. I cannot see how this will attract tourists; in fact I would think that they would be put off coming to Bridlington if our lovely coastline views were blocked by housing.</p> <p>With regard to my last two comments, I would also point out that residents already find it difficult to sell their properties quickly and at a reasonable price because of the practice of allowing new build on previous 'greenbelt'. These two proposals will only add to this problem.</p> <p>Why is there no suggestion to move the fairground rides to one side of the town? I cannot think of any other seaside resort (except Blackpool) that has these noisy vulgar rides in the middle of town.</p> <p>There is a suggestion that Leisure World may be demolished. If so, the facilities must be replaced and be of higher quality.</p> <p>Why is a bridge over Beck Hill being suggested; it is a quirky pretty road and will lose a lot of its character if changed.</p> <p>The 'Town Square' of Queen St, Manor St and Bridge St is not near enough to the sea front where most of the visitors congregate. Cliff St, Garrison St and Princes St would be better, provided a multi storey was built at Palace car park, otherwise too much on street parking needed by residents would be lost.</p> <p>On the preferred plan, buildings are shown on South Cliff Gardens. Please leave this little bit of green space for the residents to enjoy. We have precious little green space as it is.</p>	<p>needs for efficient and environmentally sustainable buildings and which also complement Bridlington's particular character, in line with all other policy on good design (national and regional).</p> <p>The proposed Park and Ride scheme at South Cliff has been granted planning permission.</p> <p>The 600 dwellings will be distributed throughout the scheme where it is possible to protect residential amenity. They will not be high rise flats and will be sensitively designed to complement and enhance the historic character of Bridlington. The scale of housing proposed is in line with the housing allocation for East Riding required by the Regional Spatial Strategy and the distribution between principle towns as set out in the adopted Joint Structure Plan.</p> <p>The AAP recognises that the coastline views at Bridlington are a major attraction and looks to preserve and enhance this key asset. Any housing development will be required to contribute positively to this area.</p> <p>The AAP recognises the adverse impact of the fun fair in its current location. It may prove feasible in time to concentrate the seasonal seaside activity elsewhere creating an alternative critical mass and visitor destination with good links to the town centre. Meanwhile, policy will seek to achieve a better balance between the seasonal use of the Seafront area and the need to use the Town Centre's best assets</p>

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
					<p>all year round.</p> <p>Leisure World recognised as an important community facility as well as a rainy day activity for visitors. The Council's options for the replacement of a swimming pool are: redevelopment on the current site, a new facility on the edge of the Town Centre or a new facility at South Shore near the new Park and Ride and Land Train.</p> <p>The bridge over Beck Hill enables the Gypsy Race corridor to run through the town centre to the harbour and helps create a more attractive area within the town centre.</p> <p>The importance of public space at Cliff St, Garrison St and Princess St is recognised and redevelopment in this area will provide enhanced public realm. The SPD will show an approach centred on a Winter Garden in the Garrison Square area.</p> <p>The buildings shown on South Cliff Gardens have now been removed from the plans.</p> <p>Recommendation: ensure the Submission Draft is as short as possible and written in Plain English, avoiding all jargon. Ensure the proposals for improving movement and access are clear.</p>
6038	Sup w Cond	Environment Agency – Sam Kipling	Opportunities to more explicitly accord with PPS25, risk of being deemed unsound under Test of Soundness 4B.	Whilst generally supportive of the document there are opportunities for it to more explicitly accord with PPS25: Development and Flood Risk. Whilst areas of high flood probability are relatively constrained in Bridlington, significant risks are posed by flooding from Gypsy Race and from the North Sea, which the policies within the document could	<p>General support for the AAP is welcomed.</p> <p>Detailed comments on ensuring the AAP accords more explicitly with PPS25 are welcomed and recommendations will be</p>

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
			<p>Detailed comments explain what must be changed for the document to pass the tests.</p> <p>Could be considered unsound under Test of Soundness 7, suggest sustainability changes.</p>	<p>do more to manage. Specifically there is no commitment to accord with the Flood Risk Sequential Test as required under PPS25. In the absence of this, the document could be deemed unsound under Test of Soundness 4B. We have the following detailed comments which explain what must be changed for the document to pass the tests:</p> <p><b>Policy BridTC6</b> – s.j must be amended to read ‘flood risk avoidance then mitigation’. This is in line with the Sequential Test required by PPS25.</p> <p><b>Policy BridTC17</b> – some parts of the proposed Burlington Parade development are identified as being at high risk of flooding from either Gypsy Race or from the North Sea. Given that comprehensive development is proposed the policy must be re-worded to include a commitment to avoiding flood risk areas by adopting a Sequential Approach to site layout. This would involve the locating of public open space, play areas and other ‘water compatible’ uses in the flood risk areas, with ‘less vulnerable’ and ‘more vulnerable’ development kept away from these areas. Such an approach should be achievable given the relatively constrained area of flood risk. A new section should be added as follows: “A Sequential Approach to the design and layout of the Burlington Parade development will be taken. This will include the overall avoidance of development in Flood Zones 2 and 3, where possible. In Flood Zones 2 and 3, preference will be given to ‘water compatible uses’, whereas ‘more vulnerable’ developments will not be permitted.”</p> <p><b>Policy BridTC18</b> – some parts of the Marina development are identified as being at high risk of flooding, either from Gypsy Race or from the North Sea. Given that comprehensive development is proposed, the policy must be re-worded to include a commitment to avoiding flood risk areas by adopting a Sequential Approach to site layout. This would involve the locating of ‘water compatible’ uses in the flood risk areas, with ‘less vulnerable’ and ‘more vulnerable’ developments kept away from those areas. Such an approach should be achievable given the relatively constrained area of flood risk. A new section should be added to read as follows: “A Sequential Approach to the design and layout of the Marina development will be taken. This will include the overall avoidance of development in Flood Zones 2 and 3, where possible. In Flood Zones 2 and 3, preference will be given to</p>	<p>incorporated into the submission draft.</p> <p>Necessary changes will be made to the AAP to ensure soundness on sustainability.</p>

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
				<p>'water compatible uses', whereas 'more vulnerable' developments will not be permitted."</p> <p><b>Policy BridTC19</b> – opportunities should be explored to locate areas of public open space and other 'water compatible' uses in flood risk areas. This will help to promote natural drainage, provide additional flood storage and minimise the need for development in areas of high flood probability.</p> <p><b>Policy BridTC20</b> – a number of sections of the seafront are identified as being in areas of high flood probability. Because these areas are relatively constrained, opportunities should be explored to set-back new developments outside these areas. This will help to help provide natural protection against flood events.</p> <p>Other comments</p> <p>At present the document could be considered unsound under Test of Soundness 7. The following change would ensure it is sound on sustainability.</p> <p>Policy BridTC3 – given the government's target of zero carbon homes by 2016 it is important that local policy reflects the need for minimum standards to increase over time, towards the 2016 target. The policy should be amended so that BREEAM and CSH standards increase over time. The CSH levels should follow a similar pattern. In addition to that, the size threshold should also go down over time with standards eventually applying to all development. A similar approach could also be taken to the on-site renewables section of the policy. In the absence of this iterative approach, minimum standards will become quickly outdated and meeting the government's ambitious targets will be unlikely.</p> <p>Should you require any additional information or clarification, please do not hesitate to contact me.</p>	
6041	Obj	Mrs B Bond	Writing to lodge and objection / appeal on property at the corner of Station Approach and	After meeting with you at Leisure World on November 9 <sup>th</sup> and attending a meeting on Thursday 29 <sup>th</sup> November to discuss my personal situation I am now writing to lodge and objection / appeal for the concern of my property which is situated just inside the boundary line of the intended	There is nothing in the AAP that will required that these buildings are necessarily re-developed. Under the proposed planning policies these buildings could remain. The

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
			<p>Quay Road.</p> <p>I am finding it very difficult to find out exactly what the Councils intentions are.</p> <p>I am protesting vigorously to save these buildings.</p> <p>Any compensation would have to cover the very good rental value I am getting.</p>	<p>AAP development that lies between the Railway Station and the town centre development. The property in question is situated on the corner of Station Approach and Quay Road and houses the national estate agents Reeds Rains, a café and a sandwich shop. Above these premises there is a two bedroom apartment and at the rear there is a busy taxi office with a car par area for nine cars. The car park houses parking for all these individual tenants as well as parking for myself and two of my staff which are invaluable as my office is opposite the block in question.</p> <p>My argument is that it is a very aesthetic building and has been recently upgraded to a high standard, winning an award from the Civic Society. Good quality, stylish and attractive are the words you have used in your brochure, my property fits all these specifications. As well as sitting perfectly on the corner in question, it would certainly enhance your potential plans for a retail shopping area. Neither would it affect the proposed entrance of the retail park.</p> <p>I am finding it very difficult to find out exactly what the Councils intentions are, nobody can give me the answers I am looking for and the wording of all your plans for action are so ambiguous that not many people can understand them.</p> <p>I am sure you can understand my concerns as my tenants have leases on these properties and of course my worries are that they may feel the need to relocate, leaving me high and dry with no-one wanting to rent the properties, not knowing of course the outcome of the Councils intentions.</p> <p>Therefore I am protesting vigorously to save these buildings as its madness to knock something down only to put another outlet on the land, when my property would look equally as good as anything that would be put in its place. Of course I haven't touched on the fact that it is my living and my children's inheritance. Any monies that would be offered to compensate me would have to be enormous to bring in the very good rental value I am getting from these properties.</p>	<p>plans for this area will become clearer once a preferred developer is selected.</p>

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
6043	Sup	English Heritage – Ian Smith	<p>Agree with assessment of the likely effects upon the historic environment and mitigation measures suggested.</p> <p>Pleased to note the recognition of the importance of the historic environment.</p> <p>Suggest use of the DCMS fund help culture and arts in seaside resorts.</p>	<p>Thank you for consulting English Heritage about the Bridlington Town Centre Area Action Plan.</p> <p>Given the nature of the AAP being examined, overall, we would agree with the conclusions reached regarding the assessment of the likely effects which the preferred Options might have upon the historic environment. For those adverse effects which have been identified we would agree with the mitigation measures which have been suggested. (Incidentally, on page 12-8 in the “Current Sources of data” column, the references to “Natural England” should read “English Heritage”). If you have any queries about this matter or would like to discuss anything further, please do not hesitate to contact me.</p> <p>We are pleased to note the recognition within the Report of the importance of the historic environment to the character and distinctiveness of this part of East Yorkshire and welcome the role that it is envisaged the heritage assets of the area can play in helping to delivering the Vision for Bridlington. We have the following comments to make on the content of the document:</p> <p><b>Objective 5</b> – welcome the objective to enhance the public realm and public spaces of the town.</p> <p><b>Objective 6</b> – support recognition of the importance of historic environment and contribution which it can make towards achieving the Vision for Bridlington and we welcome the inclusion of a specific objective relating to the conservation and enhancement of the distinctive heritage of the town.</p> <p><b>Para 1.38 Enabling Objectives</b> – in view of Objective 5 and, especially 6, it is surprising that there is no specific enabling objective relating to regeneration through investment in the historic assets of the area. DCMS recently announced a £45m funding boost to help culture and arts regenerate some of our most run-down seaside resorts with investment specifically targeted at disadvantaged coastal resorts around England. Such investment is intended to stimulate wider improvements and economic benefits in the area. Under this scheme CABE is responsible for identifying projects – such as historic high streets and public spaces, galleries or concert halls – where investment in the cultural and heritage infrastructure will help bring life back to run-</p>	<p>Support for the assessment of the likely effects upon the historic environment and mitigation measures suggested is welcomed.</p> <p>Support for enhancing public realm and public spaces is welcomed.</p> <p>Support for recognition of the importance of historic environment, contribution to the vision and specific objective relating to the conservation and enhancement of heritage is welcomed.</p> <p>A bid will be made under the DCMS fund for the Spa environs scheme at the end of October 2008.</p> <p>Support for landscaped public plaza at the Grade2 listed station is welcomed.</p> <p>Support for major new area of open space at Bridge/Queen Street is welcomed. The observation that the utilisation of historic buildings in the areas might warrant examination as a conservation area is noted.</p> <p>Support for retention and protection of listed piers is welcomed.</p> <p>Support for proposed public realm strategy is welcomed.</p> <p>Support for BridTC1 is welcomed. The first line of Criterion (f) will be amended to read “<i>protecting and, where appropriate, enhancing the town’s special character</i>”.</p>

