


|  Executive 10th July 2013 | | Agenda Item No. 8 |
|---|---|------------------------------------|
| Title | Progress on the Warwick Town Centre Plan | |
| For further information about this report please contact | Andrew Jones, Deputy Chief Executive Lorna Coldicott, Senior Planner | |
| Wards of the District directly affected | Warwick North, Warwick South, Warwick West | |
| Is the report private and confidential and not for publication by virtue of a paragraph of schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972, following the Local Government (Access to Information) (Variation) Order 2006? | No | |
| Date and meeting when issue was last considered and relevant minute number | Executive - July 2012, minute number 30 | |
| Background Papers | | |

| | |
|--|---------------|
| Contrary to the policy framework: | No |
| Contrary to the budgetary framework: | No |
| Key Decision? | Yes/No |
| Included within the Forward Plan? (If yes include reference number) | Yes. Ref:394a |
| Equality & Sustainability Impact Assessment Undertaken | N/A |
| | |

| Officer/Councillor Approval | | |
|--|-------------|--------------------------|
| Officer Approval | Date | Name |
| Deputy Chief Executive | 29 May 2013 | Andrew Jones |
| Head of Service | | Tracy Darke |
| CMT | | Chris Elliott, Bill Hunt |
| Section 151 Officer | | Mike Snow |
| Finance | | Mike Snow |
| Portfolio Holder(s) | | Cllr John Hammon |
| Consultation & Community Engagement | | |
| Consultation on Preferred Options undertaken October/November 2012 | | |
| | | |
| Final Decision? | No | |
| Suggested next steps (if not final decision please set out below) | | |

1. SUMMARY

This report seeks:

- To inform members of the results of the 'Preferred Options' consultation for the Warwick Town Centre Plan and the steps required to progress the Plan to the next stage of its preparation.
- Approval to carry out a survey with regard to the future of the Warwick Mop.
- Approval to take steps to secure the services of a consultant to assess the viability of the major site proposals within the Plan.
- Approval to release a further £8,000 from the Planning Reserve to support the viability work to be undertaken by a consultant on behalf of the Council

2. RECOMMENDATION

2.1 That the Executive notes the results of the public consultation on the 'Preferred Options' of the Warwick Town Centre Plan attached at **Appendix 1**

2.2 That the Executive approves the survey to be carried out with regard to the future of the Warwick Mop at **Appendix 2**

2.3 That the Executive approves the commissioning of a consultant to assess the viability of the major site proposals within the Warwick Town Centre Plan and approves the release of £8,000 of additional funding from Planning Reserves in order to carry out the required viability work.

2.4 That the Executive notes at 3.4 – 3.14, progress in respect of sites contained in the Warwick Town Centre Plan and the Warwick Heritage Improvement Programme (Saltisford) (WHIPS) and specifically agrees to officers exploring in greater detail the option of housing development at West Rock Car Park (3.11.1 refers).

3. REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDATION

Report of Consultation: Preferred Option

3.1 In July 2012 a report was brought to the Executive requesting approval for Warwick District Council to undertake public consultation on the 'Preferred Options' for the Warwick Town Centre Plan (WTCP) on behalf of the Warwick Town Centre Partnership (Warwickshire County Council, Warwick District Council, Warwick Town Council, Warwick Chamber of Trade and the Warwick Society). The paper was approved for that purpose and the consultation was subsequently carried out during October and November 2012.

3.2 The results of the consultation are summarised and attached to this report at **Appendix 1** to inform members and to highlight the main issues raised through the consultation, which includes a high proportion of respondents claiming a lack of town centre car parking. A total of 147 responses were received, which is rather disappointing considering an estimated number of around 1000 people were given leaflets, spoken to at exhibitions and meetings and visited the staffed Warwick Market stall set up to disseminate information.

3.3 The next step to be taken is to produce a Draft Plan. A considerable amount of work will be required to ensure that the Plan is well evidenced, sound and capable of standing up to the scrutiny of a Planning Inspector. In the meantime however, it is hoped that some of the schemes will progress and may even be

completed before the Plan is eventually adopted. The Town Centre Plan will follow the same procedure as that for the Local Plan in that the Draft Warwick Town Centre Plan will be subject to another public consultation before it is submitted to the Secretary of State. A Planning Inspector will then be appointed and an examination into the Plan will take place followed by the publication of the Inspector's report before the Plan is adopted (subject to required changes).

The programme leading up to adoption of the Plan is as follows:

| Further Public Participation | Submission To Secretary of State | Publication Of Inspector's Report | Proposed Date For Adoption |
|-------------------------------------|---|--|-----------------------------------|
| Spring 2014 | Autumn 2014 | Early 2015 | Spring/Summer 2015 |

This may be subject to change depending upon the timetable for the Local Plan, since this document cannot be adopted until after the Local Plan.

Site Progress

3.4 Market Street/Theatre Street

3.4.1 Officers are in discussion with interested parties to bring forward a residential scheme as suggested in the Town Centre Plan.

3.5 Linen Street

3.5.1 Plans are being finalised to upgrade the car park aimed at increasing the utilisation.

3.5.2 In November 2012 the Executive agreed to allow funding from the sale of 21 Church Street to fund various improvements to Linen Street car park. The improvements include:

- The introduction of LED lighting throughout the car park which would result in savings on the energy bill making the introduction cost neutral in 4 years.
- The improved ease of access within the car park by reducing the size of the kerbs at the top / bottom of the ramps.
- Redecoration of the internal aspects of the car park to improve general appearance to visitors.
- The extension of the operating hours from 8pm to 10pm each evening to support local business use linked to season tickets.

