

## **Bridlington Town Centre AAP**

### **Inspector's note on an additional hearing**

1. Thank you for your response to my first post-hearings note. Your proposals for the matters to be covered at a further hearing are helpful and will enable us to make good progress.
2. Referring back to the Matters and Issues identified prior to the main hearings (ED13) those set out at Matter 3 remain pertinent. In order to focus discussion they have been whittled down and those for the additional hearing will be:

**Whether the development of the harbour top is essential to the viability of the Burlington Parade proposal and thus the regeneration of Bridlington.**

**Is its inclusion within Burlington Parade based on robust and up-to-date evidence?**

**Is its development appropriate, feasible and deliverable, having regard to harbour operations and any environmental or heritage constraints? Are all stakeholders and landowners committed to the proposals? Is there sufficient flexibility in the AAP on this matter?**

3. The items discussed at the hearing will include therefore the following:
  - the contribution of a developed harbour top to the viability of Burlington Parade and wider regeneration objectives (your item i),
  - matters covered by Jacobs including how the harbour top would be constructed alongside continuing operations at the harbour (your item ii).
4. In preparing for these you should concentrate on the elements of soundness which are particularly under scrutiny, namely justification for the first and delivery/effectiveness for the second.
5. You will remember from my first note that there are still concerns about the effect on the conservation area. A further item will therefore be:
  - how the character or appearance of the conservation area would be preserved or enhanced.
6. It will be helpful if a representative of English Heritage is present to give their views on this matter. With regard to soundness this matter relates to delivery and to whether the AAP is consistent with national policy.

7. Thank you for making your formal request under Section 20 (7C). In the event that additional evidence and discussion at the hearing are not sufficiently convincing I will therefore recommend modifications to the APP in order that it becomes sound. To that effect a fourth item for discussion will focus on amendments which would make the AAP sound by putting right any delivery and/or justification issues resulting from proposals for the harbour top. These include the alternatives of:

***Either*** removing the harbour top from the Burlington Parade proposal,

***Or*** rewording BridTC3 (and explanation in the text) to allow variation to the Burlington Parade scheme should the harbour top not be available for development.

8. The Programme Officer has already begun to explore possible dates and it is likely that the hearing will take place on Wednesday 16 May. You will need to provide your additional statements by Friday 20 April in order that the other participants may have two weeks in which to respond, that is by 9 May, and us all to have a few days after this to read those responses.
9. This timetable will be challenging and you should make your statements as concise as possible; they should be no longer than 3,000 words on each of the four items. If necessary you may attach additional analysis, surveys and so on as appendices. In your statement on amendments you should put forward wording to show how both of the suggested alternatives could be implemented in the AAP.
10. A draft agenda is attached to illustrate how the hearing is likely to proceed.

# ***Bridlington Town Centre Area Action Plan Examination***

## **Additional Hearing**

### **Draft Agenda**

#### **Introduction by Inspector**

##### **Key issues:**

**Whether the development of the harbour top is essential to the viability of the Burlington Parade proposal and thus the regeneration of Bridlington.**

**Is its inclusion within Burlington Parade based on robust and up-to-date evidence?**

**Is its development appropriate, feasible and deliverable, having regard to harbour operations and any environmental or heritage constraints? Are all stakeholders and landowners committed to the proposals? Is there sufficient flexibility in the AAP on this matter?**

1. Contribution of a developed harbour top to the viability of Burlington Parade and wider regeneration objectives.
2. Matters covered by Jacobs including how the harbour top would be constructed alongside continuing operations at the harbour.
3. How would the character or appearance of the conservation area be preserved or enhanced?
4. Potential amendments and their implications for soundness;
  - i. the removal of the harbour top from the Burlington Parade proposal.
  - ii. the rewording of BridTC3 to allow variation to the Burlington Parade scheme should the harbour top not be available for development.
5. Any other matters e.g. next steps, timetable etc.
6. Brief summaries of cases (if necessary).
7. Closing remarks by Inspector.