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
				<p>down seaside resorts. Bridlington would appear to be a potential candidate. Indeed, even if a bid is not successful the Council should be reassessing whether parts of the town might warrant Conservation Area status (there are, for example, a considerable number of Listed Buildings around Queen Street which might potentially, form the basis of a Conservation Area). Such areas may benefit from the HLF's Townscape Heritage Initiative Programme – which is currently seeking bids from the region.</p> <p><b>Para 1.44</b> – welcome the proposal to create a landscaped public plaza at the northern end of the scheme. This should help to improve the setting of the Station – a Grade II Listed Building.</p> <p><b>Para 1.47</b> – welcome the prospect of a major new area of open space at Bridge/Queen Street. It is hoped that as part of this proposal, the opportunity will be taken to fully utilise the potential of the numerous historic buildings along Queen Street and Queen's Square. As we have stated above given the number of historic buildings in this part of the town, we consider that it would warrant examination as a Conservation Area.</p> <p><b>Para 1.55</b> – welcome retention and protection of listed piers as a principle feature of the Marina development.</p> <p><b>Para 1.58</b> – support the proposed public realm strategy (particularly the proposals for Station Plaza, and the Town Square at Bridge Street).</p> <p><b>Policy BridTC1</b> – support the overarching strategy outlined in this Policy particularly Criterion (f) relating to the raising of design standards and the protection of the town's historic buildings and their settings. However as part of the strategy should also be a commitment to the enhancement of these assets. It is suggested therefore that the first line of Criterion (f) is amended to read <i>“protecting and, where appropriate, enhancing the town's special character”</i>.</p> <p><b>Policy BridTC3</b> – Whilst we support the thrust of this policy, in terms of Criterion 1, PPS22 states that renewable energy projects should only be granted consent where it can be demonstrated that the objectives of the designation will not be compromised by the development. The justification to this policy should include caveat to this effect. We welcome the recognition within Criterion 4 of the contribution which the reuse of existing buildings (Sub-Criterion (g)) and the safeguarding of the historic environment (Sub-Criterion (l)) makes to environmental sustainability.</p>	<p>Support for the recognition of the contribution that reuse of buildings and safeguarding of the historic environment makes to environmental sustainability is welcomed. The justification of BridTC3 will include a caveat that renewable energy projects should only be granted consent where it can be demonstrated that the objectives of the designation will not be compromised by the development in line with PPS22.</p> <p>Support for measures to ensure development improves the built environment is welcomed.</p> <p>Support for measures to protect and enhance the historic character of the Town Centre is welcomed.</p> <p>Support for considerations that will be used in assessing appropriateness of development is welcomed.</p> <p>Support for high standards of design is welcomed.</p> <p>Support for assessing appropriateness of development is welcomed.</p> <p>Support access and movement proposals is welcomed.</p> <p>Support for use funds to improve public realm is welcomed.</p> <p>Support for Burlington Parade is welcomed.</p>

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
				<p><b>Para 3.27</b> – welcome the measures outlined in this paragraph to ensure that development and change improve the built environment within the Town Centre.</p> <p><b>Para 3.28</b> – welcome the measures to outlined in this paragraph to protect and enhance the historic character of the Town Centre.</p> <p><b>Policy BridTC4</b> – support this policy which will help to ensure high standards of design within that part of the town covered by the AAP and that, where appropriate, schemes will take full account of the context within which they are proposed.</p> <p><b>Policy BridTC6</b> – support this policy which clearly expresses the considerations which the Council will use in assessing appropriateness of development proposals.</p> <p><b>Policy BirdTC14</b> – broadly support access and movement proposals outlined in the justification to this policy especially the initiatives designed to reduce the impact of traffic upon the Town Centre.</p> <p><b>Policy BridTCxx</b> – support this policy particularly the intention to use funds collected under the provisions of this policy to improve public realm within the town.</p> <p><b>Policy BridTC17</b> – generally support the proposals detailed in this policy for the Burlington Parade development. Given the potential scale of work envisaged, in order to ensure that the town's distinctive heritage will not be adversely affected, the Council should, as part of the strategy for this area, undertake an assessment of the character of this part of Bridlington, identifying those aspects which make a positive contribution to its distinctiveness and establishing an appropriate framework, possibly through the designation of a Conservation Area, to ensure that these elements will not be adversely affected by future development proposals.</p> <p><b>Policy BridTC18</b> – support integration in Criterion 1(d) to integrate the harbour and marina area with the remainder of the Town Centre. This is essential if the benefits of the investment in the Harbour are to filter back to the remainder of the town, particularly its historic core. We welcome the intention, as part of Criterion 1(g) to protect the character of the Listed structures within this area. It is important (and also a requirement of national policy guidance) that development proposals also safeguard the setting of these Listed Buildings. Consequently it would be preferable for the first line of Criterion 1(f) to state “the protection of the listed piers and their setting in line with the provisions</p>	<p>The suggestion for an character assessment is noted.</p> <p>Support for the harbour/marina proposals is welcomed. Suggested rewording of BridTC18 1(f) is noted.</p> <p>Support for BridTC19 and Strategic Public Realm Framework elements that benefit listed buildings is welcomed.</p> <p>Support for BridTC20 is welcomed.</p>

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
				<p>of PPG15..."</p> <p><b>Policy BridTC19</b> – support this policy especially reinforcement of the Town Centre’s special character areas and landmarks (Criterion 1(b)(vii)) and protection and celebration of key views and vistas (Criterion 1(e)). We support the specific elements of the Strategic Public Realm Framework detailed in criterion 2, a large number of which will benefit the setting of historic buildings within the area.</p> <p><b>Policy BridTC20</b> – support the proposals for this area of the town particularly Criterion 1(e) relating to the preservation of historic buildings in the area and Criterion (f) the improvements to the public realm.</p>	
6046	Obj	J P Hustwit	<p>Objects to the proposed scheme as it affects home</p> <p>Open space could be a drain on public money.</p> <p>99% of cyclists use the footpaths.</p> <p>I consider my home to be worth in the region of £140,000 at today’s prices.</p>	<p>Further to our (interrupted) conversation at Leisure World on the 9<sup>th</sup> November I would like to put on record my objections to the proposed scheme as it affects my home at 7 Palace Avenue YO15 3AE. Due to the obvious oversight that Palace Avenue is not referred to by name in any of the proposed drafts I was unable to fill in a consultation form but surmise that it is involved in the ‘Black Hole’ created between Beck Hill and The Burlington Parade / Park. The inference being that my home is required to extend the walkway created by, I believe Yorkshire Water at the side of the Gypsy Race. In a bygone age most people appreciated open spaces but with the arrival of the Urban Vandal and Litter Louts (who in practice seem to be above the law) these area’s are a thing of the past unless supervised, thus making them a constant drain on public money. As to extending Cycle Lanes, 99% of cyclists in this town use the footpaths, even ignoring one way streets, the carriageways being used only as a link to the opposite footpath.</p> <p>Since seeing you and hearing the comments made by the woman about her property on Hilderthorpe Road (a house and shop) being undervalued by your valuer I have spent several hours researching property prices. Using the property section in the Free Press also all the online estate agents websites for 4 bedroom terrace / town houses in Bridlington Town Centre. None of which compare to the location of Palace Avenue with its features of a stream with breeding wild ducks and a banked wooded area with squirrels unique and priceless in a Town Centre. Due to these reasons and the fact I am happy and</p>	<p>The Council will continue discussions related to proposed property acquisitions.</p> <p>The re-opened Gypsey Race will be carefully designed to ensure development of a high-quality amenity feature. Concerns regarding the design and upkeep of the Gypsey Race are noted and will be addressed. The AAP outlines the Section 106 Agreement Charges, which will help to finance the development and maintenance of public realm improvements in the Town Centre.</p> <p>The provision of additional cycle facilities could be an important tool in reducing congestion in the Town Centre, by promoting the appeal of non-motorised forms of transport. Enhancing cycle links also conforms to national planning policy, which encourages the development of more sustainable forms of transport.</p> <p>Recommendation: no change to AAP needed.</p>

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
				<p>contented here I am loath to give them up without trying to defend what is my home and castle. Taking into account the price of property on offer in the town and the prices asked, I consider my home to be worth in the region of £140,000 at today's prices. Today's prices of course could fluctuate up or down in the future dependent on how your proposed schemes affect the housing market, if a housing shortage is created prices will obviously rise.</p>	
6047	Sup w cond	Mrs Lynn Walker	<p>Support the majority of the suggested ideas puzzled over why Gypsy Race has been left out.</p> <p>Have a few issues proposals for Springfield Avenue.</p> <p>Worried that work will damage property.</p> <p>Vague maps and forms put people off.</p>	<p>Thank you for inviting me through correspondence to attend the Town Centre Area Action Plan that is at the library. I have looked at the maps, read the literature and was in the process of filling in the consultation form. The form unfortunately is a bit of a waste of paper, as was the map. I think the scheme is very ambitious to say the least and I support the majority of the suggested ideas but I am a little puzzled over why the regeneration of the Gypsy Race has been completely left out (of the consultation form).</p> <p>I have a few issues I hope can be cleared up as the map is no good. I live on Springfield Avenue, very close to the arrow marked on the map, which looks like the pedestrainisation of the Gypsy Race. I need to know if my property will be earmarked for demolition or spared. If it is spared and the road part pedestrianised will Springfield Avenue become a no through road for traffic but still allow residents to park. How do we cross the Gypsy Race to enter Hildethorpe Road presuming the bridge that goes over the Gypsy Race will be removed? Is the entrance to Tesco going to be moved and closed, re-opening at either Springfield Avenue (Quay Road side) or on Quay Road (I can't tell by the map). How long will the demolition process be? Our house suffers greatly from noise pollution and I fear this work will affect our quality of life whilst the Gypsy Race and Burlington Parade is being redeveloped. Do the Council have any grants so that we can soundproof our property whilst the process is happening? If not I would like some kind of compensation so we can move out whilst the work is being completed (temporarily). Our other concern is structural damage caused by vibration and the ground movement. I'm worried that such a vast amount of work will damage our property and make it unsafe of un-sellable. We struggle with insurance due to the flood plain. Please can you help me clarify some of these issues I have so that I can complete</p>	<p>The Gypsy Race has not been left out and forms the basis of the major part of the public realm improvements in the plans. The key features are described in para 1.40 to 1.52. Para 1.58 describes the main components of all public realm and Policy TC19 (para 4.32 to 4.34 sets out the policy in more detail with the main areas shown in Fig.4.3.</p> <p>The current plan looks to take the properties on the 'Tesco' side of Springfield Avenue but not the odd numbered properties to the south of Hilderthorpe Road.</p> <p>The AAP only puts in place the planning polices to allow further development of a particular type and in the absence of a detailed scheme at this stage it is not possible to respond in more detail to some specific concerns.</p> <p>The support for the AAP is welcomed.</p>

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
				<p>the consultation form before the deadline of Monday 10<sup>th</sup> December.</p> <p>The rest of the Area Action Plan is absolutely fantastic and will firmly put Bridlington on the map, hopefully attracting a new market of wealthier visitors. Can't wait.</p> <p>P.S. Keeping maps and forms deliberately vague will put off people who live in the area from taking part in the consultation process, or is this the idea?</p>	
6049	Sup w cond	R.Peter Belt	<p>In general support proposals.</p> <p>Concern over access to car park off Wellington Road to the south.</p> <p>Would like to discuss the possible options along the way.</p>	<p>We are in receipt of the CD-ROM indicating the Bridlington Town Centre Preferred Options Area Action Plan. In general we are in total agreement with the suggested proposals for the development of the town centre, but would initially like to draw to your attention the specific area of concern which affects my Practice, and the future effect that your proposals may have on the viability of the Practice.</p> <p>We own Wellington House and you will see from the letterhead that it is also my Practice offices. At the moment we have a small car park facility between our building and Wycliffe Lane to the west, which runs down the side of Christ Church. The access to the car park is actually off Wellington Road to the south.</p> <p>In Sections 1.58 and 3.28 of the Action Plan you are suggesting that Wellington Road will be closed to traffic and that the Cenotaph Gardens could well be brought up to the front of our building. In many respects we would welcome this action and would consider it an improvement as we consider that the road is sometimes extremely dangerous for pedestrians trying to cross at numerous points. Our only concern is to be able to maintain vehicular access to our car park and to our garage just down Wycliffe Lane. We understand that this idea is perhaps in its infancy and as such has a number of issues to consider in time. We are not yet able to tell exactly what you anticipate doing with Wellington Road and by what method you intend to close it off. The budget costing to the end of the report refers to an amount of £39,000 which, after removing the cost of works to the cenotaph does not leave much for doing anything with the road.</p>	<p>Support for the AAP proposals is welcomed.</p> <p>The concerns over access to the car park and garage down Wycliffe Lane are noted and discussions will take place to develop a solution.</p>

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
				<p>As mentioned earlier we have no objections to this but we have a need to maintain the use of the car park and the access to Wycliffe Lane. We would be grateful if, at some stage, you would provide us with further information as to the method of closure, the use of the area and the anticipated landscaping method. We would ask you to keep a dialogue going so that we can discuss the possible options along the way. A location plan is enclosed showing the position of our office and the entrance position of the car park.</p>	
6050	Obvs	Terry Morrell	<p>AAP un-inspirational but the only vehicle available.</p> <p>Need to promote Bridlington.</p> <p>Without 'creative' industries the economy is inward looking. The main job thrust must come from all year round retail and tourist opportunities.</p> <p>A case for a wider footprint Town Centre Development.</p> <p>Bridlington needs a major attraction to make it different.</p> <p>Railways should be taken out of the equation. The road system a minor consideration nationally. Parking is a problem. A pedestrianisation scheme an urgent need.</p>	<p>The proposals offered in the Area Action Plan (AAP), are by the very nature of the document an uninspirational bland paper with no new ideas, 'step change' initiatives. The few points which emerge are either 'work in progress' or those which have been on the table for some time or so blatantly obvious that they should have been achieved years ago. Having apparently been so critical in my opening paragraph I think that the AAP is not only the greatest opportunity to 'drag' the resort into the 21<sup>st</sup> century but the only vehicle available.</p> <p>Yes, the Spa Complex will be a flagship presentation where Bridlington can present itself to the world with an array of facilities capable of hosting a wide variety of events but I see no mention in the AAP to promote Bridlington. It may be considered to have been 'taken as read' but this is a crucial lynch pin to make the whole thing come to fruition.</p> <p>The Marina is obviously a 'special' anchor project for certain influential members of ERYC and apparently no matter what arguments are put forward it will never be demoted to the 'second tier' priority which its huge cost deserves. How many tourists / businesses / jobs will a marina attract on a wet day in January? Of course, it would be a great icon, something that could be boasted about and flaunted large on all kinds of advertising material but I am afraid 'it would butter no parsnips'. 'Bums on seats' is a much used phrase but translate that to 'visitors all year round' and that means a good steady income for the local economy.</p> <p>Pedestrianisation of the town centre appears as a 'bright star' in the AAP but anyone with any vision must realise that safe freedom of</p>	<p>Support for the AAP as a great opportunity to take Bridlington into the 21<sup>st</sup> Century is welcomed.</p> <p>Promotion of Bridlington is one of the 7 priorities under the IDP and this is now being progressed.</p> <p>The evidence base highlights the interdependence of proposals to develop the town centre, and proposals for a marina. Development at the Harbour of a marina will help to create the conditions that will enable the transformation of the Town Centre. The marina will make it feasible to attract the scale, mix and quality of development in the Town Centre that otherwise would not be possible. Enhancement of the Harbour itself also has considerable potential to aid the Town Centre's regeneration; both enhancing Bridlington as a place where people want to live, work and visit, and improving the commercial prospects of the Harbour's working activities.</p> <p>The AAP intends to enhance pedestrian priority in the Town Centre using a variety of techniques, including the widening of</p>