3.5.3 It is anticipated as a result of these measures utilisation in Linen Street would increase to around 60%. The possible development of part of West Rock car park for residential use would further increase usage at Linen Street by a further 40 – 50 vehicles Monday – Friday. That would take utilisation up to over 80%.

3.6 Northgate Street

3.6.1 Warwickshire County Council has sold the identified properties to a developer to bring forward a residential scheme as suggested in the Town Centre Plan.

3.7 **Former Police Station**

- 3.7.1 Warwickshire Police Authority has sold the site to a developer who hopes to bring forward a primary health hub housing two GP practices currently situated on Cape Road as suggested in the Town Centre Plan. The scheme is dependent on NHS funding and a decision has not yet been made.

3.8 **Former Gasworks and former Fire Station**

- 3.8.1 With a £280,000 contribution from WDC, this site will be brought forward for affordable housing of up to 23 units as suggested in the Town Centre Plan. The Council has also agreed to invest £40,000 to improve the St Michael's open space which lies behind the site. Executive's agreement to transfer Council land and its capital investment will enable Waterloo Housing Group to invest £2m+.

3.9 **St. Michael's Chapel & Master's House, Saltisford (Old Leper Hospital)**

- 3.9.1 In December 2012 EC Harris produced a feasibility report, which demonstrated the suitability of the site for the development of specialist Housing with Care accommodation and the restoration of the Chapel and the Master's House as potential communal or office facilities for this accommodation. Following this report a soft market testing event was hosted by Warwick District Council and Warwickshire County Council on 8 May 13. The event was well supported with some thirteen different organisations attending, comprising of registered social landlords, developers and care providers. Since this event feedback is being sought from providers and developers to gauge their response to this development opportunity and a number of one to one meetings are taking place. It is hoped there is sufficient interest to progress the project to a tender stage.

- 3.9.2 Alongside the market testing activities, conversations are on-going with English Heritage that is keen to support this project through the provision of grant funding for the restoration of listed buildings. A meeting was held on site mid-May with English Heritage to identify how best to progress an application for English Heritage funding. It is anticipated an application for funding will be submitted later this summer. The Architectural Heritage Fund is also engaged in assisting the project to identify further funding sources for the restoration of the listed buildings.

- 3.9.3 In addition, a member of the Organisational Development team, Debbie Cole has been assigned as a Project Manager for the project and is responsible for progressing the above work.

3.10 **Court House**

- 3.10.1The Town Council was able to secure a significant lottery award and this Council has supported the complementary development of Pageant House with a grant of £60,000.

3.11 **West Rock Car Park**

- 3.11.1The site was identified for residential development in the Town Centre Plan although this was part of a package of changes to ensure that the car parking provision in the Town Centre was not compromised. Further analysis undertaken by the Council's Neighbourhood Services team suggests that

allocation of c50% of West Rock car park would not compromise parking provision as there is over-capacity at Linen Street, New Street and St Mary's Lands Area 4. Officers therefore recommend that this site is explored in greater detail with a further report being brought to Members once the further analysis has taken place.

3.12 **Saltisford Arm (Saltisford Canal Trust) – WHIPS**

3. The Canal Trust has been signposted to various groups including WCAVA for support in increasing volunteer numbers. A number of improvements have been made to the site including trimming of the hedge along the Saltisford Road. A sensory garden, funded by WDC and aimed at increasing residents and visitor numbers is under construction at the time of writing. The garden will be accessible to wheelchairs. Discussions are under way regarding improving signage to the area for pedestrians.

3.13 **St Mary's Lands – WHIPS**

- 3.13.1 The site has been given Local Wildlife site designation. Tree works to the spinney have been completed and owl and bat boxes erected. Signage will be installed shortly and the grass land seeding has been completed.

- 3.13.2 Members considered a report at their 19th June Executive meeting in respect of St Mary's Lands business strategy and approved the recommendation to appraise potential leisure uses for the site, including the construction of a hotel.

3.14 **Other Warwick District Town Centre land**

- 3.14.1 The Council has been proactive in supporting the needs of business and community use in the Town Centre through the sale (actual and proposed) of properties in Chapel Street and Church Street. It is likely that the Council will be increasingly proactive in using its assets to support local business and community aspirations.

Warwick Mop

- 3.15 One of the topics raised through the 'Issues' consultation in 2010 has resulted in a timely consideration of the future of Warwick Mop. There was a general feeling that the Mop has outgrown the Market Place and that, having lost its traditional purpose and become a large fun fair, it is no longer an appropriate event for the historic town centre. Fun fair rides are considered to be too large and too close to historic buildings and the event is far removed from a more traditional Mop for which the licence was originally intended.

- 3.16 Accordingly, the 'Preferred Options' document committed to carrying out a survey with regard to the future of the Mop and its location. The proposed survey is attached at **Appendix B** and approval is sought to publish this document to assess public opinion in advance of the application to renew the licence which expires in 2014.

