

**Draft Park Way Planning Brief - Public Consultation
Schedule of Changes with Reason**

Appendix 12(b)

	Respondent	Comment	Council Action
1	Newbury Volunteer Bureau	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Shopmobility should be next to dedicated parking spaces 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No amendment proposed. This is a detailed matter to be addressed through the planning application process
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Support extension of Shopmobility, subject to funding 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Noted
2	Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Support for general principles of Newbury Vision and regeneration of Park Way through mixed-use development. - Important that development of Park Way does not prejudice the trading of existing retailers within the Town Centre 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Noted
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Brief needs to recognise that replacement car parking should be well related to existing stores/retailers as well as new commercial development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No amendment proposed. Para 4.16 (as renumbered) sets out the requirement for new development to complement and reinforce the town centre's existing retail and leisure offer in line with planning policy and in the interests of taking forward the Newbury 2025 Vision and ensuring redevelopment of Park Way contributes to strengthening the town centre. - Amendment to Para 5.18 (as renumbered) acknowledges the importance of existing retailers and requires developers to ensure car parking is linked to existing development. Additionally, para 4.9 and 4.10 (as renumbered) note that car parking provision to

- | | | |
|--------------------------|--|---|
| <p>3 Littman Robeson</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Object to servicing arrangement in Fig 11. Not convinced adequate servicing can be achieved to existing stores. – Object to pedestrianisation of Marsh Lane due to impact on customer car collect operations – Support for general principles – Important that development of Park Way does not prejudice the trading of existing retailers within the Town Centre, Greater consideration should be given to linkages with Northbrook Street, orientation of units and transport links to ensure no | <p>replace the existing parking levels should be provided on-site or consideration could be given to alternative location(s). The brief requires that if an alternative location is proposed it should be done so in consultation with the Local Authority and should be suitably located to support the continued vitality and viability of the town centre.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Fig 10 (as renumbered) is amended to clarify that it is an indicative concept rather than a definitive requirement. – No amendment proposed. Marsh Lane is important in providing a pedestrian route linking Parkway with Northbrook Street. This is in line with the general approach advocated by the brief of maximising pedestrian permeability and ensuring full integration of the site with Northbrook Street and the rest of the town centre – Noted – No amendment proposed. Para 4.16 (as renumbered) sets out the requirement for new development to complement and reinforce the |
|--------------------------|--|---|

detrimental impact on existing operators

- Object to servicing arrangement in Fig 11. Amend the brief to ensure that adequate servicing can be achieved to the rear of 30/31 Northbrook Street
 - Object to loss of access rights to 30/31 Northbrook Street. Amend brief to ensure development does not encroach on private service yard and car park to the rear of 30/31 Northbrook Street
- town centre's existing retail and leisure offer in line with planning policy and in the interests of taking forward the Newbury 2025 Vision and ensuring redevelopment of Park Way contributes to strengthening the town centre.
- Fig 10 (as renumbered) is amended to clarify that it is an indicative concept rather than a definitive requirement. As regards servicing the Council recognises that development on the site may require a change to existing servicing arrangements and the brief expects proposals for the site to be accompanied by a servicing management plan that demonstrates that proper servicing can be provided to both new and existing units.
 - No amendment proposed. The brief is not specific about the layout of developments that may come forward for the site. However, the brief seeks to maximise total floorspace and the ability of the site to accommodate needed development. It is likely therefore that this will result in the loss of the objector's car park. Additionally, as the property flanks Northbrook Place which is recognised as a key link

- 4 English Heritage
- Brief should examine the scope for dual use surfaces and shared accesses
 - Need to consider new ways for servicing goods delivery along narrow lanes
 - Brief should be informed by a character appraisal of Newbury

between Northbrook Street and Park Way, it would be inappropriate of the brief to seek to protect the private service yard and car park at the expense of maximising pedestrian access and increasing permeability of the site from Northbrook Street.

- No amendment proposed. Para 5.22 (as renumbered) notes that servicing and access arrangements and space should be shared where possible.
- No amendment proposed. The Council recognises that development on the site may require a change to existing servicing arrangements and the brief expects proposals for the site to be accompanied by a servicing management plan that demonstrates that proper servicing can be provided to both new and existing units
- An urban design analysis has been undertaken for the Park Way site and is included as an amendment at Appendix 4. An amendment is also made at Para 5.3 (as renumbered) to detail that any developer will be required to prepare a