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
			<p>A dedicated cycle route along the cliffs to Flamborough</p> <p>More consideration needed regarding the resort assets.</p> <p>Management of resources should be reviewed.</p> <p>Serious consideration for the visual and functional improvement of the area along Hilderthorpe Road.</p>	<p>movement for visitors has always been high on the agenda. Alright, Park and Ride (P&amp;R) developments should give car owners a real alternative but town centre parking has long been ignored as an unnecessary intrusion of valuable space for people circulating.</p> <p><b>Demography</b> One has to consider the potential artificial population of the town. Obviously, the resort attracts a large number of people retiring from their working life environment coming to spend their later years by the sea with all its quoted healthy advantages. This creates a growing property market, work for maintenance trades and associated support services. However, without 'creative' industries this economy is inward looking and unable to produce additional and necessary new revenues. At least this older incomer group bring the product of the labours with them in the form of savings and pensions etc. It is the work shy from the industrial conurbations who settle here for the purpose of avoiding employment and be able to continue to receive state funding in the shape of benefits. This is proved by recent events where-by certain local businessmen have been buying traditional 'boarding houses' to house East European immigrants to fill a number of local jobs. The British import situation has been known for some years but not acknowledged by the authorities. How does this situation reflect the stated need for extra employment growth? Obviously, there is always a case to improve career opportunities particularly for younger people especially in the more academic sectors. 'Labouring' skills are not only unattractive but the type of business demanding these skills will not flourish in this area of the country for a number of geographical reasons. It is my belief that apart from a few specialist companies, who may be attracted to the Bessingby site the main job thrust must come from retail and tourist opportunities and these must also be all year round jobs. Seasonal work is not attractive to employers or workers and is not sustainable. This is my main criticism of the Marina project.</p> <p><b>Town Centre Development</b> It may sound contradictorily but there is a case for a wider footprint. Any major development of the periphery of the town will certainly focus an attraction but with the correct direction and transport infrastructure visitors to that site will migrate to the rest of the town where they will</p>	<p>pavements or full pedestrianisation where warranted. The AAP also proposes a package of integrated transport measures, designed to relieve traffic congestion and improve all forms of transport (including public transport, cycling and walking) within the Town Centre, linked by a new transport interchange. Parking provision is also very significantly enhanced with major new public car parks providing a net gain of about 750 spaces.</p> <p><b>Demography</b> One of the main aims of the Town Centre AAP is to create the conditions to enable business growth in Bridlington, by removing the constraints to the market's ability to provide good quality office stock. The AAP also aims to better manage the seasonal surge and encourage additional types of tourist activity, in particular non-seasonal visitor markets. The Marina is interdependent with proposals to redevelop the Town Centre and will make it feasible to attract the scale, mix and quality of development that otherwise would not be possible.</p> <p><b>Town centre development</b> The area for the AAP has been carefully considered and is considered appropriate. The development in the town centre will be supported a marketing strategy for Bridlington.</p> <p><b>Traffic</b></p>

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
				<p>spend both time and money. My previous suggestion, Bridlington Expo was a perfect example (though not the only option). The outcome of the AAP must realise that Bridlington is not the only resort, either coastal or inland in reach of the major population centres, and consequently needs a major attraction to make it different and create the necessary difference when people start to think where they are going to make their destination for a day, weekend, or overnight outing. It might sound like a 'mackerel to catch a sprat' but Bridlington can do with lots of both. ERYC will say that everything I have proposed can be accommodated in the new Spa complex but may I suggest that the Spa has a much more focused function, namely conferences, musical productions, small shows (railway exhibitions, art, or craft fairs) and sporting events, particularly with the anticipated demise of the Three Bs complex. A rolling programme of exhibitions of National quality standard to attract a regular and anticipated clientele. Supported by a heavy advertising programme this would generate that focus and be the 'step change' required, and be much more effective than a Marina. Numerous regular visitors, the year round would then attract National Chain Stores and together all of this would be the necessary catalysis for an economic recovery.</p> <p><b>Traffic</b></p> <p>1. Although traffic is the vehicle for future economic growth it obviously does pose its own problems. I refer to these in no particular order. Railway - Unless the rail companies can be persuaded to operate special excursion at attractive prices it is inconceivable that this form of transport will never again be attractive to the masses. Creating restrictive problems for motorists will not change this situation but will only deter visitors. Therefore, railways should be taken out of the equation.</p> <p>2. The road system leading to the resort is, and will remain a minor consideration compared to the national priority requirements. Therefore, little can be done or expected in this arena. ERYC can only press for the elimination of 'black-spots' and cheap measures where awkward bend, etc, can be removed easily and at little expense.</p> <p>3. Parking is, and will remain a problem irrespective of whatever measures are imposed. However, Park and Ride (P&amp;R) facilities will only be welcomed by motorists if the price is right and the support</p>	<p>1. Measures proposed in the AAP are designed to relieve traffic congestion and improve all forms of transport (including public transport, cycling and walking) within the Town Centre, linked by a new transport interchange. The movement and access strategy is designed to reduce traffic congestion in the Town Centre through better management of traffic flows.</p> <p>2. Comment on the road system is noted but improvements to roads outside of Bridlington are not part of the remit of the Town Centre AAP.</p> <p>3. The AAP makes provision for additional car parking facilities within the Town Centre including multi-storey car parks providing a net gain of about 750 spaces. Changes are proposed to the directional signage in Bridlington, with the aim of separating, before it gets close to the Town Centre, the traffic that is destined for the Town Centre, from traffic that is destined to points north or south of the town. Provision is also made to divert traffic from the Town Centre to a park and ride facility at South Shore.</p> <p>4. The movement and access strategy is designed to reduce traffic congestion in the Town Centre and improve the pedestrian environment.</p> <p>5. Comment on cycle route to Flamborough Head is noted but this area falls outside the remit of the Town Centre AAP.</p> <p><b>Resort Assets</b></p> <p>New development on the Seafront will return the area to non-seasonal and a wider mix of</p>

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
				<p>transport is adequate in comfort, frequency and time constraints. Also, besides P&amp;R 'short stay' town centre parking needs a serious review. Multi-storey and both off- street and on-street parking are situations which require an 'external consultant' review as this subject needs a fresh vision other than that of ERYC to achieve the best results. There is considerable scope for a 'one-way traffic routing system', single side echelon street parking and through routing of non essential traffic.</p> <p>4. Integrated with this review a serious pedestrianisation scheme must be an urgent need. The main town centre area only requires access for delivery vans prior to 10 am and public transport and emergency vehicles until 6 pm. A recent event closing Bridge St has already shown the possibilities.</p> <p>5. Sustrans recent proposal for a dedicated cycle route along the cliffs to Flamborough is a welcome diversion and should be seriously encouraged. If the Lottery grant is eventually not forthcoming then consideration for inclusion into any AAP must be incorporated.</p> <p><b>Resort assets</b></p> <p>As well as developing new proposals there needs to be much more consideration regarding those benefits which already exist and are being neglected.</p> <p>The Beach -This is probably the finest stretch of sand along the East Coast and consequently attracts many visitors in its own right particularly at weekends, Bank Holidays and school children's holiday periods. However, the weather is not always dry and when it rains there is no shelter for the families to seek protection from the rain which can be sudden and fierce. There is a great need for adequate cover along all of the promenades. This problem of protection from inclement weather is even more of a problem throughout the all the whole of the resort. Apart from two or three large stores, the new Promenade Arcade and expensive amusement establishments there is nowhere to find any form of relief in bad conditions. Consequently, if the weather forecast is poor people simply never set off for Bridlington. If the weather turns nasty then visitors simply make a hasty retreat to their cars and vow never to return.</p> <p>Promenades, etc - Maintenance of pavements, re-constituted marble surfaces, walls, pools, features and other property is essential. The promenades from the Spa, thru Princess Mary and onto Pitts Wall is an</p>	<p>activities, taking advantage of the exceptional position over the sea and Harbour. The Town Centre SPD will set out one comprehensive option for responding to the changes and opportunities in the area showing an approach to redevelopment which creates a mix of residential, hotel and ground floor leisure uses, centred on a new 'winter garden' in the Garrison Square area. Many of the proposed, year-round uses will incorporate appropriate shelter. The AAP recognises the importance of improving public realm and outlines the Section 106 Agreement Charges, which will help to finance its development and maintenance in the Town Centre. The AAP recognises the adverse impact of the fun fair in its current location. It may prove feasible in time to concentrate the seasonal seaside activity elsewhere creating an alternative critical mass and visitor destination with good links to the town centre. Meanwhile, policy will seek to achieve a better balance between the seasonal use of the Seafront area and the need to use the Town Centre's best assets all year round.</p> <p><b>Best Use of Resources</b></p> <p>Comments are noted but this is not within the remit of the AAP.</p> <p><b>The Best Points</b></p> <p>Support is for the recognition of a need for year round tourist attractions is welcomed. The focus on the Town Centre will enable improvements to the whole of Bridlington.</p>

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
				<p>utter disgrace. Damage caused by skateboarding, vehicles, etc, has created a situation which has been ignored.</p> <p>Harbour Top - The intrusion of the densely packed Fun Fair rides and the loss of the Floral Hall and flower beds has certainly changed Bridlington from a place of relaxation into a poor cheap mimic of Blackpool. Even Scarborough isolated their fair rides into a separate compound away from the main strip at the far end. No doubt, this situation will be blamed upon the previous Humberside C C but what is being done to try to change it? Recently, ERYC agreed to add to the problem by authorising the 'Bid Wheel'. May be, recent financial constraints may solve this sooner rather than later. Suggestions from residents took a long time to be accepted in the 'war against chewing gum and the encouragement of property owners to improve the fascias of their buildings. However, is enough being done?</p> <p><b>Best use of resources</b> Examples of this can be seen throughout the year. On the first weekend in December motorised street cleaning vehicles were seen along the front at 9 am in pouring rain. This summer the beach tractor man has been sweeping the beach in a dire effort to get finished before the tide covers his tracks, waste management men and vehicles are regularly seen repeating tours of bins that were emptied only the previous evening and obviously never reused in the in-between. These and many other situations are incorrect use of precious resources. Management of finite resources needs to be seriously reviewed in any future development programme.</p> <p><b>The best points</b> The fact the AAP recognises a need for all year tourist attractions. Serious consideration for the visual and functional improvement of the area along Hilderthorpe Road by the (hopeful) acquisition and demolition of poor property to create a new and extended town. It is a pity that this venture is not far more reaching with a huge central retail core, including hotel, recreational, leisure and people space. A major project encompassing Hilderthorpe Rd, Bridge St Prince Street and Beck Hill could fulfil such an objective. This could also encompass The Gypsy Race as a feature. Whatever is decided and how much of anyone's comments and ideas are accepted or discarded (for whatever</p>	<p>Additionally the areas referred to (Hilderthorpe Rd, Bridge St Prince Street and Beck Hill) are all within the AAP area and significant retail, residential, recreational, leisure and public space is proposed. The Gypsy Race, with adjoining landscaping, will be a key feature of the AAP providing a logical spine and a very appealing pedestrian environment and development setting, making use of under- and ineffectively used land and property.</p> <p>Recommendation: no change needed.</p>

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
				reason) I sincerely hope that ERYC and its Officers find a genre of help in the final plan. Bridlington deserves a much better fate than it currently enjoying.	
6052	Obvs	West Street Area Regeneration Group – Ray Gainey	Concerned about the lack of thought and investment in the area adjacent to the Spa and proposed marina between Windsor Crescent and Hornsforth Avenue.	Our Association recognise that consultation on the AAP expired on the 10 <sup>th</sup> December 2007. However, we are a new Association and have only looked at the proposals recently. We are extremely concerned about the lack of thought and investment in the area adjacent to the Spa and proposed marina between Windsor Crescent and Hornsforth Avenue and believe that the lack of investment could result in the further deterioration of an area already much in need of regeneration. We therefore wish to register this concern before the deadline. Our Association will discuss the AAP at its next meeting to be held on 11 <sup>th</sup> December 2007.	Observations noted.  Meetings between the Council and West Street Area Regeneration Group are on-going. Whilst the redevelopment of the West Street Area does not form part of the AAP this area will benefit for the re-opening of the Spa and new town centre uses.
6053	Sup w cond	Yorkshire and Humber Assembly – Jenny Poxon	Officer comments to highlight where issues related to general conformity with the Regional Spatial Strategy might arise.  General Conformity with the Regional Spatial Strategy  Welcome the explanation of the RSS in Appendix 3 but feel this would be more useful at the start.  Vision and strategic objectives of the AAP are consistent with the Core Approach of the RSS.  Should note changing	The Yorkshire and Humber Assembly welcomes the opportunity to comment on the Area Action Plan (AAP) Preferred Options document for Bridlington Town Centre and to continue its involvement in the development of a coherent spatial planning framework for the region. The comments offered in this letter are intended to be within the spirit of continued and productive joint working.  At this stage, the Assembly's response to the consultation document is a set of officer comments. The aim is to highlight where issues related to general conformity with the Regional Spatial Strategy might arise. When the AAP is submitted to the Secretary of State a formal Assembly view on its general conformity with the Regional Spatial Strategy will need to be given.  The following officer comments are made in relation to the existing Regional Spatial Strategy for Yorkshire & the Humber (based on the selective review of RPG12 issued in December 2004), the Draft Regional Spatial Strategy – the Yorkshire and Humber Plan (submitted to the Secretary of State in December 2005) and The Secretary of State's Proposed Changes to the Yorkshire and Humber Plan (September 2007). Government guidance (paragraph 4.19 in PPS12) states: "Where the regional spatial strategy...has been through an	The importance of highlighting 'general conformity' between the RSS and the AAP is noted. The submitted AAP will highlight the need for there to be 'general conformity' between the RSS and the AAP.  Support for the vision and strategic objectives of the AAP is welcomed.  Potential population and household projections are noted. The AAP will take these into account where necessary.  The potential increase in provision of dwellings is noted. The AAP will take this into account where necessary.  Potential changes to job projections are noted. The AAP will take this into account where necessary.  The AAP will contribute to the employment