Viability Report for Opportunity Sites

- 3.17 The 'Preferred Options' Paper put forward a number of opportunity sites with some suggested uses. Some of these sites are already progressing toward these suggested uses (see above), but others will require major private

developer investment. In order to assess whether these sites have a viable future for the proposed options, the advice of an expert is required. This will assist with deciding whether or not it would be prudent to pursue the sites through the Town Centre Plan. There is no in-house expertise in this field, therefore advice will need to be sought externally.

- 3.18 This work will form part of the evidence base for the Town Centre Plan. Recent experience elsewhere in the country has demonstrated that Plans have been found unsound by Planning Inspectors where a robust piece of evidence, such as a viability report, has not accompanied the Draft Plan. All steps needed to avoid this should be taken and this piece of work is currently missing from the evidence base.

4. **POLICY FRAMEWORK**

- 4.1 **Policy Framework** – The WTCP will need to reflect and conform to the policies within the Local Plan when adopted. The WTCP will provide specific planning policy and guidance for an area where investment needs to be managed. It will address the specific challenges and opportunities presented in Warwick town centre and will specify any changes of use and alternative uses of land and buildings identifying key strategic interventions. This plan will contribute to the delivery of some of the Local Plan’s objectives.

- 4.2 **Fit for the Future** – The final version of the WTCP will need to align with and help deliver the Sustainable Community Strategy (SCS) and the Council’s Fit for the Future programme where appropriate. It will also need to align with the Local Plan and our partners documents, including the Warwickshire Local Transport Plan and respective Asset Management Plans.

5. **BUDGETARY FRAMEWORK**

- 5.1 Undertaking this work will have resource implications on the Council in terms of staff time as well as financial implications in terms of the costs of publicity, preparation and the printing of consultation material in respect of the Mop survey. Additionally, there will be financial implications associated with the commissioning of consultants to undertake the viability work on behalf of the Partnership.

- 5.2 These costs will be accommodated within the existing budgetary framework, although additional funding may be made available by the other partners if required. To enable the viability study to be undertaken, £8,000 is requested from the Planning Reserve which currently has an unallocated balance of £297,000.

6. **ALTERNATIVE OPTION(S) CONSIDERED**

- 6.1 A survey for the future of the Mop Fair could be omitted but this would not be in the spirit of public consultation or fulfil the commitment made as a result of the Town Centre Plan consultation that a survey would be carried out.

- 6.2 A consultant’s report on the viability of sites could be omitted, but the likelihood is that the Plan will be found to be unsound without it.

APPENDIX 1

WARWICK TOWN CENTRE PLAN – PREFERRED OPTIONS REPORT OF PUBLIC CONSULTATION

Summary of Responses: Vision

| Ref no: | Vision |
|---------|--|
| 01 | More effort needed on existing sites rather than making new ones |
| 02 | Vision relies on history and not looking forward. Constraints on buildings mean that they can't be used for 21 st century. No cultural strengths in Warwick to build on. Needs seeding with a business hub and infrastructure to replace that removed with County Town functions. New life would support town centre businesses with tourism a bonus. Proposed vision of building economic and social success on Warwick's architecture and undefined cultural strengths commits Warwick to slow death by old age. |
| 03 | Need to have measurable targets in place to gauge success over time What are the economic measures? How do you measure social success Economic success the most important aim? |
| 04 | The vision doesn't mean anything; it's just a sound bite. |
| 05 | Suggest "To assist in generating a prosperous and fulfilled community in Warwick whilst maintaining the town's historic appearance." |
| 06 | If you want to encourage visitors into the town or even our own townsfolk into the town, you have to provide things for them to do and see. Taking away the museum would stop visitors wanting to go to Warwick Town Centre. They will disappear down Smith Street to St John's. Pedestrianisation would reduce traffic pollution but would increase congestion in an already problematic road system between Warwick & Leamington. This is supposed to be the County Town of Warwickshire and closing everything - Police Station, Courts, Fire Station and now the proposal to move the Museum to another site - could hardly be seen as improving Warwick. Leave the Museum where it is as a visitor attraction and get some more shops into the town centre. |
| 07 | Not particularly visionary, rather an opportunity to promote use of public land |
| 08 | What is meant by economic success or social success? |
| 09 | I doubt if we could ever find the money for half of the projects envisioned in this plan. |
| 10 | Insufficient provision for parking. Especially for local shops. |
| 11 | Takes no account of traffic when Northgate Street is returned to housing. |
| 12 | Sustainable transport routes must be a central part of the vision. Cycling provision is wholly inadequate and there is no dedicated routes into the town centre. Some development of routes within the Priory park and St. Nicholas would help. Cycle parking also needs to be addressed. |
| 13 | Vision limits the scope of the plan by focusing on architectural and cultural strengths whereas the primary need identified in the options is to address the traffic problem. It would be hard to identify and measure social success and attribute its achievement to the architectural and cultural measures identified as the building blocks. Perhaps it would be better to define a vision that directly addresses the primary issues and concerns identified by residents and contributors to this planning process - build on Warwick's unique distinguishing features; address the impact of traffic on the fabric of the town; revive the flagging economy. |
| 14 | The 'vision' is idealistic and will sadly have to be modified due to financial constraints. The vision is unlikely to be realised, if ever, in the near future. |
| 15 | Fantastic. Well overdue and the ideas really tackle the issues that need sorting in the town. |

