

# **Civic Quarter Area Action Plan (Regulation 19, Publication Version) Consultation Summary Report**

## **1.0 Purpose of the Report**

- 1.1 This report provides an overview of the public consultation process that was undertaken in January to March 2021 in respect of the Regulation 19 Publication Version of the Civic Quarter Area Action Plan (CQ AAP) and its supporting documents. It also makes reference to the viability-led consultation exercise which took place in July 2021, and this report should be read in conjunction with the report prepared by Continuum which covers that event in full detail (contained at Appendix A).

## **2.0 Background**

- 2.1 The Council is preparing the CQ AAP to guide development and positive change in this key growth location. The AAP area comprises approximately 55 hectares at the heart of Trafford including the Trafford Town Hall, the international sporting venue of Lancashire Cricket Club and the former B&Q site. The Council has identified the Civic Quarter as pivotal in the regeneration of the surrounding area, in particular Stretford and Old Trafford.
- 2.2 The CQ AAP is intended to provide clarity and increased certainty about how opportunities for growth and investment can be realised. It establishes a vision, masterplan and strategy for the area's revitalisation over the next 15 (plus) years.
- 2.3 Once adopted the CQ AAP will form part of the Statutory Development Plan alongside the Trafford Core Strategy (adopted in January 2012) and the remaining 'saved' policies of the Revised Trafford Unitary Development Plan (adopted in June 2006). These existing Development Plan documents are becoming increasingly out of date and will – in time – be superseded by the emerging Trafford Local Plan. Once adopted the new Greater Manchester 'Places for Everyone' document (formerly the Greater Manchester Spatial Framework and now a plan for nine GM districts) will also form part of the Trafford Development Plan.

## **3.0 Regulation 19 Version of the CQ AAP**

- 3.1 The Regulation 19 Publication Version of the CQ AAP was subject to public consultation for over a six week period. The process commenced on Wednesday 20th January 2021 and concluded on Friday 5th March 2021. In addition to the CQ AAP document, there was an accompanying updated Integrated Assessment which assessed the impacts of the CQ AAP on a series of social, economic, environmental, health and equality objectives. There was also a Consultation Statement which provided an overview of the consultation process at Regulation 18 stage, together with a series of evidence-base documents which supported the content of the CQ AAP.

- 3.2 All consultation documents were placed on a dedicated CQ AAP page on the Council's website.
- 3.3 On commencement of the consultation, a letter was sent to over 1,700 residents in the Clifford, Gorse Hill, Longford and Stretford wards. Members of the four affected wards were notified via email. Email contact was made with all regular consultees who feature on the Planning Service's consultation database, and those groups/individuals who had responded to earlier CQ AAP consultation were also informed (including landowners and key stakeholders). A Council press release was issued and the Council's social media links were updated. An online questionnaire was created, accessible via the Council's consultation page, to facilitate feedback on the AAP. Comments were also invited via email or by post.
- 3.4 It was explained in the consultation material that representations at this stage in the plan-making process were invited chiefly on the 'soundness' of the CQ AAP and also on its accordance with legal and procedural requirements.
- 3.5 National changes to regulations regarding how public consultation should take place - in response to the COVID-19 pandemic - prevented any face-to-face consultation at the Regulation 19 stage of the CQ AAP. The Council offices also remained closed throughout the consultation period. However, the letter to residents made it clear that hard copies of consultation documents and/or the online survey could be made available on request. No virtual consultation events took place.

#### **4.0 Consultation Responses**

- 4.1 At the time of the consultation period's closure, 34 representations had been received, and from a range of individuals/residents, consultees, landowners, developers and other key stakeholders. Five were in the form of responses to the questionnaire on the Council's website whilst the other 29 comprised bespoke written responses (provided by email).
- 4.2 A summary of the feedback received during the consultation process is provided below. This is separated into four areas: 1. The results from the online questionnaire, which contained targeted questions concerning soundness and legal/procedural compliance, and with all respondents to this format comprising individuals/residents; 2. Bespoke email responses from individuals/residents; 3. Bespoke email responses from consultees; and 4. Bespoke email responses from landowners/developers/key stakeholders or consultants operating on their behalf.