- North / south pedestrian routes should have active frontages.
 - Agree with desire for full permeability and open to the elements.
 - Ground floor units in Northbrook Street could be used to create alley style entrances into new uses and development at rear
- detailed landscape / townscape analysis for proposed schemes within the site. This analysis will be expected to include areas which have a physical link to the site and a visual analysis to identify the impact of the proposed development on existing views and vistas.
- Amendments made to paras 5.7 and 5.32 (as renumbered) requiring development along the routes leading off Northbrook Street and to the rear of Northbrook Street to provide active frontage
 - Noted
 - No amendment proposed. The brief seeks to maximise linkage between Northbrook Street and Park Way whilst recognising the historic fabric of the area, listed buildings and conservation areas status. Para 5.30 sets out the requirement for design proposals to maintain the integrity of the historic frontage. The appropriateness or otherwise of any proposal to create alley style entrances is a detailed matter that would be addressed through the planning application process

- Car parking blocks should be located where Burgage plots have already been lost
- Concern over corralling A3 uses into one place
- Support for preserving the historic character of Northbrook Street
- No amendment proposed. The Council considers restricting car parking to areas where the historic burgage plots have been lost would inappropriately constrain the development potential of the site. Whilst the brief requires developments to respect the historic character of the site the brief also seeks to ensure that the redevelopment opportunities of the site to accommodate needed new development are maximised and the Council is satisfied that the brief provides for an appropriate balance between these two issues.
- No amendment proposed. The Council does not agree that the brief corrals A3 uses into one place. Para 4.18 (as renumbered) recognises that as part of the modern shopping experience there is capacity for some A3 uses within the site. Para 4.19 (as renumbered) however specifically seeks to restrict A3 uses within the site to ensure the Newbury 2025 Vision and Council policy for A3 provision is not undermined.
- Noted

- Broadly agree with para 5.7. Monolithic / homogeneous blocks should be avoided. However, continuous frontage to Parkway is not necessarily desirable; elevations should be broken by openings
- Support for improvements to Canal side (para 5.9)
- Public Art could be incorporated into building design
- Concerned that tegula blocks are becoming ubiquitous in towns
- Para 5.8 (as renumbered) is amended to clarify that schemes proposing the development of monolithic / homogeneous blocks are unlikely to be considered acceptable.
- The brief does not specifically rule out further openings in the Parkway frontage however, the brief also requires development at the site to maximise floorspace and provide for the retail needs of the town as set out within the Retail and Leisure Study. The Council considers further openings may preclude the provision of necessary retail floorspace and considers the enhancement to the existing lanes and design guidance set out within the brief (particularly with regard to a vertical emphasis and roofline silhouette - paras 5.40 & 5.41 as renumbered) provides an appropriate balance between the needs of new development and the historic character of the area.
- Noted
- Agreed. Appropriate amendment made to para 5.53 (as renumbered)
- Brief has been amended (bullet 4, para 5.47) by

- 5 White Young Green – Brief is contrary to PPG1, PPG12 and draft PPS12 which requires SPG to be consistent with national regional and local plan policy
- Brief conflicts with local plan policy by giving other uses same priority as retail
 - Brief conflicts with Retail & Leisure Study by encouraging smaller shop units rather than large scale retail units
 - Medium & small shop units will not offer space requirements of national retail operators.
- deleting specific reference to tegula blocks
- No amendment proposed. The Council is satisfied that the brief is consistent with national policy and complies with both structure and local plan policies. Para 3.1 (as renumbered) sets out that the brief has been prepared in the context of national planning policy, and notwithstanding, para 3.4 (as renumbered) requires development of Park Way to comply with all national regional and local policy and guidance.
 - No amendment proposed. The brief seeks to maximise retail floorspace within the context of a town centre mixed use development. Policy SHOP.2 of the Local Plan states that the Council will promote additional town centre shopping development together with leisure and community facilities, housing development and car parking.
 - No amendment proposed. The Council is satisfied that there is no conflict between the Retail & Leisure Study and the brief. Paragraph 4.14 (as renumbered) of the brief is clear that

- Fig 11 is too prescriptive, Fig 11 is not achievable
- Brief should not imply that whole site will be developed in a single development

proposals for development at Park Way should have regard to the Retail & Leisure Study and will be expected to demonstrate how they make best use of the site to meet the identified retail needs. Paragraph 4.15 (as renumbered) recognises that a mix of other smaller unit shops will be needed to complement and balance the larger stores.

- Fig 10 (as renumbered) is amended to clarify that it is an indicative concept rather than a definitive requirement.
- Agreed. The Council recognises that a single scheme is unlikely to come forward to develop the whole of the site. Accordingly one of the purposes of preparing a planning brief is to set a framework to ensure compatibility between schemes, to ensure the overall viability of developing Park Way is not jeopardised by individual schemes and that the opportunities that the site presents are maximised. The brief has been amended to remove any implication that the site will be developed in a single development.