Summary of Responses by subject – sites

1. Market St/Theatre St

| Ref no: | |
|---------|---|
| 01 | Yes please. Knock it down and build again. Anything would be more beautiful. |
| 02 | Agree |
| 03 | <p>Warwick Printing Site forms part, the preferred option is: 'Residential on Theatre Street and above Market Street. Retained retail to Market Street frontage to include some visual improvements to buildings and reduce excessive bulk of Theatre Street'. The rationale for these uses provided by the plan is to retain the retail element and that the principle of residential uses has been established by the previous planning applications. There are a limited number of sites available to Warwick Town Centre to meet the vision and objectives to improve the retail and leisure offer in the town centre. Our client's site therefore provides a unique opportunity to deliver any wider town centre uses in the future. However, more flexibility will be required (particularly in the prevailing market conditions) to ensure that the allocation is deliverable and market facing, particularly in the absence of market/viability testing of the proposed allocation. The plan should therefore provide scope for a wider mix of town centre uses at the site than currently proposed, such as leisure, hotel and other town centre uses. This will provide more flexibility to deliver the scheme in future, in line with the NPPF. The precise mix and quantum of each use will need to be considered as future proposals for the site emerge, and be in line with market demand at that time. We therefore propose that the allocation should be more flexible to deliver a wider mix of uses, in the absence of any viability testing to inform the plan to date. In addition, any retail provided is likely to require a 'value generating' anchor in order to create footfall and drives values at the site, particularly in order to meet demolition and other costs required to deliver the site, These factors which will reduce the viability of any development scheme brought forward in the future. Scale and massing - The proposed allocation for Site 1 proposes to reduce the scale and massing of any future building from that currently present along Theatre Street. We are concerned by this approach given that the upper floors of any development of the site are likely to provide residential uses which will be required to be maximised in order to 'cross fund' any niche retail scheme on the ground floor. As currently drafted, the proposed allocation could render any future development of the site unviable. In addition, the draft plan does not justify why the current buildings along Theatre Street are considered to be of 'excessive bulk'. The principle of delivering buildings of a similar height to those existing is well established, being crystallised in both the extant and previous planning applications for the site. We would therefore request that the reference to reducing excessive bulk should be removed from the proposed allocation of Site 1. As the site is within the Conservation Area, there will be a requirement for any developer to show that the Conservation Area is preserved and if possible, enhanced by any future proposals. This will include a consideration of whether the scale and massing proposed is appropriate at that point in time. Land Ownership and Delivery - The allocation for Site 1 includes a number of surrounding areas of land adjacent to our client's site. It will therefore be necessary to ensure that flexibility is provided within the plan to enable land owners to either pool their interests (if possible) and bring forward a comprehensive proposal, but in the alternative, enable them to deliver their site in isolation. This flexibility will ensure that the delivery of the regeneration of the site is not stifled. The plan should recognise that Site 1 is in multiple ownership and that individual sites may come forward in isolation in the future to deliver the regeneration of the site.</p> |

| | |
|----|---|
| 04 | I object to the proposal to demolish Market Street and to have a paper which will blight the value of privately owned properties there. This is not aspirational; it is an ill-conceived and damaging option which should be removed from the preferred options paper. The plan ignores the legal ownership of many properties and the ability to develop or demolish properties in our town centre. If there is no intention to demolish or redevelop those buildings, this should be made clear with assurances given to people who own buildings in that street. |
| 05 | I have lived on Market Street for over 10 years and understand that the preferred option is to redevelop the frontage - how is this to be done? Where are the residential tenants/owners of the flats and the retail units currently in place to go? There is no detail to the extent of this redevelopment and how it will affect those who live or have businesses there. With regards to parking in the Town centre, I note that you have stated that car parking is not a problem in Warwick - all I can say is that I have not found this to be the case. I have an on-going issue with regards to the residents parking for Market Street to which I have failed to get a satisfactory response to. When anyone visits me they often struggle to park. I have noted that you promote the use of the racecourse car park however, I believe this will deter many people from coming to Warwick as a 10 minute uphill walk into town will discourage a good proportion of people. You also state that the Linen Street car park is under-utilised, this I can understand as the spaces are very narrow and the tight corners put off drivers. It also closes at 8pm so anyone visiting for the evening cannot park there. Reducing public parking in Warwick will probably destroy most businesses as people will just go to Leamington instead. Is this the plan? These are just two of the main issues I have with the "plan" - I am sure if I had more time to review in depth I would cover other options also. |
| 06 | Realistic. |
| 07 | The blanket scheme as shown (whatever the intention) means that you have put a planning blight on the private flats and shops leased by WDC. No one in their right mind would purchase properties in that block at the moment. |
| 08 | If the requirement for more high quality visitor accommodation in the town centre can be substantiated then this site could support a hotel. The location would have excellent transport links and already has access to parking on Linen Street. |
| 09 | Improve existing retail and residential with facelift and provide residential parking for the area (including Woolpack while Site 2 is redeveloped). |
| 10 | DCA has made a major investment in the creation of a second significant studio and office space in this building. Currently 60 DCA staff work here, with an expensive fibre optic communications link to our Church Street premises and a suite of high quality visitor meeting rooms. |
| 11 | Agree, but with reservations as to the height and scale of the development. Consideration should have been given to the blight that has been placed on the area, which is now likely to result in deterioration due to a lack of investment. |
| 12 | If the requirement for more high quality visitor accommodation in the town centre can be substantiated then this site could support a hotel. Visually it may be an improvement compared to the existing site and would have excellent links to the bus station and the facilities in the centre of town. The car park on the opposite site if the road would be better utilised. There was previously a hotel close to this location Why was it given planning permission for residential development here if there is strong demand for high quality visitor accommodation? |
| 13 | Keep Market Street building as it already provides the preferred uses and is not a bad design for its date. The Theatre Street frontage should be residential or a small hotel opportunity (with a courtyard between the frontages giving light and access for parking, servicing and, possibly, a higher level landscaped courtyard). |