#### **1. Results from Online Survey**

<b>Question</b>	<b>Response</b>
<i>Is the CQ AAP positively prepared?</i>	Yes - 3 No - 1 Not answered – 1
<i>Is the CQ AAP justified?</i>	Yes – 2

	No – 2 Not answered – 1
<i>Is the CQ AAP effective?</i>	Yes – 1 No – 2 Not answered – 2
<i>Is the CQ AAP consistent with national policy?</i>	Yes – 1 No – 2 Not answered – 2
<i>Thinking about the test of soundness, do you consider the CQ AAP to be sound?</i>	Sound – 1 Unsound – 3 Not answered – 1
<i>Based on the answer to the test of soundness, please state clearly which page, policy, paragraph, plan or other content you are referring to in forming your view</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The typeface of the AAP is too small</li> <li>• There is insufficient open space proposed</li> <li>• Playground/recreational space should be proposed</li> <li>• The document does not consider the shift in habits following the pandemic; less demand for office space and increased demand for walking/cycling infrastructure and recreational facilities</li> </ul>
<i>Please state why you consider the CQ AAP to be sound/unsound, including references to relevant legislation and policies</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• National planning policy should be updated to reflect cultural changes brought about by the pandemic</li> </ul>
<i>Are you proposing modification(s) to the CQ AAP to make it sound/strengthen its soundness?</i>	Yes – 1 No – 1 Not answered – 3
<i>You will need to say why this modification(s) will make the CQ AAP sound/strengthen its soundness. It would be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for the relevant policy or text and include all information and evidence necessary to support/justify your suggested change</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A smaller document should be prepared and sent to residents to comment on</li> <li>• Hornby Road should not be made into a processional route and it should stay as a cul-de-sac</li> <li>• All private office blocks should provide public realm space which would be integrated with well-being routes</li> <li>• A public play area should be established close to The Quadrant</li> <li>• Improve accessibility along the well-being route for pedestrians and cyclists</li> <li>• Increase pedestrian crossing routes at Talbot Road/White City Way junction</li> <li>• Reduce traffic flows</li> </ul>

<i>If your representation is proposing a modification(s), do you consider it necessary to participate in the Examination in Public?</i>	Yes – 0 No – 2 Not answered – 3
<i>If you wish to participate in the Examination in Public [on soundness], please outline why you consider this to be necessary</i>	
<i>Do you consider the CQ AAP to have met/not met the requirement of the Duty to Cooperate in accordance with Section 110 of the Localism Act 2011 and Section 33A of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004?</i>	Met – 1 Not met – 1 Not answered – 3
<i>Please give details of why you consider the CQ AAP has met/not met the requirements of the Duty to Cooperate</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The document is not clear; I do not know what is proposed for my street</li> </ul>
<i>In regards to the Duty to Cooperate, do you consider it necessary to participate in the Examination in Public?</i>	Yes – 0 No – 2 Not answered – 3
<i>If you wish to participate in the Examination in Public [on the Duty To Cooperate], please outline why you consider this to be necessary</i>	
<i>With regard to the updates to the Integrated Assessment process, do you consider the assessment undertaken to be adequate?</i>	Yes – 1 No – 1 Not answered – 3
<i>Depending on your answer [to the above question], please give details of why you consider that the updated Integrated Assessment process is/is not adequate</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More office space is not needed after the pandemic</li> </ul>
<i>Do you have any further comments regarding the CQ AAP/</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Door to door consultation with the residents of Hornby Road and Barlow Road is required</li> <li>The A56 should not be altered, other than to increase its capacity</li> <li>White City Retail Park should be retained</li> <li>The retail park makes a positive contribution to the area and there are limited alternatives</li> </ul>

## 2. Bespoke responses from Individuals/Residents

### **Procedural/Administrative**

- The document is hard to read since the print is small
- The symbols within the document are confusing
- The questionnaire is not worded in a way that residents would understand
- Door to door consultation should take place with the residents to understand what the area is like to live in on match days