- Object to para 4.25, Park Way frontage should be primary retail use as advised by Newbury 2025 Vision. Brief conflicts with Newbury 2025 by proposing limited retail along Park Way frontage
- Insufficient space for car parking provision as indicated by Fig 11 to be provided.
- Car parking requirement would mean construction of high level vehicular bridges which would not be viable and would be unacceptable in design terms
- Para 4.20 (as renumbered) is amended to clarify that the Council does not expect retail frontage to the Park Way frontage facing Victoria Park. The Council considers that an emphasis towards retail frontage facing Victoria Park would be unlikely to generate strong linkage between the frontage and Northbrook Street.
- Fig 10 (as renumbered) is amended to clarify that it is an indicative concept rather than a definitive requirement
- The Council recognises that upper level car parking has financial implications and consequent potential viability implications for schemes. However, the Brief is not specific about the extent or layout of developments that may come forward for the site. It is consequently unreasonable to expect the Council to assess the detailed viability of any such scheme in the preparation of the planning brief. The Council does accept that the car parking requirement may necessitate car parking to be distributed across the site or may

- Replacement of existing car parking is beyond the scope of local plan policy.
- be provided at an alternative location providing the facility is suitably located to support the continued vitality and viability of the town centre and Paras 4.8 and 4.9 (as renumbered) are amended reflect this
- As regards design issues, the Council is satisfied that the principle of car parking at upper levels is acceptable and considers there to be scope for design solutions to accommodate such development and satisfy other objectives of the brief.
- The Council recognises that SHOP.2 of the local plan contains no specific reference to the re-provision of existing car parking on the park Way site. However, Policy LD5 of the Berkshire Structure Plan maintains that development will not be permitted where it is likely to give rise to serious problems of parking and Policy T4 of the emerging Berkshire Structure Plan requires all development to take appropriate measures to offset any adverse effect it has on the transport network. Additionally, the Newbury 2025 Vision is clear in its expectation that

- Object to servicing arrangement in Fig 11, service route appears particularly narrow
 - Proposals for Jack Street would cause pedestrian / servicing conflict inconsistent with requirements of the brief
 - Widening of Northbrook Place is inconsistent with brief’s aim to replicate the scale and character of existing narrow lanes
 - Demolition of 32/32a Northbrook Street is out-of-keeping with street scene
- development within the Park Way area will incorporate the re-provision of existing surface area parking.
- The Council recognises that a single scheme is unlikely to come forward to develop the whole of the site and recognises that the car parking requirement may necessitate car parking to be distributed across the site or may be provided at an alternative location. Paras 4.8 and 4.9 (as renumbered) are amended accordingly.
- Fig 10 (as renumbered) is amended to clarify that it is an indicative concept rather than a definitive requirement
 - Fig 10 (as renumbered) is amended to clarify that it is an indicative concept rather than a definitive requirement.
 - No amendment proposed. The Council recognises that widening of Northbrook Place may be necessary in order to ensure the viability of any scheme and to ensure proper connection to Northbrook Street in terms of permeability and pedestrian access. The Council is satisfied that the treatment of

- 4-5 storey building to rear of Northbrook Street would overshadow existing properties
- Design solution of the brief does not satisfactorily accommodate all the requirements of the brief

Northbrook Place provides an appropriate balance between the needs of new development with the need to have regard to maintaining the historic character of the area

- The Council is satisfied that the principle of a 4 – 5 storey frontage to Park Way is acceptable and considers there to be scope for design solutions to accommodate such development without unacceptable impact on existing buildings. The brief has been amended to include a indicative sketch drawing to illustrate the concept of setting back upper floors to reduce the apparent height of a building.
- No amendment proposed. The brief does not offer a design solution, rather it seeks to provide parameters within which proposals should fit. The Council is confident a suitably designed scheme or schemes for Park Way can be provided that meets all the requirements of the brief, including maximising retail floorspace, providing mixed use development with appropriate car parking and respecting and complimenting the historic environment of the town centre.

– Brief is too prescriptive in requiring creation of narrow burgage plots to rear of Northbrook Street. Such plots have never existed along Park Way frontage

– 34, 35 & 35a Northbrook Street are Listed Buildings

6 Wesleyan Assurance Society – No comment

7 Colin Milsom Architect – Object to treatment of Northbrook Place entrance and its effect on 30/31a Northbrook Street

– No amendment proposed. The brief does not require the creation of narrow burgage plots. Rather it requires development to have regard to the historic character of the area, and seeks to take this forward within the context of modern building.