Summary of Responses by subject :
Site 2 Linen St Car Park

| Ref no: | |
|---------|--|
| 01 | Car park is menacing to use and should certainly be demolished |
| 02 | The costs of either 'modifying' or demolishing the concrete structure of the existing car park are likely to make residential development unviable. The use of lower floors for car parking, combined with residential above will not be attractive to investors and mortgagees for the residential element. |
| 03 | Various sites suggest closing car parks to reduce car parking space. How can this benefit traders? Why not move council parking from Barrack Street and make it useable every day. |
| 04 | Agree, but this would require a massive excavation which be extremely disruptive. |
| 05 | Unrealistic and the use of this car park could be much improved now. |
| 06 | The one thing that would improve car parking would be to change around the entrance and exit of Linen St Car park so that cars enter off the main road. This would need modest capital and I believe would greatly increase its usage. Greening the car park with plants as happens in Stratford would improve the visual appearance of the car park and give a better view from the town. |
| 07 | If a hotel was built on the Market Street site, the car park would be much better utilised. |
| 08 | OK as long as sufficient spaces available for proposed residential as well as plenty of "shoppers" spaces and extend opening hours. |
| 09 | Disagree. The area should be kept for car parking only. It should be redeveloped for easier access and use. It should be open after 8.00pm. Further residential development will result in yet more cars needing parking spaces. |
| 10 | The costs of either "modifying" or demolishing the concrete structure of the existing car park are likely to make residential development unviable. The use of lower floors for car parking, combined with residential above will not be attractive to investors and mortgagees for the residential element. |
| 11 | If the legal commitments can be overcome, a residential development with parking at a lower level would be most appropriate. (Which would leave Theatre Street as a boundary between the town centre uses and the residential inner suburbs.) |

Summary of Responses by subject:
Site 3. Barrack Street

| Ref no: | |
|---------|---|
| 01 | Delighted to see proposed demolition of diabolical carbuncle. |
| 02 | Would like to see it go |
| 03 | Another option would be to take office floors down to level of former library level and create public open space, roof garden style on top of retained car park. |
| 04 | Removal of hideous building is desirable because it lacks any merit. |
| 05 | Would make an ideal location for a town centre hotel if it was proved that there was a need for an additional accommodation and also incorporating retail opportunities. This as the site is bounded on three sides by commercial building. It would also rid Warwick of an architectural nightmare. |
| 06 | Further details about the County Council's intentions for this site are required before developability of this scheme can be assessed. Similar concerns as per site 2 apply. |
| 07 | Why not keep the car park. It is safe, convenient, and large. Turn office space into a 'Bicester Village' retail mall. Think about it, good real, road link to London, good parking, nice day out for branded clothes buyers with cash but not enough cash to shop in London. |
| 08 | Do not want building to be demolished and car-park is needed for the employees of Warwickshire District Council. |
| 09 | Yes, rebuild it. |
| 10 | Agree. |
| 11 | A council planning folly which is now coming back to haunt. It is an eyesore but demolition and re-use is a costly and possibly unnecessary option. Developing what is there is much more sensible, perhaps as a hotel. (Parking readily available) Making the car park public now would much improve the use and value of this site. |
| 12 | Improvement in the signage of Barrack St Car park in the evening and at weekends when it is used by the public would greatly increase its usage and again this could be done quickly and at minimal cost. It could have been done already if WCC really had the desire to do it. |
| 13 | Barrack Street already has good access by car and a car park, so would therefore be a further suitable site for a hotel if needed. The area does not have residential areas in such close proximity. This location would allow excellent access to the many amenities our town centre has to offer and could allow a more environmental and conservation friendly build than those on a Grade 1 listed site in a Conservation Area. |
| 14 | OK but complete redevelopment would incur huge expense. Feasibility of retaining car park but removing top floor/floors thus lowering overall height. |
| 15 | Barrack Street already has good vehicular access and a car park. The area does not have residential areas in such close proximity and there is a good chance that a hotel would look more attractive than the present building, which some may once |

| | |
|----|---|
| | have thought was built 'using appropriate and sympathetic forms'. This location would allow excellent access to the many amenities our town centre has to offer and could allow a more environmentally friendly build than more restricted locations such as the Castle Stables. |
| 16 | Don't be tempted to demolish this building, however awful it is – if you do, the view of St Mary's Church from Saltisford will still be blocked by Shire Hall (go and look from the hill on Lammas Fields). |
| 17 | Redevelopment offers opportunity for significant restoration and improvement to the character of Warwick Town, both for residents and visitors. |
| 18 | Further details about the County Council's intentions for this site are required before developability of this scheme can be assessed. The costs of either "modifying" or demolishing the concrete structure of the existing car park are likely to make residential development unviable. The use of lower floors for car parking, combined with residential above will not be attractive to investors and mortgagees for the residential element. |
| 19 | Due to County Council use, very unlikely to come forward for redevelopment. (A large array of renewable energy provision has only recently been put on the roof.) |