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
			<p>national and regional context to population and household projections.</p> <p>Should ensure contribution to employment land needs.</p> <p>Proposed Policy BridTC10 is consistent with national policy and the RSS. Would like additional transport-orientated element.</p>	<p>Examination in Public, and the proposed changes have been published, considerable weight may be attached to that strategy because of the strong possibility that it will be published in that form by the Secretary of State”.</p> <p>As the Proposed Changes are now published, Assembly responses to consultations on DPDs need to make it clear how the Proposed Changes impact on the policies quoted and to point out to local authorities that ‘considerable weight’ will need to be attached to them by the decision-making body and by Inspectors at Examinations of DPDs. At the same time, it will be important to note that the Assembly itself will be making comments on the Proposed Changes and that the final version of the new RSS is expected early in 2008.</p> <p>Both the existing and draft Regional Spatial Strategies aim to achieve a more sustainable pattern and form of development, investment and activity across the region, putting a greater emphasis on matching needs across the region with opportunities and managing the environment as a key resource. There is a particular emphasis on achieving the regeneration and renaissance of the region’s city and town centres by making them the focus for housing, employment, shopping, leisure, education, health and cultural activities and facilities in the region (for example Policy P1, existing RSS, December 2004 and Policy YH5, Draft RSS, December 2005).</p> <p>I trust that the comments contained in Annex A are helpful to you as you prepare the Bridlington Town Centre Area Action Plan for submission to the Secretary of State. If you wish to discuss any of the points made here please do not hesitate to get in touch. We look forward to continuing to work with you on your Area Action Plan.</p> <p>General Conformity with the Regional Spatial Strategy</p> <p>As you know, the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 introduced mechanisms to help ensure that Development Plan Documents (DPDs) drawn up by local authorities as part of the Local Development Framework (LDF) are in general conformity with the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS). The intention is to ensure that DPDs</p>	<p>land needs of the district and support economic diversification.</p> <p>Introduction of additional transport-orientated element to the sequential approach of Policy BridTC10.</p>

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
				<p>are contributing to the delivery of the RSS and that the two strands of the Development Plan for an area (the RSS and DPDs) are mutually supportive and not in conflict. It will be important in the submitted Bridlington Town Centre Action Plan to highlight the need for there to be 'general conformity' between the RSS and the Area Action Plan, to ensure that the two strands of the development plan are mutually supportive. We welcome the explanation of the RSS in Appendix 3 but feel this would be more useful at the start of the document. This would also help to put into context references to the RSS made throughout the document.</p> <p>Vision and Objectives</p> <p>Draft RSS identifies Bridlington as a Principal Service Centre within the region's settlement network. It should be noted that the Secretary of State's Proposed Changes to the Draft RSS introduces a change in terminology, renaming Principal Service Centres as Principal Towns. Policy YH6 A states that Principal Towns should be the main local focus for housing, employment, shopping, leisure, education, health and cultural activities and facilities. Part B of Policy YH6 seeks to enhance the roles of Principal Towns as accessible and vibrant places to live, work and invest.</p> <p>Policy YH7 relates specifically to rural and coastal areas and seeks to protect and enhance rural and coastal areas as attractive and vibrant places and communities, providing quality of place and excellent environmental, economic and social resource. The policy seeks to ensure that all plans, strategies, investment decisions and programmes achieve a high standard of design; support innovative means of accessing and delivering services; retain and improve local services and facilities; support economic diversification and meet locally generated needs for market and affordable housing.</p> <p>The Assembly considers that the vision and strategic objectives of the AAP are consistent with the Core Approach of the RSS. In particular, objective 1, which seeks to reinvigorate the Town Centre's year round offer to meet the needs of its residents and businesses reinforces the RSS' transformational agenda and approach to coastal areas.</p>	

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
				<p>Population and Housing</p> <p>The Local Authority should note the following changing national and regional context to population and household projections, which may have an impact on the estimated figures for Bridlington. The 2004-based sub national population projections released by ONS suggest a population increase of 35,400 between 2006 and 2016 in the East Riding of Yorkshire. Initial work commissioned by the Assembly on migration shows that the 2006-based national population projections (yet to be disaggregated to the sub national level) could equate to an increase of 19% between 2006 and 2029 for the Humber sub region compared to the 14% increase predicted by the 2004-based projections. Household projections calculated by the Department for Communities and Local Government (using the initial 2004-based projections) show an additional 25,000 households in East Riding by 2016. The expected increase in household growth between 2004 and 2029 is 41%. The differences between the 2004 and 2006 based population figures will have a significant impact on the household projections. It is probable that the next set of household projections, once published by CLG, will show a similar increase. The analysis of migration trends in the region show that the East Riding will see an average rate of net internal migration of 4,200 people per year and an average inflow of 1,700 international migrants per annum. It should be noted that these figures represent trend-based scenarios and do not account for policy or other interventions.</p> <p>Draft RSS sets a net housing provision target for East Riding of 1150 dwellings per annum for the whole of the plan period from 2004 to 2021. This gives a total figure of 19,550. The approach to housing provision in the Humber sub region reflects a policy of strategic restraint in the rural areas north of the Humber to support the transformation of Hull and the Gateway Hull East Riding Pathfinder programme. The approach also seeks to support for role of the Principal Towns and the regeneration of Bridlington. The Proposed Changes to the RSS retains the annual figure of 1150 dwellings but extends the plan period through to 2026, increasing the total amount of provision to 25,300 dwellings.</p> <p>Jobs and Employment Land</p>	

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
				<p>It is noted that the AAP estimates a need for an additional 2,900 jobs by 2016 and 2,000 – 4,000m2 of office floor space. Draft RSS predicts 123,198 FTE in East Riding in 2005/6, rising to 126,700 in 2010 and 132,800 in 2016. The job growth and employment land forecasts in the Proposed Changes to the RSS are based on a 2007 Scenario D run-off of the Regional Econometric Model. Proposed Changes forecasts potential annual job growth in the East Riding to be 760. Draft RSS forecasts the change in B1 employment land between 2006 and 2016 in the East Riding to be approximately 9-17 hectares. Draft RSS gives district level guidance for employment land requirements and states that for the Humber Estuary districts, there is a need to ensure that the employment land portfolio offer seeks to capitalise on opportunities from the Humber Ports and the port logistics cluster. The Proposed Changes gives a figure of 20 hectares for the potential net change in industrial and storage/distribution land in the East Riding. The guidance on employment land provided by the Proposed Changes states that in the East Riding and Hull there is a need to review current allocations, taking account of the role of Hull as a Regional City and the need to facilitate port-related development and urban transformation. There is also a need for sites for an appropriate scale of development for rural diversification focussed on the Principal Towns. The Local Authority should ensure that the Area Action Plan contributes to the employment land needs of the district, particularly the need to support economic diversification.</p> <p>Location of Development and the Siting of Town Centre Uses</p> <p>Policy YH8 of draft RSS provides guidance on the location of development within settlements. Part A states that the allocation of land for new development will be concentrated in the Regional Cities and Sub Regional Cities and Towns followed by sufficient development in the Principal Towns to enable them to fulfil their service centre role. Limited development is allowed in Local Service Centres with a focus on meeting local needs. Part B of the policy advocates a sequential approach which gives first priority to the re-use of previously developed land and buildings and the more effective use of existing developed areas within the centres identified in Part A; second priority to other suitable infill opportunities within these centres and third priority to</p>	

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
				<p>planned growth areas on the periphery of or well related, in public transport route terms, to these centres. Part C of Policy YH8 requires local planning authorities to adopt a transport orientated approach when identifying sites for development. Proposed Changes to RSS suggests amendments to Policy YH8 but does not remove its focus on the sequential approach to allocating sites for and determining the location of development.</p> <p>Proposed Policy BridTC10 is consistent with national policy and the RSS however the Assembly would like to see an additional transport-orientated element introduced to the sequential approach of the policy.</p>	
6054	Sup w cond	Yorkshire Forward – John Pilgrim	<p>AAP generally well aligned to the Regional Economic Strategy</p> <p>Support Policy BridTC11, Policy BridTC18, Policy BridTC7 and BridTC12.</p> <p>There is a need for evidence of a lack of demand for town centre office development</p> <p>need to carefully manage the impact of the relocation of major retailers</p> <p>Needs to be confirmed who will complete the sustainability checklist.</p> <p>we welcome BridTC4 which seeks to provide high standards of design with RES para 3.125.</p>	<p>Thank you for seeking Yorkshire Forward's comments on the above document. We welcome the opportunity to comment on local planning policy formulation within the Yorkshire and Humber region as part of our role as a statutory consultee. Yorkshire Forward is pleased to be working with East Riding of Yorkshire Council in the development of projects that aim to achieve the renaissance of Bridlington. The Bridlington Town Centre Area Action Plan (AAP) Preferred Options is generally well aligned to the Regional Economic Strategy (RES), we particularly support;</p> <p>Policy BridTC11: which promotes office development in the Town Centre, particularly Burlington Parade in line with the sequential test. This is in line with RES objective 6b(i), which seeks to 'deliver high quality, integrated renaissance programmes in all our major cities and towns'. However the accessibility criteria laid out in both the current and emerging RSS should be used when locating all new development, including B1 office uses to improve access and promote sustainable modes of transport.</p> <p>Policy BridTC18 (Bridlington Marina): Yorkshire Forward recognises the regeneration benefits that will result from the redevelopment of the marina and the opportunities identified within the document to link the proposed new marina with the rest of the town centre. Therefore we support the objectives outlined in the policy which are in line with RES objective 6b(i), which seeks to 'deliver high quality integrated renaissance programmes in all our major cities and towns'.</p>	<p>Support for BridTC 11, 18, 7 &amp; 12 is welcomed.</p> <p>Support for the recognition that the investment in the Spa should stimulate a better choice / standard of hotel is welcomed.</p> <p>The need to carefully manage the impact of the relocation of major retailers is noted.</p> <p>Reference will be made to how the public realm can support and promote new uses.</p> <p>Support for the adoption of local planning policy encouraging energy efficiency and renewable energy generation is welcomed.</p> <p>At submission stage it will be confirmed who will complete the sustainability checklist and how it will be compiled.</p> <p>Strengthening the sustainability policy by reference to promoting CHP will be considered.</p> <p>BridTC5 2(g) will be rephrased to improve</p>

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
			<p>Policy BridTC19 should reference the importance of high quality public realm.</p>	<p>Policy BridTC7 (mixed use developments): with particular reference to the need for active streets and public spaces and the importance of encouraging appropriate uses within the town centre to support this. Well designed mixed use developments can reduce the need to travel and therefore reduce car use, which is inline with RES objective 5d(i), which seeks to 'deliver projects that reduce and mitigate greenhouse gas emissions'.</p> <p>The commitment to providing affordable housing on all major housing developments within policy BridTC12, as this is in line with RES objective 6c(iii) which seeks to 'tackle access to transport, services and affordable housing'.</p> <p>However we have identified several areas within the consultation document where amendments could be made to further support the implementation of the RES, develop best practice or rectify inconsistencies within the plan. The following comments and suggested amendments are made in response to Yorkshire Forward's role as a statutory consultee on planning policy in Yorkshire and the Humber rather than as a partner in the development of the project.</p> <p>Objective 1, para 1.17 – there is a need for evidence to be provided that demonstrates there is a lack of demand for office development within the town centre and that incorporating office development into mixed use schemes improves the viability of office development. An assessment of the demand for office development from existing businesses and overseas investment.</p> <p>Hotels – we welcome the recognition that investment in the Spa should stimulate a better choice and standard of hotel by increasing the Spa's competitiveness in markets that require overnight stays. Yorkshire Forward has invested £3.94m in the refurbishment and redevelopment of the Bridlington Spa. The Spa project will provide new conferencing facilities aimed at attracting large conferences which will require supporting accommodation. Conferences tend to require a large hotel that the majority of delegates will stay at. The rationale is, therefore, that once the Spa is opened this will provide more confidence to private sector hotel operators to invest in the town and since the Spa project is</p>	<p>consistency between the policies of the AAP.</p> <p>The value of the RIBA Design Competition / Design Panels / Advisors is recognised. More detailed design guidance will be contained within the SPD.</p> <p>Further detail on the public realm, quality of materials and street furniture will be included within the SPD</p> <p>The proposed addition to para 4.47 will be considered in the next draft of the AAP.</p>

