

As we set out in our matter statements, the Lords are a charitable trust doing good deeds for the local community. They are a major land owner in the town and have a real interest in improving the town centre. The Lords have made representations at all stages of the plan making process about their concerns and I particularly want to highlight three areas to go through with you.

The first is the Beck Hill car park and what that means for the flexibility of the plan's policies. Secondly, traffic management and parking issues in the town centre and the third is regarding the primary retail area.

If I could then start with the Beck Hill car park and the flexibility of it. We made reference to the Lords planning application for the Beck Hill car park as an example where the AAP does not provide flexibility. It is always a test of emerging planning policy to see how it might work in practice. Beck Hill car park we use as an example. The Lords and Council agree the Beck Hill site could accommodate a 200 space multi-storey car park. Despite the acknowledged need for parking in the town a significant investment contemplated by the Lords in the regeneration strategy was refused as being contrary to the AAP. The Lords are in a position today where they can either go to appeal as suggested by Mr Melvin or secondly wait for the Gypsy Race Park to be created, with the delays and uncertainties that are involved in that. The Lords are staggered that it cannot invest in its own property to assist regeneration and are concerned the lack of flexibility within the planned policies may mean planning by appeal. It is also the case that if the lords and the council agree on the principal of the development in terms of a multi-story car park - 200 spaces - at the location of Beck Hill we still can't get planning permission because it is contrary to the AAP policies. What hope is there for any further schemes in the Burlington Parade, the Marina development, the Gypsy Race Park where consent of landowners and consensus of landowners is required but is not yet in place?

In terms of Beck Hill car park specifically, as the council are agreeable to the 200 space multi-storey car park and I refer you to John Lister's letter and plans set out in appendix 2.4 of the Council's response to Objectors' Responses to the Inspector's Matters - paper 2, I would suggest that BridTC3.7c be amended to make reference to a multi-story car park at Beck Hill to provide about 200 spaces rather than the 80 spaces that is currently proposed within the AAP. This change in policy and to be consistent it would also be necessary to amend plan 3.10 on page 72 of the plan which currently at Beck Hill states circa 80 - change that to circa 200 - and policy BridTC8.1d would also need to be amended in terms of those car parking numbers.

If I can now turn to traffic management and parking generally. The Lords have great concerns about traffic management measures and the impact they will have on access, parking and servicing to their properties in the town centre and this will be to the detriment of its tenants and its ability to let its properties. The lords are particularly concerned about the restricted access to Manor Street and Bridge Street and wish it to remain as it is today. In order to accommodate this request the Lords are seeking the removal from BridTC7 the last point in that policy under item 'i'.

Turning now to the retail area, again the concern about the extension to the retail area – it will have an adverse impact on the Lords properties within the town centre. Again to the detriment to its tenants and the ability to let those properties. The lords do not consider that the shopping area should be extended as set out in BridTC1.