### **Transport/Traffic**

- The targets within the Transport Assessment (TA) to achieve a reduction in single-occupancy car travel are not ambitious enough
- Peak hour traffic in the Trafford Wharf/White City roundabout/White City Way/Talbot Road/Seymour Grove area is already high and could be made worse by these proposals if not subject to a comprehensive solution
- Great Stone Road where a super-crossing is proposed also experiences heavy traffic flows
- The potential for park and ride should be considered

### **Cycling Infrastructure**

- The TA claims that cycle infrastructure in the AAP area is excellent; this is not true.
- The references to enhancing the cycling environment should mean that segregated cycle ways will be built and that cyclists will be prioritised at junctions in order to meet or exceed national standards
- Any shared off-road pedestrian/cycle provision is strongly objected to since it is dangerous for both users
- Cycling from The Quadrant to the leisure centre is currently a dangerous route
- The trams should be allowed to accommodate bicycles

### **Accessibility**

- Increasing pedestrian accessibility is not necessarily a good intention for existing residents who enjoy the quieter days
- How residents would continue to access the streets leading from the processional route is not clear

### **Design/Visual Amenity/Public Realm**

- Tall buildings should not be encouraged
- The building of 687 Chester Road is a disgrace; it has been repeatedly vandalised and is insecure and unsafe
- Old Trafford Metrolink station is inhospitable to visitors on arrival; it should be subject to environmental improvements to make it more welcoming and to reflect its significance

### **Green Space**

- The amount of green space should be increased
- New green spaces should include water features

### **Environment**

- No buildings in the area (domestic or commercial) should be allowed to use wood-burning appliances;

- The document is very poor on environmental issues; it is not positively prepared or consistent with national policy concerning the environment and air pollution;

### **Leisure Centre**

- The new leisure centre should include a sauna/steam room
- A refurbished leisure centre would be welcomed but, as part of these proposals, it is essential to consider how the new facilities would be accessed, and to include convenient car parking as well as more cycling parking

### **Commercial**

- More bars, cafes, restaurants and independent shops should be encouraged
- A new large hotel with a rooftop bar would be welcomed

### **Miscellaneous**

- The area would greatly benefit if it had the latest fibre optic broadband capabilities
- The aspiration for the area should go beyond its sporting offer
- The document's ambitions to improve the area are not focussed on the existing residents' needs
- Encouraging more activity would further increase crime, litter and anti-social behaviour
- The number of houses proposed is not justified in an area which already has problems with access due to cars blocking the road and poor quality roads

## **3. Bespoke Responses from Consultees**

### **Coal Authority**

- No comments since there is no evidence of any risks from coal mining legacy in the area

### **Heritage Development Officer**

- The inclusion of heritage as one of the key themes within the AAP is supported
- The heritage of the area is not sufficiently carried through in the proposed layout of individual neighbourhoods, and nor the potential for archaeology or heritage interpretation
- The cricket ground (excluding the stands) and the police station should be identified as a non-designate heritage asset in the CQ AAP and the Heritage Assessment (HA)
- Within the HA, the setting of Trafford Town Hall and of the entrance portal and lodges to White City (both listed) should be expanded
- An analysis of views of all designated and non-designated heritage assets should be included in the HA, in particular for Trafford Town Hall, and with these key views identified within the CQ AAP in order that they are protected
- The Townscape and Visual Assessment (TVA) also does not take account of all heritage assets in the CQ AAP area, or of heritage assets outside of the boundary that could still be impacted
- The HA does not mention the former Warwick Road Station
- There are concerns regarding the proposed height parameters; up to 20 storeys is exceptionally tall.

- A more sensitive scale of 3 storeys would be welcomed in certain areas, particularly along Talbot Road and Warwick Road and adjacent to the White City Gates
- The need for the restoration of the White City Gates, which are in poor condition, should be recognised by the CQ AAP
- New public realm should form the setting to the White City Gates
- The unique history of the area should be adequately interpreted and better reflected in Policy CQ5
- Existing design principles along Talbot Road should be given better recognition, particularly the set back from the carriageway, the space between buildings, and the existence of street trees
- The CQ AAP should include a specific design code for tall buildings within each neighbourhood
- The CQ AAP boundary should be extended to include the full route up to the football ground