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
				<p>just one part of the wider renaissance of the town, this will in turn further reduce the risk to hotel operators as Bridlington becomes a more sought after destination.</p> <p>Primary Shopping Area – the opportunities presented by the potential relocation of major retailers is clearly recognised in the AAP. As part of this, there is a need to carefully manage the impact of the relocation of major retailers from their existing locations which should be considered in tandem with the development of the Burlington Parade scheme. There needs to be a reference back to the strategic public realm plan to identify how the development of public realm can support and promote new uses as described in 3.14.</p> <p>Policy BridTC3 – Objective 5c(ii) of the RES seeks to ‘promote energy security and reduced fossil fuel dependency by more energy efficiency and clean and renewable energy generation’. Therefore we strongly support the adoption of local planning policy that encourages where practicable, energy efficiency and renewable energy generation in new development. Yorkshire Forward encourages the highest sustainable construction targets in the development of projects. Therefore we welcome the Council’s commitment to achieving BREEAM ‘very good’ and CSH 3 as a minimum. We also welcome the recognition of the importance of design in achieving sustainable development outcomes, for example layout, building orientation, locating, massing and development mix. In addition we welcome the reference to a minimum of 10% of energy from on-site renewable sources / decentralised renewables / low carbon energy supply. At the submission stage of the AAP it will need to be confirmed who will complete the sustainability checklist and how it will be compiled. As an appropriate set of sustainability criteria on developments within the AAP area this would have the potential to contribute towards reducing the Region’s target of reducing greenhouse gas emissions by 20-25% by 2016. The sustainability policy could be strengthened by reference to promoting the use of CHP if this can be facilitated anywhere in the AAP area. This would provide consistency with RSS draft policy ENV5 and RES objective 5c(ii) which seeks to reduce fossil fuel dependency by more energy efficiency and clean and renewable energy generation. CHP schemes have significant potential to reduce greenhouse gas</p>	

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
				<p>emissions and have been highlighted as a key action within the Regional Energy Infrastructure Strategy (2007). It is important that the AAP takes appropriate account of the actions identified in the Regional Energy Infrastructure Strategy. To improve consistency between the policies in the AAP it would be helpful to rephrase Policy BridTC5 2(g) to read 'environmental sustainability, in accordance with BridTC3'. It may also be appropriate to consider the potential for renewables in accordance with PPS22. The AAP should consider utility provision throughout the AAP, this supports RES Objective 5c(i), which seeks to 'make the most of private sector utilities and infrastructure development – including water and energy and join it up with renaissance programmes'.</p> <p>Design – we welcome BridTC4 (Design and Built Environment) which seeks to provide high standards of design throughout the AAP area. This supports the Bridlington Urban Renaissance Town Charter 2005 however there is scope to recognise the value of the Royal Institute of British Architects (RIBA) Design Competition/Design Panels/Advisors in creating places of contemporary architecture. There is also scope to add the following bullets within point 2 of BridTC4: the treatment of shop frontages and shutters, the use of colours and textures, the regard for the retention and enhancement of key vistas. The addition of these points is inline with RES para 3.125, which states that: 'retail can change the fortunes and image of a town or city. The renaissance approach will focus on quality retail that add to the shopping experience in existing towns, including independent retailers and interesting, individual designs and landscapes that prevent centres from becoming bland and samey'.</p> <p>Policy BridTC19 (Public Realm in the Town Centre and Strategic Public Realm Framework) should include a reference to the importance of high quality public realm, including the use of high quality materials and street furniture.</p> <p>The following should be added to para 4.47 – policy is needed to 'create a framework for design that will create a character area that will be distinctive from, but complementary to, the proposed Harbour Plaza'.</p>	

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
				<p>Finally, I hope the above comments are helpful in shaping the Bridlington Town Centre AAP and look forward to future opportunities for involvement in the Local Development Framework preparation process. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any comments or queries regarding this response.</p>	
6055	Sup w cond	Highways Agency – Sarah Watson- Quirk	<p>The Highways Agency supports the strategic objectives of the AAP.</p> <p>Sustainable modes of transport should be encouraged.</p> <p>Major projects should be heavily supported by travel plans and sustainable transport solutions.</p>	<p>Thank you for your letter dated 26th October 2007 providing the Highways Agency (henceforth referred to as the Agency) with the opportunity to comment on the above document. The Agency has reviewed the document provided and has the following comments to make.</p> <p>As you may be aware the Agency has responsibility for managing and operating the Strategic Road Network [SRN] in England on behalf of the Secretary of State for Transport [SoST]. Amongst other activities the Agency is responsible for considering the potential impacts on the safe and efficient operation of the SRN that result from development proposals and initiatives. The area covered by the Bridlington Town Centre AAP does not directly include any of the SRN; however, the Agency is interested in any development proposals which potentially could impact on the SRN. As Bridlington is a tourist destination there is the potential for any major development to attract more visitors via the SRN.</p> <p>The Agency supports the strategic objectives of the AAP set out to transform Bridlington and provide a year round offering to those working in and visiting the area. With regards to Proposed Policy BridTC 14 the Agency would support the proposals to improve access to and movement around Bridlington. However, with regards to Proposed Policy BridTC 15, the AAP as provided includes options for providing around 750-775 additional car parking spaces in the AAP area. While the Agency supports the regeneration of the area, it is considered that sustainable development should be encouraged and therefore to reduce traffic congestion, trips into the area should be heavily promoted by sustainable modes of transport, rather than by the private car.</p>	<p>Support for the strategic objectives of the AAP is welcomed.</p> <p>Support for Proposed Policy BridTC14 is welcomed.</p> <p>Observation on promotion of sustainable modes of transport is noted. The AAP proposes a package of integrated transport measures, designed to relieve traffic congestion and improve all forms of transport (including public transport, cycling and walking) within the Town Centre, linked by a new transport interchange.</p> <p>The major projects will be supported by integrated transport measures.</p> <p>The Highways Agency will continue to be consulted throughout the development of the AAP.</p>

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
				<p>The Agency recognises the proposals for the following major projects: Burlington Parade (the Town Centre Development Scheme); Bridlington Marina; Public Realm in the Town Centre and the Strategic Public Realm Framework and The Town Centre Seafront. The Agency would suggest that all of these proposals should be heavily supported by travel plans and sustainable transport solutions to ensure that the traffic impacts are minimised. The Agency would also like to be consulted as early as possible on the major project proposals, as they are developed, so that the potential impact on the SRN can be identified.</p> <p>I trust these comments are helpful, please do not hesitate to contact me should you have any further questions and I look forward to hearing from you in the future with regards to the development of further LDF documents.</p>	
6056	Sup	Bridlington and District Civic Society	<p>Express support for the aims and aspirations of the AAP.</p> <p>Have no comments to make on specific aspects at the moment.</p>	<p>The members and committee of our Society have had several opportunities to consider the above AAP. A number of our members are actively involved in the various Regeneration Forums such as the Town Team, which has been instrumental in developing some of the ideas involved. As such we wish to express our support for the aims and aspirations of the AAP. We have no comments to make on specific aspects at the moment. We consider it more appropriate to make comment at the later, more detailed, planning stage.</p>	<p>Support for the aims and aspirations of the AAP is welcomed.</p>
	Sup w cond	Government Office for Yorkshire and The Humber – Alastair McIntyre	<p>Suggest particular consideration to the Planning Inspectorate's tests of soundness and guidance from them.</p> <p>Consider reducing or amalgamating sections and bringing various elements together for clarity.</p>	<p>Thank you for consulting the Government Office on the Bridlington Area Action Plan and accompanying documents. I enclose our comments on the Preferred Options consultation document. They are made without prejudice to anything we may say at any later stage in the process. The comments are intended to help you prepare a document which is sound when it reaches submission stage. We suggest you give particular consideration in further stages of the DPDs preparation to the Planning Inspectorate's tests of soundness and to guidance from them arising from their early experiences of examining DPDs ('Local Development Frameworks: Lessons Learnt Examining Development Plan Documents, June 2007). The PAS Core Strategy Guidance and their soundness self-assessment toolkit should also be helpful.</p>	<p>The Council welcomes the comments and suggestions of the Government Office for Yorkshire and The Humber.</p> <p>The Council takes the view that there are compelling benefits to be gained from elevating objectives in policy: the policy objectives are what constitute the AAP's strategy; they clarify its purposes, minimising uncertainty as to the purposes of the AAP as part of the Development Plan; and their inclusion aids the AAP's flexibility.</p>

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
			<p>Consider building on Vision. Need to be clearer on role of the evidence base.</p> <p>Needs to be clearer on role of Tesco site.</p> <p>Suggest amendments to BridTC1, BridTC3, BridTC7, BridTC9, BridTC10, BridTC12, BridTC15, BridTC16, BridTC17, BridTC18 and BridTC20.</p> <p>SA should be integral to the whole process.</p> <p>No indication of how SA informed choices.</p> <p>Should PG13 be brought into movement and parking strategy? AAP will need sufficient flexibility for the new RSS</p>	<p>General Comments</p> <p>The document is comprehensive in length. PPS12 para 2.2 says that local development documents should be succinct and I think you should try to make it more concise for submission. Areas that you might consider reducing or amalgamating include sections 1 and 2 where the summary of proposals and evidence base material anticipate the later more detailed material. Elements of the evidence base material in particular overlap with polices and accompanying text in section 3 and 4 where it might be more appropriate anyway?</p> <p>Following on from this point you will want to consider the presentation of your submission document, particularly structure and scope. In the preferred options document, information on the evidence base, conformity, delivery and monitoring are all covered in separate sections. You might want to consider whether the linkages between them are adequately brought out. You could for example, think about bringing the various elements together more for greater clarity, with each policy summarising the key elements of the evidence base and conformity requirements and addressing delivery and monitoring issues? The SA results could be brought in (see further below). See also the comments below about the evidence base.</p> <p>Detailed Comments</p> <p><b>Town Centre AAP</b> – The Vision with its emphasis on Bridlington as a great place to live, is well articulated though it seems short at only 11 words. You might want to think whether you need to build upon it in order to make it more locally distinctive and provide a robust basis for the strategic objectives.</p> <p><b>The Evidence Base Summarised</b> – P20 para 2.1 refers to the sources of the evidence base as summarised in s.2. You could be clearer about whether this is exhaustive or an indication of the key components. In presentational terms it may be helpful to set out, possibly in tabular format, the different strands or studies which have fed in to the evidence base with cross references to issues, objectives and polices they relate to. The document says on page 21 para 2.5 that the relationships between the different parts of the evidence base are set</p>	<p>This flexibility derives from allowing for changes in circumstances and unforeseen development proposals to be assessed against the policy objectives, with the possibility of departing from the specific development proposals and delivery targets anticipated by the AAP, but with no loss to the integrity of the AAP's purposes (its objectives).</p> <p>The Council agrees that policies should also be criteria-based and succinctly drafted.</p> <p>The Council accepts the suggestion that the AAP should clarify how risks to the delivery of the strategy would be assessed and will do this.</p> <p>With regards to Proposed Policy TC7 the Council agrees with the suggestion that the policy should have greater local content and precision in its wording.</p> <p>In relation to the wording of Proposed Policy BridTC9 and cross references to policies the Council agrees that this is more appropriate in text rather than policy and will amend the AAP accordingly.</p> <p>The AAP will be amended so the target housing figure for the plan period is included in the policy and not just text. The AAP will also be clear on how this figure fits with the RSS requirement and the East Riding trajectory.</p> <p>In relation to providing a justification for the number of parking spaces the Council recognises this point and promotes a</p>

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
				<p>out in full in the regeneration strategy. I think this will be important in demonstrating that the strategies and policies in the AAP are founded on a robust and credible evidence base (soundness test vii). Housing (pages 33-35, 2.75-2.86): you will need to be clearer about how the numbers proposed (up to 600) fit with the RSS housing requirement for East Riding and East Riding's overall housing trajectory. At paragraph 2.80, for example it is suggested that early results from the trajectory indicate a requirement in Bridlington of some 300 to 2016 (out of 600 in the JSP eastern sub-area). At paragraph 2.83, however, the numbers proposed in the Burlington Parade scheme (600 houses) is said to be 'consistent with allocation for Bridlington'? As well as being clearer about how these figures reconcile with each other, you will also need to take into account the potential for the Joint Structure Plan – policy H1 of which guides the housing allocations between its four sub-areas - to be superseded by RSS when the JSP expires in June 2008. I note this is referred to in Appendix 3 (at page 22, para 34). Affordable Housing: the document states that East Riding policy is 'in flux' and that with no East Riding target/threshold a requirement for the AAP area cannot be set. I think you may need something more specific in policy than a general requirement. It is stated that interim arrangements are being considered and will be taken on board (para 2.87, 3.66 also is relevant) - what is the timescale for this? Will this be reflected in the submission document? In the absence of a locally specific policy you will, as you acknowledge, need to rely on national / regional policy and may need to apply the PPS3 threshold (15 or more dwellings) and RSS target for East Riding (40%). (see also the comments below on BridTC12).</p> <p>Movement (p 38, 2.105): see comments below on BridTC15.</p> <p>Preferred Options for the Strategic Town Centre Policies</p> <p>The inclusion of the current Tesco site (in the primary shopping area) assumes their participation in the regeneration, if they do not participate the store will be excluded (p 45, 3.14). I do not think the reasoning behind this is clearly explained and should be made more explicit. Given that primary shopping areas (as defined by PPS6) are defined areas where retail development is concentrated (generally comprising the primary and those secondary frontages which are contiguous and</p>	<p>package of integrated transport measures designed to relieve traffic congestion and improve all forms of transport within the Town Centre linked by a new transport interchange.</p> <p>Sufficient detail will be provided in the AAP and the suggestion that objectives are not appropriate for the policies and the quantity should be in the policy itself is accepted by the Council.</p>