– The brief is amended by the inclusion of Figs A1, A2 and A3 within Appendix 2 which provide historical evidence of narrow burgage plots across the whole site.

– Noted. Amendment made to correct Fig 8 (as renumbered).

– No amendment proposed

– No amendment proposed. The Council recognises that widening of Northbrook Place may be necessary in order to ensure the viability of any scheme and to ensure proper connection to Northbrook Street in terms of permeability and pedestrian access. The Council is satisfied that subject to satisfactory design, the treatment of Northbrook Place provides an appropriate balance between the

- 8 Bettina Kirkham
(*WBC Landscape Consultant*)
- A visual analysis should be carried out to identify key views, vistas, landmarks, vantage points etc
 - Site boundary should include the edge of Victoria Park to ensure it is properly considered
- needs of new development with the need to have regard to maintaining the historic character of the area, including the potential impact on the streetscene and neighbouring properties.
- An urban design analysis has been undertaken for the Park Way site and is included as an amendment at Appendix 4. An amendment is also made at Para 5.3 (as renumbered) to detail that any developer will be required to prepare a detailed landscape / townscape analysis for proposed schemes within the site. This analysis will be expected to include areas which have a physical link to the site and a visual analysis to identify the impact of the proposed development on existing views and vistas.
 - No amendment proposed. The brief makes clear any proposals will need to recognise the role of Victoria Park and enhance its setting. The Council does not consider there to be a need therefore to amend the site boundaries of the brief to ensure the role of the park and its enhanced integration with the Park Way area and town centre generally is achieved.

- Development concept should follow the urban design analysis
- Brief should require application(s) to be accompanied by comprehensive design statement(s) in accordance with PPG1 and “By Design”
- Townscape/landscape character analysis should be extended and include the site and areas within the site’s visual envelope
Landscape analysis should be carried out of the setting of the site, identifying soft and hard features and their contribution to the streetscene, historic value, spatial & social function etc
- This is a presentational consideration. Amendments are proposed to the layout of the brief to provide greater clarity
- The Council is satisfied that the brief is consistent with national policy including PPG1. Paras 3.3 – 3.5 (as renumbered) set out that the brief has been prepared in the context of national planning policy and require development at Park Way to comply with all national regional and local policy and guidance, including PPG1 and *Better Places to Live – By Design Guide*. However, an amendment is made at Para 5.3 (as renumbered) to detail that any developer will be required to prepare a detailed landscape / townscape analysis for proposed schemes within the site
- An urban design analysis has been undertaken for the Park Way site and is included as an amendment at Appendix 4. An amendment is also made at Para 5.3 (as renumbered) to detail that any developer will be required to prepare a detailed landscape / townscape analysis for proposed schemes within the site. This analysis

			will be expected to include areas which have a physical link to the site and a visual analysis to identify the impact of the proposed development on existing views and vistas
		– Concerned that tegula blocks are becoming ubiquitous in towns; brief is over prescriptive on suitable materials	– Brief has been amended (bullet 4, para 5.47) (as renumbered) by deleting specific reference to tegula blocks
		– Lighting should be conceived as part of the architectural and landscape design	– Agreed. Brief has been amended by the inclusion of new paragraph (para 5.50).
		– Brief should include reference to consultation exercise and future involvement of community in assessment of development proposals	– Agreed. The Council intends to include reference to the consultation exercise and community involvement within the published the planning brief.
9	Thames Water	– Brief should include reference to public utilities and services and their capacity	– Agreed. Brief has been amended to include an appropriate reference at paras 2.48 – 2.56 (as renumbered)
		– reference to the need to consult with Thames Water in respect of foul and surface water drainage should be included	– Agreed. Brief has been amended to include an appropriate reference at paras 2.48 – 2.56 (as renumbered)
10	RB Windsor & Maidenhead	– No comment	– No amendment proposed
11	English Nature	– Brief should seek to safeguard the river during any construction and should make reference to PPG9 and ENV9 in relation to the River Kennet	– Agreed. Brief has been amended to include reference to PPG9 (para 3.6) and ENV.9 (para