Summary of Responses:

Site 4 Northgate Street

| Ref no: | |
|---------|--|
| 01 | Best use (residential) for the buildings and a priority as they are architectural gems. |
| 02 | SHLAA site Ref W02. The SHLAA refers to concerns about the loss of employment premises as a consequence of converting the properties to residential. This policy concern must be overcome before viability of the proposals can be assessed. |
| 03 | This should have been undertaken several years ago. |
| 04 | Returning the houses to their original use is acceptable – but what is the overall plan for this area and how will that impact on my Church in Barrack Street? Like much of this plan it needs better communication and discussion. |
| 05 | About to happen. |
| 06 | This would be an ideal location for a boutique hotel or residential development. |
| 07 | Agree. I am however concerned that the visual plans currently available seem to indicate that Northgate Street will become a public space. If there is no access, or limited access for vehicles, it will cause problems for funerals, weddings and christenings at St Mary's Church. It will also reduce available parking. |
| 08 | This would be an ideal location for a boutique hotel. |
| 09 | I understand that agreement on the restoration of these properties to residential use is imminent – ensure that it is carried out to high quality internally and externally. |
| 10 | SHLAA site Ref W02 - The SHLAA refers to concerns about the loss of employment premises as a consequence of converting the properties to residential. This policy concern must be overcome before viability of the proposals can be assessed. |

Summary of Responses:
Site 5. Former Police Station

| Ref no: | |
|---------|--|
| 01 | Not a type of health facility. Doctor's surgery or a fitness centre. |
| 02 | Health facility a good idea providing it does not become an 'exclusive' centre. |
| 03 | The police station is not to be a surgery as greedy developers have designs on profit not sense. |
| 04 | No, this is far too intensive. Combined with site 3 development there would be far too much traffic in this area. Congestion is already bad at key times. Make it into a youth centre or Old Peoples home. |
| 05 | Already dealt with by sale – although further development is awaited. |
| 06 | Agree, but must have sufficient car parking. |
| 07 | A Health Centre here is a good idea. However there will be issues of pedestrian access and traffic flows. |
| 08 | Agree. This is a busy junction as access down the Butts is narrow. Careful consideration needs to be given as to access to and from the site. |
| 09 | A health facility here is a good idea. Consideration may need to be given to the increased number of people crossing the road to gain access to the facility from the south. |
| 10 | The footprint of this site is restricted. You must be very careful to ensure that its future development does not encroach on either the land area or the appearance of the building from the road. The present building managed these aspects very well. If the new building occupies a substantial portion of the site, where will cars be parked? |
| 11 | Residential redevelopment, to an appropriate design, would be an acceptable alternative use. |

Summary of Reponses
Site 6, Cape Road

| Ref no: | |
|---------|--|
| 01 | Do not fully understand the leasing agreement. Cape Road clinic and Priory Medical Centre? Would like more detail here. |
| 02 | This development appears to be linked to the opportunity to redevelop the adjacent Police Station as a Health Centre. This will impact on programming. Also the viability of a scheme for residential 'over' car parking must again be questioned for the reasons set out in relation to site 2. |
| 03 | A possible use, but need to consider low cost affordable housing scheme –unless built at ground floor level 'parking beneath' is a nonstarter. There is also an opportunity to offer additional land for the necessary expansion of the Priory Medical Practice. This could be considered now by the removal of council employee parking from the site, which, as indicated above, is unnecessary and contrary to environmental policies. |
| 04 | Agree. |
| 05 | This is not a public car park. |
| 06 | Agree. I am concerned about the references to "parking beneath". This is expensive and often proves impractical. |
| 07 | Agree with residential development. |
| 09 | This development appears to be linked to the opportunity to redevelop the adjacent Police Station as a Health Centre. This will impact on programming. Also the viability of a scheme for residential "over" car parking must again be questioned. As previous residential consents have not been pursued on this site and the SHLAA refers to potential contamination problems, it is likely that a residential scheme will be unviable given the prevailing "benchmark" values for homes, as evidenced by the scheme to the east of this site. |
| 09 | There appears to be some confusion about this site as the text refers to a 'health centre' whereas there is a health centre (with offices over), a doctors' surgery, and a major County Council staff car park (available to the public out-of-hours). The car park is fully used during the day, and well used on Saturday mornings, while the surgery is a separate facility to the Health Centre. If one of these two facilities is going to move, than that part could be rebuilt for housing, with the other elements being retained. |