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
				<p>closely related to the primary shopping frontage), what would be the justification for exclusion from it a retail use such as a Tesco store which presumably has, if not a primary frontage, then a secondary frontage? It is unfortunate that the policies are in a worded format (even though all marked 'proposed polices') at this stage. While the detailed wording is not important at this stage, more the articulation of the options and their implications, I will pick up a few points with the submission document in mind. In drafting the policies and justification for the submission document you may find it helpful to refer to the advice contained in the POS guide 'Policies for Spatial Plans'.</p> <p><b>BridTC1:</b> The first part of the policy sets out the regeneration objectives within the town centre area, ie the six strategic as set out in section 1. I do not think these should be presented as a key element of the policy. As strategic objectives they should articulate how challenges can be addressed and indicate the broad direction that the more detailed policies should take ie the policies are designed to deliver the objectives. See also the comment below BridTC17. The second part of the policy says that development that contributes to meeting objectives will be allowed and that which poses a risk will not be allowed. You may need to be clearer in the supporting text about what poses a risk actually means, ie how will this actually be implemented? It also recurs in many of the policies – is it necessary for it to be restated frequently?</p> <p><b>BridTC3:</b> In view of the current policy development regarding renewable energy and microgeneration, you could think about whether and how you could further develop the first part of the policy (ie the 10% renewable requirement). The forthcoming PPS on Climate Change should help in this respect.</p> <p><b>BridTC7:</b> The policy is very short and has little locally distinctive material. Can it be more specific in addressing the local issues eg is there scope for drawing on the evidence base or the accompanying text which is more expansive and (at 3.45) priorities specific spaces for leisure/tourism uses. Also the use of 'encourage' does not provide much certainty in how will it be implemented or how it will inform decisions about planning permission. (This also occurs elsewhere in other policies, eg BridTC13.</p> <p><b>BridTC9:</b> The policy has several cross references to other policies. I think such cross references are more appropriate in text rather than</p>	

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
				<p>policy, where possible. This occurs elsewhere in other policies, eg BridTC13.</p> <p><b>BridTC10:</b> We note the justification for the use of s106 (rather than conditions) to prevent a change of use of intensification otherwise allowable by the GPDO on development outside the AAP area. You will need to be sure that in so doing you are not placing an undue burden on developers. The policy should not refer to PPS6 and a specific paragraph in policy – this wording has the potential to go out of date very quickly. I do not think the reference is particularly necessary but if you want to spell out the definition it should be in the text. Again you will want to be clear about how sub-criteria 1(a) and (b) will be implemented and monitored. What does flexible mean in the Bridlington context – is this adding anything to PPS6?</p> <p><b>BridTC12:</b> The target for the Burlington Parade scheme is ‘an additional 500-600 dwelling over the plan period’. This figure should be in policy not just text (it could be appropriate in BridTC17 – see comments below on that policy. As stated above you will need to be clear about how this figure fits with RSS requirement and overall ERY provision/trajectory.</p> <p><b>BridTC15:</b> The AAP is proposing c.750-775 net additional short-stay spaces (BridTC17 specifies 1,600 new and replacement spaces). I acknowledge that the AAP proposes schemes to promote more sustainable travel choices, including park and ride, easier/encouraging cycling and walking, and increasing the pedestrian environment, eg through the objectives and policy provision in BridTC14. However, you will need to justify the numbers of spaces proposed in view of policy requirements to reduce the need to travel, especially by car (PPG13). The evidence base, not least regarding the current availability of parking spaces will be important. The results and recommendations of the SA Report should also feed in. (Soundness test vii).</p> <p><b>BridTC16:</b> You propose a standardised s.106 charge for public realm works in line with ODPM Circular 05/05 and the policy itself sets out the types and scale of development to which it will apply, while Appendix 5 sets out the schedule of costs of works and proposed charges per sq m. You might want to consider whether the detail of the standard charges and methods of calculating the level of contributions for different developments are more appropriate for the SPD, if there could be a need to update and revise detailed aspects due to changing</p>	

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
				<p>circumstances (see paragraph 3.16 of the DCLG Planning Obligations Good Practice Guidance). You will also need to consider the implications of emerging national policy as you acknowledge (in section 5 and appendix 5). In this regard, you will wish to be aware of, if you are not already, the ministerial statement of 9 October on the subject (Planning Reform).</p> <p>Preferred Options for the Major Projects</p> <p><b>BridTC17:</b> Detailed guidance on design and delivery will be in SPD (para 4.8) though delivery proposals are in section5. You will need to ensure that the information on delivery proposals in section 5 of the AAP is sufficient for the purpose and that you are not leaving too much for the SPD. This also applies to the Marina SPD – see below. The first part of the policy sets out objectives for the development as do all the proposed policies for major projects ie BridTC 18,19 &amp; 20. As noted earlier, objectives are not appropriate for policies which should be precise, succinct and capable of providing a basis for planning decisions and contain criteria if they assist in applying the policies’ objectives. While the policy is long it contains none of the target mix and quanta, which is set out in the accompanying text (page 87, para 4.14), but says ‘meet the need for’ which as it stands, appears too flexible to apply in practice. I think the quanta should be in policy itself, including the housing numbers.</p> <p><b>BridTC18:</b> The AAP makes policy provision for the marina and the objectives underlying it while the details of the spec, layout, extent and procurement will be in the Marina SPD. Again, you will need to be sure that you can put all the material there that you propose ie there is nothing that should be in the DPD (AAP) such as allocations or policies.</p> <p><b>BridTC20:</b> More clarity at submission about the future of the arcade area would help. One option mooted is to move it to South Cliff and it is proposed to consult on this as part of the Allocations DPD. I accept South Cliff is outside the AAP area, but you should be clearer about the timeframe and relationships with and implications for the AAP eg. will its current/continuing presence on the seafront compromise the delivery of (this elements of) the AAP? As AAP delivery progresses you will need to keep under review and may need to intervene more forcibly if market does not respond and a comprehensive masterplan becomes</p>	

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
				<p>necessary (page 102, para 4.50). This is important regarding soundness test ix and the need to respond to changing circumstances. With this in mind you should be clear about the link to policy monitoring, and how decisions in this respect will be informed and when. The Winter Gardens are currently 'no more than an idea' (para 4.52). How will this be pursued? Through the AAP or SPD? Leisure World options are being considered and the policy enables redevelopment and relocation (para 4.55). More certainty on this would help. What is the timeframe for decisions and how will it fit with the AAP and town centre proposals, including not least, the implications for delivery?</p> <p>Delivering and Monitoring</p> <p>Monitoring: we note that only policy targets are dealt with and that SA targets and indicators will be brought into the submission document when SA completed. SA should be integral to the whole process of producing a DPD integral and you should be showing how (draft) SA is being used to inform the development of the document eg with regard to rejected options and those favoured. Also how the SA recommendations and proposed mitigation measures are being acted upon. The draft SA report should not be a discrete/remote document but should have clear linkages in the DPD (soundness tests (ii) and (vii)). A risk assessment will follow in the submission document (page 117). This should identify contingency options in the event that policy cannot be delivered and the basis for contingencies identified should be set out in the AAP. (see soundness test 9).</p> <p>Appendix 2: Statement of Options Rejected and Reasons</p> <p>There is no indication of how SA informed choices – see comments above.</p> <p>Appendix 3: Conformity</p> <p>National policy (15-18) - in view of the movement and parking strategy being one of the four key elements of the AAP should PG13 be brought in here? In view of the possibility of the AAP being submitted before decisions are made on the extent to which the new RSS will supersede</p>	

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
				<p>the polices in the JSP (para 34) the submitted AAP may need to build in sufficient flexibility and look at relevant provisions of the new RSS.</p>	
		Mr Alex Thompson		<p>Thank you for your letter dated 26<sup>th</sup> October 2007 inviting further comment on the Brid Town Centre Action Plan. I will be viewing the relevant documents momentarily. I do have a little concern as to procedure. On or about November 2006 the ERYC inserted a notice of consultation in all local newspapers. This was as follows: Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regs 2004 Reg 26 (copy enclosed).</p> <p>In view of your letter to me dated 26/10/07, 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph where you state quote "the area AAP has been reduced" unquote, I am of the belief that as the AAP area has been so reduced are the ERYC NOT obliged to re-issue the above notice in order to conform to the Regs? Any reduction i/e from that published in the issues and options paper would surely be viewed by the Government or by the Sec of State as a MAJOR CHANGE. Consulting on the next state of the Bridlington Local Development Framework is complying with the original notice of consultation (referred to above) but is it valid for the reduced AAP (a new plan), after the event?</p> <p>I submit there is a doubt of not having re-submitted the new smaller plan for further consultation under Reg 26 etc &amp; by not so doing may be viewed in authority as flawed.</p>	<p>Response from John Lister</p> <p>Thank you for your letter dated 31/10/07. As we discussed over the telephone the consultation advertised in November 2006 was for the Draft Statement of Community Involvement and not for the Bridlington Area Action Plan. The Issues and Options (Reg.25) stage was advertised and completed in July 2006 and from that consultation we have now produced the Preferred Options (Reg.26) Area Action Plan. The scope of the issues and options was the whole of Bridlington Town Council area, plus most of the parish of Carnaby (to cover employment land). Following this consultation the advice from Government Office and from leading Counsel was that the AAP would be better restricted to the area of significant change and other comments from the issues and options could be fed into the Development Plan Documents (DPD's) which still had to be produced by the Council (see para's 17 to 19 in the AAP Executive Summary). Therefore, as this is the first consultation under Reg.26 we do not believe the process to be flawed.</p>
		ERYC Planning Committee	<p>Councillors raised the following issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Accommodation for people attending</li> </ul>	<p><b>Extract from Minutes of ERYC Planning Committee – 6 December 2007</b></p> <p><b>4096 Bridlington Regeneration Strategy – Area Action Plan</b></p>	<p>Support for the AAP is welcomed.</p> <p>The issues raised by the ERYC are being dealt with through on-going discussions.</p>

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
			<p>conferences and additional parking.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Flood risk</li> <li>▪ Lack of consultation with local members.</li> <li>▪ Degeneration of the town over the 25 years of the plan.</li> <li>▪ Lack of quality hotels.</li> <li>▪ Subterranean car parking for the disabled.</li> <li>▪ Arcades on the Esplanade.</li> <li>▪ Relocation of part of the bus station.</li> <li>▪ Relocation of Tesco.</li> <li>▪ Location of coaches and lorries out of the town centre.</li> </ul> <p>Committee endorses the AAP and the issues raised above be taken into consideration</p>	<p>The Director of Planning and Economic Regeneration submitted a report introducing a suite of documents which together comprised the preferred options “Area Action Plan (AAP) for Bridlington Town Centre”, the full extent of which were shown on the proposal map as appended to the report. The documents had been placed on deposit for public consultation from 29 October to 10 December 2007 (six weeks) in accordance with the revised Local Development Scheme (LDS) as submitted to The Cabinet on 18 September 2007. The report was submitted to enable the Planning Committee to comment on the document which would then be reported back to The Cabinet alongside all other comments before a revised version of the document was submitted to the Secretary of State.</p> <p>The Head of Bridlington Development Plan gave a brief presentation on the plan and answered Members’ questions thereon. Councillors raised the following issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The Spa and to what extent accommodation for people attending conferences would be made available and what additional car parking was available.</li> <li>▪ Flood risk – it was suggested that the plan include a comment on this including mitigation measures etc.</li> <li>▪ The lack of consultation with local members was raised.</li> <li>▪ Concerns that the plan would take over 25 years resulting in the degeneration of the town in the meantime.</li> <li>▪ Lack of quality hotels.</li> <li>▪ The issue of subterranean car parking for the disabled.</li> <li>▪ The issue of the amusement arcade on the Esplanade.</li> <li>▪ The relocation of part of the bus station to Station Approach.</li> <li>▪ The relocation of Tesco.</li> <li>▪ The location of coaches and lorries out of the town centre.</li> </ul> <p>Resolved – That this Committee endorses the Area Action Plan for Bridlington town centre and the issues raised above be taken into consideration.</p>	<p>A hotel demand study is on-going in relation to accommodation for those attending conferences at the Spa. Parking provision is significantly enhanced by the AAP.</p> <p>A Flood Risk Assessment will be carried out at the appropriate time. Initial investigations show that the Burlington Parade scheme is unlikely to be at danger of major flood risk and minor risks can be managed through Sustainable Urban Drainage, raising ground levels adjacent to the Gypsy Race and other appropriate measures.</p> <p>A monthly member’s forum is in place to address issues and both the Regeneration Partnership and Town Team have representation from members.</p> <p>A hotel demand study for Bridlington is on-going.</p> <p>Subterranean parking has now been removed from the scheme.</p> <p>The AAP recognises the adverse impact of the arcade on the Esplanade. It may prove feasible in time to concentrate the seasonal seaside activity elsewhere creating an alternative critical mass and visitor destination with good links to the town centre. Meanwhile, policy will seek to achieve a better balance between the seasonal use of the Seafront area and the need to use the Town Centre’s best assets all year round.</p> <p>The final AAP will include a comprehensive</p>