### **Environment Agency**

- For matters within the remit of the Environment Agency, the CQ AAP is in accordance with the criteria of 'soundness.'
- The CQ AAP is situated within Flood Zone 1 and is therefore at a lower risk of flooding

### **Greater Manchester Minerals and Waste Unit**

- Specific reference should be made within Policy CQ4 to the requirement for development proposals to adhere to the Greater Manchester Joint Waste Development Plan 2012 by ensuring the movement of waste up the waste hierarchy

### **Highways England**

- The Strategic Road Network (SRN) has not been considered when determining the traffic impacts of the CQ AAP
- Whilst a substantial proportion of the trips generated by the CQ AAP development proposals would be via non-car modes, there is still potential for a significant number of new trips to access the SRN given the scale of development proposed
- The CQ AAP area has direct connections to M60 Junction 7 and M602 Junction 3
- Aktins has undertaken a technical review of the latest AAP proposals and evidence base on Highways England's behalf
- Overall, there is insufficient evidence presented to enable Highways England to understand the full impact of the proposals on the SRN
- Given this lack of evidence, Highways England would need to have an understanding of impact further down the line at planning application stage
- Highways England would prefer to have this understanding now to enable better insight into cumulative impacts and to determine the forms of mitigation required upfront

### **Historic England**

- No comments to be made

### **Homes England**

- No comments to be made

### **Natural England**

- No comments to be made

### **Sport England**

- Policy CQ1 is supported but it could be strengthened by adding a requirement to include the principles of Active Design
- In respect of the Building Height Parameter Plan supporting Policy CQ1, Sport England would wish to see a reduction in the height of buildings adjacent to the Lancashire County Cricket Club (LCCC) ground since excessive building height could prejudice the use of a training facility. The England and Wales Cricket Board Facilities Team should be consulted on this point
- Policy CQ3 and the inclusion of a refurbished leisure centre is supported
- Policy CQ6 could also be strengthened through a reference to Active Design, and the reference to taller buildings would be inappropriate in the vicinity of the cricket ground
- The creation of a well-being route and public spaces to connect the football and cricket grounds are welcomed
- Policy CQ7 could also be strengthened through a reference to Active Design
- The policies for the well-being route and processional route (CQ8 and CQ9) are welcomed
- The inclusion of sports facilities as an essential infrastructure item under Policy CQ11 is supported
- The proposals for the Southern Neighbourhood should show a reduced height of development adjacent to the cricket ground

### **Trafford Arts Association**

- The CQ AAP does not include any new cultural attraction
- The inclusion of a multi-purpose performing arts space would be a fitting asset to an area which has a rich cultural history
- This building, if situated in a pedestrianised area adjacent to shops and cafes, would play a large part in any special community day or Trafford festival

### **Transport for Greater Manchester (TfGM)**

- The CQ AAP is broadly consistent with TfGM's 2040 Strategy
- TfGM strongly supports the approach to urban design and to density and walkability of neighbourhoods
- TfGM supports the approach to walking and cycling, which is coherent with TfGM's Streets for All approach and with the Bee Network (but it would be helpful for these to be explicitly referenced)
- There is scope to set out further elements to support walking and cycling
- There is scope to say more about the role of buses

### **United Utilities**

- The CQ AAP should set out the need to follow the hierarchy of drainage options for surface water

- The redevelopment of brownfield sites within the CQ AAP area should be based on achieving a significant volume reduction of surface water discharge and with no discharge into the public sewerage network
- Given the amount of public realm improvements, surface water management should be at the forefront of the design process
- There is an opportunity within Policy CQ4 to add a requirement for all new development to encourage water efficiency measures/techniques (such as rainwater recycling, green roofs, water butts and permeable surfaces)
- Developers should consider that sites may have existing infrastructure crossing through them