Summary of Responses

Site 7 Gas Works and former Fire Station, Saltisford

| Ref no: | |
|---------|---|
| 01 | No. This is far too intensive. Combined with site 3 development, there would be far too much traffic in this area. Congestion is already bad at key times. Make it into a Youth Centre or Old Peoples Home. |
| 02 | This site should be 100% residential and in keeping with the rest of Albert Street, with quality houses for people to buy and a concern about parking in the street. We pay for a permit and quite often cannot park as people with no permits very often have taken the spaces. We need better enforcement or permit only parking. Retain the green area opposite the church - they have a concern. |
| 03 | SHLAA site ref W32. As previous residential consents have not been pursued on this site and the SHLAA refers to potential contamination problems, it is likely that a residential scheme will be unviable given the prevailing 'benchmark' values for homes, as evidenced by the scheme to the east of this site. |
| 04 | Good idea. |
| 05 | The more the better. |
| 06 | Should be all residential. |
| 07 | These are high cost options which need a developer to take them on board. Unlikely in the current economic climate. Why does housing in Albert Street on the Fire Station site have to include 'a commercial element'? Again this only reinforces the apparent bias in this plan towards commercial interests and income generating schemes for the Councils to the exclusion of the community requirements. The closure of the Fire Station for short term gain is something I believe the Authority will regret in the long term. |
| 08 | Agree but not likely to happen until the housing climate improves. |
| 09 | OK but car parking spaces essential – none shown. |
| 10 | Agree with residential development. |
| 11 | As a resident of Albert Street in Warwick, I am very concerned to see in the preferred options pamphlet that the Gas works and Fire station is being considered as a part commercial space. This is a highly desirable residential area and in order to maintain this position it should stay as a residential area only. Especially as there is currently insufficient space for parking and the proposed development will only make this situation worse. Secondly parking is a major issue on Albert, Victoria, Edward and the surrounding streets. If the Fire station and Gas works are developed to be residents, parking for at least two cars per household must be allocated off street. There is no information given at present about the proposed residences, in order to maintain the aesthetics of the street and to limit the number of parking spaces required we would prefer the residences to be two story houses. Houses that are any higher will block the light into several of the properties on the street. |
| 12 | Please confirm that your proposals assume the retention of the corner green area opposite Saltisford Church and that sufficient car parking to serve the new homes and the church will be provided. At the moment the residents of Albert Street, the church and the Council employees use the Fire Station site for parking. |
| 13 | Due to its location, and the existing planning permission, the most appropriate use is wholly residential. |

Summary of Responses

Site 8 St Michael's Chapel and the Master's House

| Ref no: | |
|---------|--|
| 01 | Heritage use preferred |
| 02 | Too far from centre to be viable as a heritage centre. Office or residential use to be preferred. |
| 03 | Investment in residential uses on this site is unlikely to be viable given the need to retain 'heritage' buildings and surrounding values. |
| 04 | The more the better. |
| 05 | Need more info to whom do they belong? |
| 06 | Would be great as a heritage centre. |
| 07 | Agree, although this is a sensitive site. |
| 08 | This is a heritage site. The consideration of any other use is not legitimate. The fact that planning permission has previously been given for residential use only confirms the frequently inconsistent and faulty decision making processes of planners. |
| 09 | OK Heritage site preferred. |
| 10 | This site is too far out of the town centre to attract visitors as a tourist site. I suggest that the building(s) be moved to the corner of St Nicholas Park next to the entrance to the car park (quite feasible, ask Hereford Council). There it could become an adjunct to the County Museum, attracting visitors into St John's House. |
| 11 | The use as a heritage centre, while a welcome idea, does appear over ambitious. Where would funding come from to pay for the purchase and restoration of the building and the development of a heritage centre? Who would run such a centre and what kind of facilities would it have? How would it link with the town centre effectively? The detail and feasibility of such a proposal should be thoroughly investigated before it is put forward as a preferred option as part of the town centre plan. |
| 12 | The existence of the chapel, and the timber-framed Masters House (now believed to be 17th century in date), shows there is a need to protect the character of the site, while its archaeology suggests this could best be done as a heritage centre. Its isolated location and size, however, suggests this would not be viable economically – but it would still be the best use. |
| 13 | Agree but this has been on-going for years. |

Summary of Responses
Site 9 St John's

| Ref no: | |
|---------|---|
| 01 | Retain parking at front. |
| 02 | Some improvement is desirable but it is a 'take away' location and a well-used amenity. |
| 03 | In the absence of unequivocal support of the existing residents, tenants and freeholders, this proposal cannot be considered to be developable. |
| 04 | Needs developing asap. |
| 05 | This area is the takeaway centre of Warwick and in this role clearly serves a local need, but the parking/waiting facilities are wholly inadequate. The rear of the properties is squalid and brutish. I would favour a redevelopment as proposed, but with the 'takeaway industry' properly relocated at a suitable site. |
| 06 | Only if there is a need, would also make an excellent hotel, near the station and away from the Castle, so that the town might see some of the benefits of visitors. |
| 07 | An example of planners trying to effect something over which they have no influence. This is private property and therefore outside the remit of the Planning Partnership. There could however be better management of the public area to the front of the site. |
| 08 | Can't see this happening in present fiscal climate. |
| 09 | I agree that this area could be made into an attractive gateway to the town from the station, while still providing a good service in terms of take-aways etc. for local residents, but it would need good accessible parking. |
| 10 | These shops are well used because of free parking but area needs facelift. No one in their right mind would ever wish to spend time sitting here however "pretty" the brook. |
| 11 | Disagree. It is suggested that car parking should be relocated behind the retail units and the culvert opened up at the front. Car parking at the rear of the premises will result in a muggers' paradise and dissuade customers. Opening a culvert in a town with areas that already have problems with flooding seems a strange option particularly on a main junction used by emergency services requiring access to the centre of town. |
| 12 | This could be seen as an improvement if adequate parking is provided behind the development. |
| 13 | St Johns is a congested site and any redevelopment must cater for significantly more short stay car parking. |
| 14 | Agree to improved residential development, but there will be problems if the car parking is reduced. Beware of pressure to turn the (very wet) field at the bottom of Priory Park into a car park. This must be resisted. |
| 15 | Redevelopment offers opportunity for significant restoration and improvement to the character of Warwick Town, both for residents and visitors. |
| 16 | The architecture of this building block, and its siting, are not good, while the retail uses are mainly food related. If the site comes up for redevelopment, then the most appropriate use would be residential, although this could be complicated by the culverted stream through the site. The present economic climate, however, suggests that redevelopment is unlikely in the foreseeable future. |
| 17 | I am concerned about the proposals regarding St John's. It is certainly true that this 'gateway' to Warwick is unsightly. |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>However, I suspect that that the relative popularity of a number of the businesses, and presumably their consequent success, is going to make any proposals for disruption of them extremely unpopular with them. You have rightly said in your consultative documents that any development would require the cooperation of the owners of the businesses concerned. I don't think you will get that cooperation. As an alternative, can I suggest that the area in front of the businesses should be developed attractively? The overlarge London Plane trees need felling and should be replaced by smaller, more attractive specimens. The underground river could perhaps be unearthed for a short stretch to create a feature. Since your proposals already envisage parking behind the development, perhaps this aspect could go ahead thus relieving pressure on the existing parking area. As a further improvement, would it be possible to replace the rather unsightly dwellings which exist above the commercial premises to be replaced with more attractive housing without excessive disruption to the businesses? Could some inducements be offered to the existing businesses to improve the outward appearances and could some incentives be offered to encourage occupation of the currently empty premises?</p> |
|--|--|