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
					<p>timetable for delivery. Redevelopment on this scale is necessarily time-consuming, however a clear management plan will minimise disruption and seek the optimum timescales for delivery.</p> <p>The relocation of part of the bus station to station approach will provide a new transport interchange with the railway station.</p> <p>The position of Tesco is subject to on-going negotiations.</p> <p>The Council is currently assessing sites for a replacement coach park that will link to the town centre.</p>
		Minutes of the Bridlington Town Council meeting held on 4th December 2007		<p>The resolutions in respect of the AAP are reproduced below:</p> <p>Min. 148/07 - Bridlington Town Centre Preferred Options Area Action Plan.</p> <p>RESOLVED:</p> <p>(i) The Council criticises the format of the questionnaire and would therefore question the validity of the responses from the public;</p> <p>(ii) The Council considers that to preserve and enhance the character of the town, new build should be sympathetic to and in keeping with the predominantly late Victoria or Edwardian type architecture;</p> <p>(iii) A multi-storey car park should be incorporated within the Burlington Parade development;</p> <p>(iv) The Council does not favour any building at the west end of the harbour or proposed new south pier that is unconnected to marine activities, in accordance with the Coastal Planning Guide – Marina Section;</p>	<p>The comments of the Town Council are welcomed.</p> <p>(i) The Council appreciate that it is time consuming to take part and is grateful for the participation of the Community. But the Council also does not want to omit information which the community requires in order to make informed comment on the proposals. More effort still will be made to ensure future AAP consultation forms are as accessible as possible.</p> <p>(ii) The production of the detailed design guidance will have regard to the distinctive character and architecture of the Town Centre. The AAP recognises that the historic character of Bridlington should be preserved and enhanced, and not compromised by the regeneration strategy.</p> <p>(iii) The AAP makes provision for additional car parking facilities within the Town Centre</p>

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
				<p>(v) The Council considers that no buildings should be erected on South Cliff garden;</p> <p>(vi) The Council does not favour the proposed location of a town square. The preferred location should be Prince Street, with it and Cliff Street closed to through traffic. Also, to open up King Street to traffic and parking and relocate the market to the Town Square in Prince Street;</p> <p>(vii) The Council considers that the relocation of the foreshore fun fair to elsewhere would have a beneficial affect on the town;</p> <p>(viii) The Council questions the renaming of Hilderthorpe Road as Burlington Parade;</p> <p>(ix) The Council considers that in the event of the loss of the Leisure World swimming pool, that an Olympic-size replacement;</p> <p>(x) The Council considers that the proposal to open up the lane leading from Bridge Street to the harbour is quite unnecessary and a waste of public finances;</p> <p>(xi) The Council considers that the proposal to build 600 housing units in the town centre is excessive, unless they are to be allocated to persons who cannot afford or do not aspire to acquire private transport;</p> <p>(xii) To request what proportion of the local population has responded to the AAP.</p>	<p>including multi-storey car parks providing a net gain of about 750 spaces</p> <p>(iv) Following the completed Bridlington Marina Supply and Demand Study the marina will include 'marina related development'. Other uses will be located in the town centre.</p> <p>(v) The revised masterplan shows no buildings on South Cliff Gardens.</p> <p>(vi) Bridge Street will be transformed from a narrow, traffic dominated street into a space that opens up to the Race, the Harbour and to the new Town Square.</p> <p>(vii) The AAP recognises the adverse impact of the fun fair in its current location. It may prove feasible in time to concentrate the seasonal seaside activity elsewhere creating an alternative critical mass and visitor destination with good links to the town centre. Meanwhile, policy will seek to achieve a better balance between the seasonal use of the Seafront area and the need to use the Town Centre's best assets all year round.</p> <p>(vii) The AAP, however, makes clear that the name is no more than a working name – and, once the developer is selected, the issue of the actual name or names for the area will arise again. The Council will convey, as part of the development competition the fact that Burlington Parade is a working name only</p> <p>(ix) Suggestion on an Olympic sized swimming pool is noted although the cost implications of such a facility could prove prohibitive. Leisure World recognised as an important community facility as well as a rainy day activity for visitors.</p>

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
					<p>(x) Ensuring that the town centre integrates better with the harbour is a key objective in enhancing the town centre and maximising the positive contribution the harbour can make.</p> <p>(xi) Not encouraging further Town Centre residential development does not acknowledge the evidence base, which explains that the AAP must ensure there is an adequate provision of housing to meet the different types and tenures of dwellings required to meet new household formation and demand arising during the plan period. The AAP conforms to national planning policy which encourages town centre residential development that contributes to the formation of sustainable communities. Within the AAP area, the aim is for a mix of housing types (flats of different sizes, townhouses, detached houses and so on) as well as a mix of tenures (ownership, rental and shared ownership).</p> <p>(xii) The Council has consulted widely on the AAP with the questionnaire and numerous consultation events within the town. A total of 69 responses were received as part of the consultation.</p>
		<p>Bridlington Harbour Commissioners – Barton Willmore Report, December 2007</p>		<p>The Barton Willmore Partnership, Elizabeth House, 1 High Street, Chesterton, Cambridge, CB41WB. Tel: 01223345555, Fax: 01223 345550. Our Ref: 10624jA5jP2AjAPJjYE. File Ref: Rep002. Date: December 2007</p> <p><b>COPYRIGHT The contents of this document must not be copied or reproduced in whole or in part without the written consent of the Barton Willmore Partnership.</b></p>	<p>The background to the report from Barton Willmore is now largely out of date and superseded by the outcome of on-going negotiations with the Harbour Commissioners.</p> <p>Work is on-going to develop a plan that will enable the necessary land to be reclaimed</p>

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
				<p><b>1.0 INTRODUCTION</b></p> <p>1.1. This Report has been prepared on behalf of the Bridlington Harbour Commissioners to amplify their representations to the Bridlington Town Centre Preferred Options Area Action Plan. The Report should be read In conjunction with the Consultation Forms and sets out in detail the Harbour Commissioners concerns about the proposals for a new Marina contained within the Plan.</p> <p>1.2. The Bridlington Harbour Commissioners were established over 300 years ago by Act of Parliament and their present powers are derived from the Bridlington Harbour Act 1837, the Bridlington Harbour Confirmation Act 1928 and the Bridlington Harbour Revision (Constitution) Order 2004. The Commissioners consist of 11 Members which number the Chief Executive. The Members are appointed on the basis of their specialist knowledge, experience or skills pursuant to the management of the Harbour including the management of the fishing industry, water related leisure activities, shipping and transport, safety or personnel management, commercial marketing and LT., environmental matters and community Interest. The Commissioners also have responsibility for financial management, the laws relating to England and any other skills or attributes considered to be relevant to the efficient and economic discharge of their function. The Commissioners are responsible for ensuring the effective and efficient operation of the Harbour.</p> <p>1.3. This Report provides a context to the Harbour Commissioners representations as well as providing detailed comments on the various policies and proposals contained within the Plan.</p> <p>1.4. This Report has the following structure:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Section 2 : Context to the Representation  Section 3 : Comments on Policies  Section 4 : Consequential and detailed comments</p> <p><b>2.0 CONTEXT TO THE REPRESENTATION</b></p>	<p>with a minimal impact on harbour operations. Regular meetings are being held with the Harbour Commissioners to agree a way forward.</p> <p>A business case for the marina and a hydraulic modelling study have now been commissioned which will inform future discussions.</p> <p>In relation to the objection in principle set out in 2.9 there are on-going discussions between ERYC, Yorkshire Forward, the Harbour Commissioners and other parties to minimise any impact on the existing harbour. The marina will be based on the number of berths recommended by the Bridlington Harbour Supply and Demand Study.</p> <p>Policy Objections:</p> <p>BridTC1: the Bridlington Harbour Supply and Demand Study agrees that .....</p> <p>BridTC2: Discussions with the Harbour Commissioners are on-going to agree a proposed layout.</p> <p>BridTC15: references to phasing of the marina will be removed from the plan.</p> <p>BridTC 16: S106 requirements .....</p> <p>BridTC17: references to phasing will be removed. The 'Grand entrance to the Harbour' and 'Harbour Plaza' are now agreed with the Harbour Commissioners.</p>

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
				<p>2.1. The Harbour Commissioners note that the Bridlington Town Centre Preferred Options Area Action Plan relies on the Joint Structure Plan for Hull and, the East Riding (2005) to provide its 'Core Strategy'. Reference also needs to be made, however, to the policies and proposals of the emerging Regional Spatial Strategy for Yorkshire and the Humber (RSS12) which states that the coastal towns in the Eastern Sub Area, including Bridlington, 'should be the focus for smaller-scale economic and housing developments' (para 4.72). The proposals contained within the AAP are not small scale but represent substantial redevelopment including the creation of a 500 berth Marina.</p> <p>2.2. A 500 berth Marina for Bridlington has already been rejected by the Secretary of State in 2003 on the basis that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the proposal is contrary to the relevant planning guidelines;</li> <li>• it is excessive in scale;</li> <li>• it is in an inappropriate location;</li> <li>• it is defective in design;</li> <li>• it would not deliver the benefits claimed;</li> <li>• it would cause environmental damage;</li> <li>• it would adversely affect listed structures; and</li> <li>• there is real doubt whether the development will be achieved, even if authorised.</li> </ul> <p>2.3. Notwithstanding the rejection of the previous scheme, the Harbour Commissioners support the provision of a Marina at Bridlington and have been working with East Riding of Yorkshire Council and other partners to progress an acceptable scheme. It is accepted that any new proposals for a Marina must overcome the Secretary of States concerns which led to the rejection of the previous scheme. In particular, the Harbour Commissioners wish to ensure that the proposed Marina will not have an adverse impact on the</p>	<p>BridTC18:</p> <p>1(a) agree – in line with the agreement on the Bridlington Harbour Supply and Demand Study.</p> <p>(b) agree – no change.</p> <p>(c) agree – the 'Harbour and Marina' will be added.</p> <p>(d) the reference to 'maintaining' is not appropriate as this is new policy designed to enhance the integration of the Harbour with the Town Centre core.</p> <p>(e) agree to add Harbour/Marina however the rest of the proposed changes to wording are not appropriate to a planning document.</p> <p>(f) agree –no change.</p> <p>(g) agree – no change.</p> <p>(h) agree – no change.</p> <p>(i) agree – no change.</p> <p>(j) agree, but add 'sustainable' before fishing industry.</p> <p>2. Agree – no change.</p> <p>3. The business case will assess economic viability.</p> <p>4. Agree – with Harbour/Marina.</p> <p>5. Disagree – but add 'and will support the Harbour Commissioners in the exercise of their rights and powers'.</p> <p>Brid TC19: references to 'new Harbour Plaza', 'the pedestrian entrance to the Harbour from Bridge Street, which will step down to the Harbour along the Gypsy Race' and 'northern Harbour perimeter' are now agreed with the Harbour Commissioners in the Bridlington Harbour Supply and Demand Study.</p> <p>The footprint of the marina in the next draft</p>

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
				<p>operations of the Harbour or the Commissioners ability to fulfil their statutory duty. Bridlington Harbour is the largest shell fishing port in England and it is vital that the Marina proposals do not adversely affect this role.</p> <p>2.4. The Harbour Commissioners are disappointed that the contents of the Bridlington Town Centre Preferred Options Area Action Plan do not reflect recent discussions with the Commissioners. In particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A 500 berth Marina as proposed by the AAP is not required.</li> <li>• The phased approach to the development of the Harbour to form the Marina will result in the loss of operational harbour land for which no alternative provision has been or can be made. The Burlington Parade, in particular, proposal should be excluded from land comprising part of the Harbour.</li> <li>• The boundary of the Harbour as shown on the Proposals Map is not accurate.</li> <li>• There are a number of inaccuracies with the APP concerning details of the Harbour operation.</li> </ul> <p>2.5. The Harbour Commissioners strongly object to using the Harbour to provide Phase 1 of the Marina development as an integral part of the Burlington Parade scheme. The Burlington Parade scheme would adversely affect the operation of the Harbour to the detriment of its users and the town. The boundary of the Burlington Parade scheme should exclude all land within the Harbour.</p> <p>2.6. The Commissioners are also in receipt of the 'Bridlington Harbour Supply and Demand Strategy Final Report' (November 2007) which suggests that the Marina should provide 'a target of 300 berths' with an initial investment of 250 berths with the remaining 50 to be added in subsequent years as demand increases. The significant reduction in the number of berths means that the</p>	<p>of the AAP will be that which is agreed with the Harbour Commissioners.</p> <p>Consequential and Detailed Amendments:</p> <p>There is now agreement with the Harbour Commissioners on the issue of the marina within the Harbour.</p> <p>Whilst there is not an acknowledged east coast sailing route this is a deficiency that these proposals help to address. The number of berths is now agreed following the Bridlington Harbour Supply and Demand Study.</p> <p>References to phasing will be removed.</p> <p>Whilst there are routes to the Harbour from the Town Centre the integration is deficient in urban design terms and the Harbour, a key asset, is not visible from the majority of the Town Centre core.</p> <p>The Strategic Public Realm Framework proposes significant enhancement of existing areas where public realm is deficient, complemented by the creation of new area including 3 public squares 'Station Plaza', 'Town Square' and 'Harbour Plaza'. The number of berths is based on the Bridlington Harbour Supply and Demand Study agreed with the Harbour Commissioners.</p> <p>The evidence base explains that the AAP must ensure there is an adequate provision of housing to meet the different types and</p>

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
				<p>Marina can be provided wholly within the confines of the existing Harbour.</p> <p>2.7. The Harbour Commissioners have produced a number of alternative Marina proposals which make use of the existing Harbour infrastructure. By way of an example, an illustrative scheme is attached at Appendix 1 which shows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Marina within the confines of the existing Harbour</li> <li>• An area of operational land (but not the whole requirement) for the associated Marina and Harbour facilities</li> <li>• Capacity for approximately 250 berths</li> <li>• An impounded water area for the Marina</li> <li>• A tidal Harbour for the fishing boats</li> <li>• An enlarged fish quay</li> <li>• A new pier and lock</li> <li>• Landing area for pleasure boats</li> <li>• An extension to the North Pier</li> <li>• Removal of Chicken Run Jetty</li> </ul> <p>2.8. A Marina provided within the Harbour has a number of advantages:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) it protects the Listed Piers and their setting. As set out in para 4.16 of the AAP, the 'Harbour is the Town Centre's single greatest asset' and a Marina within the existing Harbour would ensure the protection of its setting;</li> <li>ii) it could provide 250 berths, making best use of the Harbour infrastructure, as recommended by the Bridlington Harbour Supply and Demand Report;</li> <li>iii) it provides adequate space for the 'top side' development as envisaged by the AAP;</li> </ol>	<p>tenures of dwellings required to meet new household formation and demand arising during the plan period. The AAP conforms to national planning policy which encourages town centre residential development that contributes to the formation of sustainable communities. The Regional Spatial Strategy has increased the number of houses to be provided in East Riding and the Council will look to Bridlington to provide a significant portion of its housing needs within the AAP.</p> <p>Parking provision will be significantly enhanced in the Town Centre and provision will be made for all new developments. Discussions with the Harbour Commissioners will ensure the provision of adequate parking and alternative improved facilities.</p>