#### **4. Bespoke responses from Landowners/Developers/Key stakeholders**

##### **Accrue (Forum) 1 LLP (former B&Q site), represented by WSP**

- The change in allocation of the B&Q site from leisure to residential is supported
- The CQ AAP should confirm that the ambition to deliver 4,000 homes is a minimum
- Policy CQ2 should specify the period in which these homes will come forward and set out a trajectory of allocated sites
- There are inconsistencies between the CQ AAP and the Trafford Local Plan regarding how the CQ AAP will meet the area's objectively assessed needs
- The AAP should reference the absence of a five year housing land supply, the Housing Delivery Test (HDT) failure, and measures outlined in the HDT Action Plan
- On the above points the plan is not positively prepared and is unsound
- The building height parameters are objected to; they are not justified and could impact on the deliverability of the CQ AAP
- The TVA only tests the Council's assumptions; it does not consider the acceptability of a range of building heights, and therefore the CQ AAP should not be used to prescribe maximum building heights
- The B&Q site is capable of accommodating buildings taller than six storeys (as demonstrated in documentation accompanying the recent planning application and supported by the Places Matter Design Review Panel)
- The CQ AAP should also encourage independent design review of major applications
- References within the TVA to the LCCC ground are not agreed with
- It is questioned why the south-western corner of the CQ AAP area is not identified as having landmark potential (unlike the other three corners)
- Efforts to connect Old Trafford Metrolink stop with Great Stone Road are supported
- It would be difficult to ensure that all ground floor units have entrances directly from streets or public spaces
- The concept of courtyard style developments is supported
- Bullet point 4 of the Amenity section of the Design Code regarding noise should be revised
- All requirements in the Residential Quality section of the Design Code would be difficult to incorporate whilst achieving the densities envisaged
- The evidence supporting affordable housing policies is insufficient

- It is not clear how 25% affordable housing can be treated as a minimum since developers would not commit to a higher proportion and there is no mechanism proposed to control this
- The testing within the Viability Assessment (VA) of only two scenarios (20% and 25% affordable housing) is too limited
- The 25% affordable housing figure is inconsistent with the 40% figure in the emerging Trafford Local Plan, and clarity is required in terms of which policy would take priority
- The CQ AAP is therefore considered unsound because its affordable housing policy is not justified
- The following will inhibit the deliverability of the CQ AAP: absence of phasing; building height parameters; and the infrastructure sum
- The introduction of a fixed rate financial contribution is objected to; it does not satisfy the three legal tests set out in the CIL Regs 2010
- It is clear that the Section 106 contributions set out in the CQ AAP, together with CIL, would significantly undermine the viability and deliverability of the CQ AAP
- The CQ AAP is therefore considered unsound since it would not be effective
- The scheme proposed for the B&Q site can drain itself adequately without reliance on a comprehensive stormwater management strategy
- The CQ AAP is not consistent with national policy (namely paragraph 35 of the NPPF and also the CIL Regs)

**Acre Manchester Ltd (701 Chester Road), represented by Brian Madge Ltd**

- An application for the erection of a 190 bedroom hotel (comprising up to 16 storeys of accommodation) was dismissed at appeal but on matters of residential amenity and inadequate parking arrangements only (not on matters of principle, on design or impact on heritage assets)
- The CQ AAP identifies 701 Chester Road as a gateway opportunity which is welcomed (does it?)
- Policy CQ3 encourages new hotel development, which is also supported
- The document's proposal to relax parking standards and with its greater focus on encouraging more sustainable modes of transport is welcomed
- The document is unclear in respect of the height of a building which may be acceptable on this site (given inconsistencies between the parameters plan and the neighbourhood plans)
- The document identifies a new super-crossing to the A56 adjacent to the site; it would be helpful if a schematic plan could be included to understand the potential impact on the site
- The identification of Hornby Road as a non-designated heritage asset is not justified since the buildings are undistinguished
- The provisions of Policy CQ11 are not well-related to specific infrastructure projects and may conflict with CIL

**Derwent Holdings (39 Talbot Road, 17-19 Talbot Road, 601 Chester Road, and White City Retail Park), represented by Aylward Town Planning Ltd**

- The Council should utilise Section 266 powers to simplify titles which would catalyse delivery and maximise yields on those parcels which are constrained