- | | | | |
|----|-----------------------|---|---|
| | | | 3.21). |
| | | | – The Council considers the protection of the river during any construction is a detailed matter to be addressed through the planning application process and accordingly no amendment is proposed to the brief |
| | | – More regard should be paid to the potential ecological enhancement of the river and its banks including improving river habitat and potential for wildlife gain. | – Agreed. Brief has been amended (para 5.11 as renumbered) to recognise the potential for ecological enhancement of the river |
| 12 | Cllr Tony Vickers | – Alternative routes for cyclists need to be provided if cycling is removed from the canal path, Northbrook Street and Parkway as a result of any development; developers should be obliged to contribute to such off-site works. | – No amendment proposed in regard to developer contributions. Paragraph 59, Appendix 1 (as renumbered), includes reference to developer contributions towards improved access for cyclists. |
| 13 | West Berkshire Spokes | – Support for brief where it addresses the needs of cyclists and provides the potential to enhance the cycling environment | – Noted |
| | | – More and clearer references to cycling should be added to certain paragraphs of the brief | – Para 4.7, bullet 5 (as renumbered) requires the layout and design of new development to make adequate provision for cycling along Park Way and to provide new cycling crossings on Park Way. |
| | | | – Brief is amended at para 4.22 (as renumbered) to reflect the requirement to strengthen the |

- Specific proposals for two new cycle routes (a north-south route and a west-east route) to be created

 - 14 Heritage & Tourism Manager
 - Include Figs 7, 7a and 7b as referred to within the text
 - Various detailed comments covering Heritage and Archaeology issues

 - 15 RB Fire & Rescue Service
 - Proposals should comply with Building regulations covering access requirements of the Fire Service
 - Fire Service requests early involvement in discussions with potential developers so that access issues can be identified and addressed
-
- existing cycle route (Sustrans National Route 4) along the canal.
 - Fig 9 (as renumbered) is amended to show cycle routes
 - The Council recognises the importance of linking cycle routes in the interests of providing cycling movement and access. The brief is amended by the inclusion of a new paragraph (bullet 6, para 4.7) to ensure development reflects the need for north/south and east/west cycle movement.
 - Agreed. The brief has been amended by the inclusion of Figs A1, A2 and A3 in Appendix 2.
 - The brief has been amended to reflect comments received.
 - The brief has been amended (para 2.57 as renumbered) to include a recommendation to developers to contact the fire service to discuss proposals prior to formal submission. As regards building regulations this is a matter beyond the scope of the planning brief and no amendment is proposed.

16	David Danielli	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Support for the attention to parking and transport within the brief - Brief should have regard to the potential for Park & Ride to the north and south of the town centre 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Noted - No amendment proposed. Park and ride issues fall outside the scope and boundary of the planning brief. This issue will be examined through the Newbury Movement study which is due for completion late 2004.
17	Pam Manvell	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No comment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No amendment proposed
18	JSPU	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No comment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No amendment proposed
19	Chris Gee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No comment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No amendment proposed
20	Clere Design & Print	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Caroline Place is private rather than a public right of way 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Noted
21	Newbury Town Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No comment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No amendment proposed
22	GOSE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No comment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No amendment proposed
23	Basingstoke & Deane Borough Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No comment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No amendment proposed
24	Thames Valley Police	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No comment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No amendment proposed
25	Peter Atkinson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No comment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No amendment proposed
26	Andrew Lutter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Fig 1 is incorrectly printed - Development to cater for retail chains is not wanted; Newbury should be kept as an historic market town 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Noted and corrected - No amendment proposed. The preparation of the planning brief for the Park Way site is in

line with the West Berkshire Local Plan and reflects the aims of the Newbury 2025 Vision which sets out a strategic framework for Newbury for the next 20 years. The Vision is informed by the West Berkshire Retail & Leisure study which recognises a need to improve, extend and consolidate the town centre's retail offer.

- | | | | |
|----|-----------------|---|---|
| 27 | Vodafone | <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Support; Brief is clear and comprehensive- Re-word 'professional' terminology (e.g.: 'permeability', 'historic grain') to better accommodate the interested general reader | <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Noted- No change proposed. The Council appreciates the difficulty the phraseology might present to non-professionals, however, the planning brief is also a technical and professional document and rightly should use the appropriate language. |
| 28 | Gillian Durrant | <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Brief is excellent- Brief should include reference to public toilets so enabling the removal of Victoria Park facilities | <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Noted- No amendment proposed. In the absence of an identified need for additional toilet facilities within the Park Way site, it would be inappropriate for the Council to include a specific requirement for public toilets within the planning brief. However, the brief does require any proposals to recognise the role of |

Victoria Park and enhance its setting. And this may include the reprovision of public toilets within any Park Way development or the potential enhancement of the existing toilets. Additionally, para 4.21(as renumbered) of the brief encourages developments to include uses providing community benefits as part of the overall development of the Park Way site.