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
				<p>iv) it provides impounded water adjacent to the Town Centre;</p> <p>v) it could prevent the tidal flooding of the Harbour Road and adjacent shops;</p> <p>vi) it is more cost effective than the 500 berth Marina proposed by the AAP as it does not require the creation of new piers, breakwaters and associated infrastructure;</p> <p>vii) it can be delivered through a Harbour Revision Order and avoids the need for a Transport and Works Order and widespread Compulsory Purchase of land. The cost savings actioned through the provision of a Marina as part of the Harbour would allow additional investment in the Burlington Parade proposals which should be carried out separately to any development at the Harbour; and</p> <p>viii) with good management, the creation of the Marina could be achieved without adversely affecting the existing operation of the Harbour,</p> <p>2.9. Having regard to the above, the Harbour Commissioner OBJECT in principle to the Bridlington Town Centre Preferred Options Area Action Plan on the basis that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Marina proposals in terms of their phased implementation and lack of detail, are likely to have an adverse impact on the operation of the Harbour contrary to the discussions held with the East Riding of Yorkshire Council, Yorkshire Forward and other parties;</li> <li>• The plan is based on the need for a 500 berth Marina whilst the Bridlington Harbour Supply and Demand Study recommend an initial investment of only 250 berths.</li> </ul> <p>2.10. The lack of meaningful discussion on the AAP and the lack of details of the Marina design has caused the Harbour Commissioners to pass the following unanimous resolution:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>'The letter of response to the Area Action Plan consultation documents should make it clear that</b></p>	

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
				<p style="text-align: center;"><b>unless the East Riding of Yorkshire Council remove at this stage all references to areas of land on the Harbour Estate from their consultation papers then the Bridlington Harbour Commissioners would not be able to negotiate any further on the Marina development plans.'</b></p> <p>2.11. The Harbour Commissioners would, however, welcome discussions on the provision of a Marina development within the existing Harbour. Arising from the above, the Commissioners set out a number of objections to the policies of the Plan (Section 3) along with consequential amendments to the text (Section 4).</p> <p><b>3.0 POLICY OBJECTIONS</b></p> <p>3.1. The Harbour Commissioners object to the following:</p> <p>3.2. <b>Policy BridTC1:</b> OBJECT - The Marina should form part of the Harbour and not vice versa.</p> <p>3.3. <b>Policy BridTC2:</b> OBJECT - The boundary of the Marina should be amended to reflect the recommendations of the Bridlington Harbour Supply and Demand Study that a SOO berth Marina is not required. The Marina should be provided within the existing Harbour.</p> <p>3.4. <b>Policy BridTC15:</b> OBJECT - Remove reference to Marina Phase One.</p> <p>3.5. Policy BridTC16: OBJECT - Section 106 requirements should relate directly to the proposed development. This is particularly important in respect of the Harbour Commissioners who can only finance matters directly related to the operation and management of the Harbour.</p> <p>3.6. <b>Policy BridTC17:</b> OBJECT - The boundary of the Burlington parade Scheme should exclude all land within the Harbour. Reference to the 'first phase' of the Marina should be deleted as should reference to the 'Grand entrance to the Harbour' and the</p>	

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
				<p>'Harbour Plaza.'</p> <p>3.7. <b>Policy BridTC18</b> - OBJECT - The boundary of the Marina and the policy text should be reduced to reflect the findings of the Bridlington Harbour Supply and Demand Study and the provision of the Marina within the existing Harbour. We suggest the following wording:</p> <p><b>"1. The objectives for the development of Bridlington Marina, the maximum extent of which is shown (subject to para 3.8 below) in the Draft Town Centre AAP Proposals Map, are:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. the provision of the Marina as part of the Harbour;</li> <li>b. the provision of sailing and other pleasure craft berths in line with assessed demand;</li> <li>c. the provision of the additional ancillary facilities as required to support the efficient and competitive operation of the Harbour and Marina;</li> <li>d. maintaining the integration of the Harbour incorporating the Marina with the Town Centre core at Bridge Street, Queen Street and Garrison Square, in line with Proposed Policy BridTC17;</li> <li>e. ensuring the Harbour/Marina provides an appropriate context and setting for the Spa without adversely affecting the economic and commercial activity of the Harbour;</li> <li>f. the protection, enhancement or replacement of the operational facilities of the Harbour in line with the Trust Port's statutory duties;</li> <li>g. the protection of the listed piers and their setting in line with the provisions of PPG15 and other current government guidance;</li> <li>h. the provision of public access to the non-operational parts of the Harbour and Marina consistent with safety and the security of the Harbour and Marina</li> </ul>	

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
				<p>operations;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. the provision and development of made land for housing and commercial activities in line with the objectives and other provisions of the Town Centre AAP for the regeneration of Bridlington;</li> <li>j. development to meet the needs of the Harbour in order to ensure the protection and enhancement of the fishing industry.</li> </ul> <p>2. Development of the Marina within the Harbour will be allowed where it meets the objectives and satisfies the other provisions of the Town Centre AAP and is consistent with the guidance set out in the Town Centre and Marina Supplementary Planning Documents.</p> <p>3. Development which poses a risk to the strategy and economic viability of the Harbour will not be allowed.</p> <p>4. The Commissioners in consultation with the Council will use their powers and exercise their rights to secure the necessary orders for the delivery of the Marina and to achieve the objectives for it.</p> <p>3.8. The maximum area of the Marina shown on the Proposals Map would need to be reduced in extent.</p> <p>3.9. Policy BridTC19: OBJECT - Reference to the 'new Harbour plaza', 'the pedestrian entrance to the Harbour from Bridge Street, which will step down to the Harbour along Gypsey Place' and the 'northern Harbour perimeter' should be removed. The strategic public realm proposals should be considered as part of any SPD or Development Brief.</p> <p><b>4.0 CONSEQUENTIAL AND DETAILED AMENDMENTS</b></p> <p>4.1. Arising from the above, the Harbour Commissioners make a number of detailed points. These are set out below and, where appropriate, reference is made to the text in the Plan. To avoid repetition we have not made reference to every change that would</p>	

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
				<p>be required in the text but have highlighted key changes that are required.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bridlington Marina should be created within the Harbour (para 1.2, 1.9, Objective 2)</li> <li>• There is not an acknowledged east coast sailing circuit (para 1.8). The 'Bridlington Marina - Feasibility Study Stage I' 2004 (para 6.27) suggests that tidal access at Bridlington restricts the scope for cruising along the east coast.</li> <li>• There is not evidence to suggest that a 500 berth Marina will create an asset that 'will secure an enduring and prosperous future for the historic Harbour' (para 1.9) or that it will become a 'regionally significant Marina' (para 1.12). The Bridlington Harbour Supply and Demand Study suggested that a Marina half this size is required.</li> <li>• All references to the Phase 1 Marina proposal should be removed from the Plan as it requires land which is currently in operational use and no alternative provision has been made. The Harbour Commissioners require all of the land within the Harbour Estate to maintain the operation of the existing Harbour.</li> <li>• At para 1.26 the AAP states that the Harbour 'is poorly integrated with the core of the town which it adjoins'. The opposite is, in fact, the case as there are three roadways and eight pedestrian routes to the Harbour from adjoining areas.</li> <li>• The Plan states that the landscape treatment of much of the Esplanade is out of date and Garrison Square is 'inhospitable' (para 1.34), yet the Plan proposes the creation of eight new public squares. The Commissioners consider that investment should be targeted at improving existing facilities rather than creating new facilities.</li> <li>• The Plan acknowledges that the 500 berth Marina is a risky investment (para 1.38); made more so by the conclusions</li> </ul>	

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation																								
				<p>of the 'Bridlington Harbour Supply and Demand Study' that suggests a Marina half the size would be more appropriate in the first instance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Chapter 2 of the AAP should be updated to have regard to the conclusions of the 'Bridlington Harbour Supply and Demand Study'.</li> <li>There is no overriding need for more housing within Bridlington.</li> </ul> <p>4.2. The 'Fifth annual update on the position with the Managed Release of Residential Development Sites' September 2007 and Table 1 (below) illustrate the number of housing completions for the Eastern Sub-Area which includes Bridlington.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Table 1 - Number of Housing Completions in 2006</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="931 727 1626 986"> <thead> <tr> <th>JSP Sub-Area</th> <th>Number of houses completed 2006</th> <th>ISP housing requirements</th> <th>Completions as a % of the requirement</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Northern</td> <td>282</td> <td>200</td> <td>141%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Central</td> <td>503</td> <td>400</td> <td>126%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Eastern</td> <td>558</td> <td>200</td> <td>279%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Western</td> <td>203</td> <td>250</td> <td>81%</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Total</b></td> <td><b>1,546</b></td> <td><b>1,050</b></td> <td><b>147%</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>4.3. As illustrated in Table 1, in 2006 the completions as a % of the requirement for the JSP targets in the Eastern Sub-Area were 279% with 408 of the 558 housing completions being in Bridlington. This is considerably more than the strategic housing requirement for the Eastern Sub-Area and a considerable amount of housing development for one town to accommodate in a short period of time. The Report goes on to state in para 4.10 that 'a continuation of completions at this level would be a serious concern'. The over provision of housing completions in recent years has more than satisfied the annual JSP target and the proposed addition of 600 dwellings under the Burlington Parade</p>	JSP Sub-Area	Number of houses completed 2006	ISP housing requirements	Completions as a % of the requirement	Northern	282	200	141%	Central	503	400	126%	Eastern	558	200	279%	Western	203	250	81%	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,546</b>	<b>1,050</b>	<b>147%</b>	
JSP Sub-Area	Number of houses completed 2006	ISP housing requirements	Completions as a % of the requirement																										
Northern	282	200	141%																										
Central	503	400	126%																										
Eastern	558	200	279%																										
Western	203	250	81%																										
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,546</b>	<b>1,050</b>	<b>147%</b>																										

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
				<p>scheme is likely to saturate the housing market.</p> <p>4.4. Para 2.80 of the AAP states that the Council are currently in the process of preparing housing trajectories as part of the Local Development Framework (LDF). Early results indicate that;</p> <p><b>'there is likely to be further (residual) requirement to 2016 for some 600 dwellings for the Eastern Sub-Area, having taken account of sites with planning permission (at over 850 dwellings). Bridlington as a whole is likely to be apportioned up to 50% of this housing requirement, amounting to some 300 dwellings'.</b></p> <p>4.5. Therefore, until the end of the plan period in 2016, Bridlington is only expected to accommodate up to an additional 300 dwellings yet the Burlington Parade scheme itself will provide approximately 600 dwellings.</p> <p>4.6. The increase in housing provision cannot be justified and is contrary to the provisions of the JSP. Moreover, Bridlington already has commitments for 482 dwellings in the next five years with an additional 665 dwelling thereafter. (EYRC 'Housing Land Position Statement' 2007).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The AAP needs to ensure that enough car parking is provided with the Town Centre to accommodate new developments. Car parking will need to be retained within the Harbour for operational use and any proposals to develop the existing car park will need to ensure that alternative facilities are provided.</li> </ul>	

## AAP CONSULTATION EVENTS

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
		Unknown	Put pedestrian bridge over Beck Hill.	Put pedestrian bridge over Beck Hill.	Beck Hill will be straightened and widened to provide the principle north-south link across the Burlington Parade development. These works will contribute to reducing traffic congestion within the town centre. Using Beck Hill also enables the route to be raised over the new pedestrian walkway along the Gypsey Race.
		Collette Tyler	Concerns over continuity of Dance Studio business.	Concerns over continuity of Dance Studio business.	Youth provision within the town centre is being considered as part of a separate study. The requirement to relocate the dance studio will be considered in the context of these plans.
		Mr Dockray – British Legion	Concerns of the Legion Club	How long does the Legion club have before it would have to close? Will alternative premises be found for the club? Where will the development begin, and at what phase will the Legion be affected? What will the area be used for, from the plans it looks like it will become a pedestrian walkway? Will there be any compensation for the club as it does not hold the lease for the building? Is it possible an agreement will be reached by the Legion Trustees before a compulsory purchase is needed? If the Authority obtains the property will the Legion club have the use of the building until such times as it is needed? If this is the case will the club have to negotiate a lease with the Authority, or would the present lease suffice. We understand a report will be produced in the near future, what information will this contain?	The Council will liaise with the Legion club and Trustees to deal with concerns arising from the AAP.
		Paul Jackson	Requires A3 copies of plans	Requires A3 copies of plans.	Copies of plans requested will be sent.
		Mr Sykes	Wants set of A3 prints.	Wants set of A3 prints.	Copies of plans requested will be sent.

ID	Type	Respondent	Summary of Representation	Full Representation	Response and recommendation
		Peter Belt	Concerns over access to the car park and garage down Wycliffe Lane	Access/car park and Wycliffe Lane. Entrance to Wycliffe Lane not shown on plans. Would be closed by proposed roadworks.	The concerns over access to the car park and garage down Wycliffe Lane are noted and discussions will take place to develop a solution.