- There is some inconsistency between anticipated yields for certain plots within the CQ AAP area when comparing the trajectory scheduled for the new Trafford Local Plan
- Many assumptions within the VA are not agreed with, including surrounding expected sales values, construction costs, professional fees, and finance costs
- The VA's blanket approach to existing use values is not appropriate given that values across the CQ AAP area are vastly different
- The VA's modelled profit margins are too low especially in a location which could experience market saturation, and are not at a level which would be accepted by market developers and Registered Providers
- Policy CQ11 should be re-written to allow for viability testing
- There is a lack of consistency in the document's requirements in respect of affordable housing, CIL and the roof tax when compared with past requirements in this location
- The proposed financial contributions are not well-based in evidence
- The car park surveys within the TA were undertaken at a time which does not remotely represent peak usage period for a retail park
- The HA has not been updated despite adjustments to the proposals contained within the CQ AAP
- The value assigned to the Old Trafford Bowling Club within the HA is not agreed with
- The HA refers to the possible designation of a Talbot Road North Conservation Area. The need for such a conservation area is strongly rejected
- The boundaries to the different neighbourhoods should be amended to reflect property interests
- The Land Uses Parameters Plan and its treatment of White City Retail Park cannot be supported
- The Building Heights Parameters Plan has not been updated to reflect more recent CQ AAP progress
- The Permeability Parameters Plan assumes new routes through the retail park which may not be available
- The parameter plans are unhelpful and should be omitted
- Policy CQ1 should accept the need for phasing and interim uses
- There is a very real risk that the quantum of homes envisaged under Policy CQ2 will not be delivered due to the viability assumptions which underpin it
- Policy CQ3 needs to be reconsidered with its reference to small scale retail uses and local needs
- The 'policy on' implications of Policy CQ4 need to be properly tested
- Policy CQ10 and its proposals for a multi-storey car park at White City need to be subject to detailed design and viability analysis
- The ambitions to achieve the proposed redevelopment of the retail park is supported in principle but any full redevelopment requires considerable market testing, and phased delivery is likely
- The CQ AAP should allow for a substantive landmark residential-led development within the eastern part of the retail park
- 601 Chester Road also provides an opportunity for a landmark building
- The site adjacent to Old Trafford Bowling Club could accommodate a development of 6-8 storeys

- It is hoped that the proposed maximum heights for block developments will be utilised as broad guidance rather than a set of absolute standards

### **Jumani Holdings (Former MKM House, Warwick Road, and Charlton House, Warwick Road)**

- The definition of the former MKM House as an 'area to be developed' is welcomed
- The identification of the Trafford Pub as a non-designated heritage asset is questioned
- The height parameters for both sites (up to 12 storeys), as set out in Policy CQ1, are not agreed with
- Some flexibility should be introduced within the policy in respect of building heights
- The masterplans for the Central Neighbourhood for the MKM site do not show a form of development that is reflective of either the consented scheme or the current planning application (including in terms of building height)
- The illustrative scheme for the redevelopment of Charlton House also shows a building below the 12 storey parameter height
- It is a missed opportunity not to show the Charlton House site as accommodating a 'landmark building'
- The new route that is shown adjacent to Charlton House could be provided as part of the site's redevelopment
- There are concerns regarding the methodology and assumptions underpinning the viability and affordable housing targets contained within the CQ AAP.

### **Lancashire County Cricket Club (LCCC), represented by Hill Dickinson**

- Earlier aspirations for the Civic Quarter were focussed on the creation of a leisure quarter, with the promotion of the cricket ground as an international sporting venue at its heart and then enhancing facilities that would support that role within its vicinity
- This ambition to create a new community leisure facility adjacent to the cricket ground on the former B&Q site has been lost as a consequence of the current pandemic and a short-term change in Council investment priorities
- The CQ AAP covers the development of the area through to 2037 and beyond, and there are other public funding programmes available which could be used to deliver a new leisure centre
- The B&Q site is wholly unsuitable for housing and would be prejudicial to the future operation of LCCC
- The vision in the current CQ AAP is a clear departure from the vision previously promoted by the Council in partnership with LCCC, and thus it calls into question the deliverability of the CQ AAP and its Southern Neighbourhood
- The policies and proposals of the CQ AAP do not adequately commit to strengthening and enhancing LCCC's status, consistent with the NPPF, the Core Strategy and the emerging Trafford Local Plan
- None of the eight listed strategic objectives refer to LCCC
- The strategic vision should also include a reference to LCCC
- Land within the Southern Neighbourhood should be promoted for development that is consistent with the supports the growth of LCCC

- By removing the multi-storey car park from the B&Q site, the CQ AAP no longer supports LCCC's intention to free up surface car parking to deliver enhanced training facilities at the ground
- The B&Q site should be re-designated for car parking/leisure and uses ancillary to LCCC
- The plans show the loss of club car parking to provide green space, a public square and built development). This cannot be supported since existing parking is necessary for the operation of LCCC
- The vision for the Southern Neighbourhood should be amended to refer to LCCC
- References to the removal of barriers and fencing within the Southern Neighbourhood cannot apply to LCCC for operational/security reasons
- Proposals for the adjacent Central Neighbourhood should also contain a commitment to activate the processional route
- The reference to podium car parking in the Southern Neighbourhood is not consistent with other references and could be an anomaly
- The Integrated Assessment is also considered inadequate

#### **Savills (97 Talbot Road, British Gas Site)**

- The site is currently a vacant office building on a sustainably located and prominent plot. The majority of the site could be redeveloped for a medium/high density residential scheme
- It is agreed that the site is an opportunity but the site is not suitable for conversion. The building should also be identified for redevelopment to provide flexibility
- The provision of tall buildings across the CQ AAP is supported, and it is considered that this site could accommodate a building of 20 storeys
- Any restrictions on height, scale and massing that would hinder a viable redevelopment should not be carried forward, and flexibility should be incorporated within the CQ AAP to allow the appropriateness of scale and massing to be assessed on a site by site basis

#### **Resolve 106**

- The CQ AAP does not meet the tests of soundness having regard to the adequacy of the VA underpinning Policy CQ11
- A revised VA should be undertaken which seeks to properly determine Benchmark Land Value in accordance with the provisions of National Planning Guidance
- The revised VA should also incorporate sensitivity testing (on a cumulative basis) having regard to potential variations in: the scope of development; affordable housing revenues; absorption rate and delivery timescale; and developer return
- Policy CQ11 should be modified to incorporate some flexibility in respect of the provision of affordable housing when allowing for specifics of each site, akin to Core Strategy Policy L2

#### **5.0 Council Response to Representations**

5.1 There is a schedule appended to this report (Appendix B) which sets out the Council's response to these representations when having regard to the scope and nature of Regulation 19 consultation (on the issues of soundness and procedural/legal compliance). The schedule also identifies whether the Council's response would initiate a further change to the CQAAP, and whether that change may be categorised as a 'main' or an 'additional' (minor) modification.

## **6.0 Dedicated Viability Consultation Event**

6.1 The Regulation 19 Publication Version of the CQAAP set out its approach to securing developer contributions via an infrastructure and obligations policy (Policy CQ11). This policy was informed by detailed viability work, and the methodology behind this work was the subject of previous viability consultation at Regulation 18 stage (in September 2020). The Consultation Statement referred to in paragraph 3.1 of this report provides further details regarding this specific exercise.

6.2 In responding to representations received on viability matters during the January to March 2021 Regulation 19 consultation, further viability-led consultation was arranged. Moving on from the viability methodology previously considered, this focussed on key viability assumptions, regarding values and costs for example. The event took the form of a virtual, interactive seminar held on 12<sup>th</sup> July 2021, hosted by Council officers and the Council's viability consultants, Continuum.

6.3 The seminar was advertised by email sent to: those who had attended the first viability consultation event in September 2020; those who had made representations following the September 2020 event; those who had made representations in response to the Regulation 19 consultation and had raised the topic of viability; and all landowners/key stakeholders within the CQAAP area. The seminar was also advertised on the Council's website.

6.4 There is a separate accompanying report prepared by Continuum which provides further detail regarding the aims of the event, its content, those in attendance, feedback received, and the Council's response (see Appendix A).

**Appendix A:** Civic Quarter Area Action Plan – Viability Consultation Responses (prepared by Continuum, dated November 2021)

**Appendix B:** Schedule of Regulation 19 Representations (including the Council's response)