Summary of Responses
Site 10 St John's House

| Ref no: | |
|---------|---|
| 01 | Central museum quarter a good idea |
| 02 | Idea for large museum good but St John's is somewhat off the beaten track – would be better in town centre. |
| 03 | Sounds good. |
| 04 | Wonderful idea to bring other museums to St John's House and expand this – make a major museum and restaurant, parking, toilets etc. |
| 05 | Agree with the footpath. Disagree with the relocation of the town centre museum which should remain in the town centre, but possibly at a different location. |
| 06 | Is perhaps one of the few sensible suggestions, but how would it be funded, especially as it involves 3 disparate Military Museums which are charities? |
| 07 | Agree with the footpath but not the relocation of the town centre museum which should remain in the town centre, but possibly at the Shire Hall (Old Courts). |
| 08 | Creation of an extended St Johns Museum would make this a much more viable destination and visitor attraction. |
| 09 | A good site for a museum hub for the town or arts centre for local artists, with parking available at the rear. Creating a Museum Hub and Art Space could give potential visitors yet another reason to visit Warwick, particularly with improved access to St Nicholas Park. The plan should also address the pedestrian access from St Nicholas Park to the Castle and Town, which due to the positioning of the pedestrian crossing is hazardous, particularly with young children. |
| 10 | Already a path from St Nicholas Car Park to Coten End! Relocate Court House Museum to here? |
| 11 | Disagree. The pathway from St Nicholas car park has already been improved. The existing museum should be marketed more effectively. The narrowness of both Smith Street and St Nicholas Church Street cannot be ignored and neither can their importance as major roads leading in and out of the east side of the town. |
| 12 | A good site for a larger museum, with parking available at the rear. Several museums together would make it a worthwhile destination for a visit. |
| 13 | Bring all the Museum displays onto this site, but ensure that modern buildings which are out of character are hidden from public view. The Museum can retain its storage/office use of the upper floor of the Market Hall. |
| 14 | We are pleased to see that St John's House is recognised in this document as working well as a museum. However, the proposal to develop a 'museum quarter' at this location and to add museum collections is unsuitable as a preferred option for the following reasons: • St John's House currently houses two museum collections, adding more would be un-feasible because of the limited space and use of the building. • St John's is not a central location, forming a museum quarter here may be detrimental to museums that currently have a more central location. • The location of museums in different locations in the town encourages people to move throughout the town and stay longer. This aligns with the objectives and preferred options of other sections of this document rather than a single museum quarter on the edge of the town centre. • The concept of an urban 'quarter' is generally one that includes a number of properties and is of a sizeable area, however the area at St John's House is limited in space and use and does not fit this definition. Additionally, the image on page 32 seems to indicate a new |

| | |
|----|--|
| | building at St John's, is this part of the proposal? Could this new building and its use be clarified? The proposed pathway from St Nicholas Car Park to Smith Street needs clarifying, on the image (p32) it seems to go to St John's Court rather than Smith Street. |
| 15 | Retention as a museum is the best use for this site, although the suggested route for a footpath link 'to Smith Street' is so illogical as to be unlikely to be used. A better link to the St Nicholas Park car park, however, is needed while the (unrecorded) public footpath through the churchyard should be improved, and signed, as a link (via Gerrard Street) to Smith Street. |

Summary of Responses
Site 11 Court House

| Ref no: | |
|---------|---|
| 01 | Use this for large museum instead of St John's House. |
| 02 | More information needed. |
| 03 | Sounds good. |
| 04 | An ideal place for a relocated museum and with underground gaol adjacent. |
| 05 | Why are we not told what is proposed here. It should form part of the whole plan so that there is openness. |
| 06 | Decisions already taken. |

Summary of Responses
Site 12 The Butts

| Ref no: | |
|---------|---|
| 01 | Sounds good. |
| 02 | Improvements suggested may assist but not a major consideration and an example of the document moving away from strategic to operational matters. |
| 03 | This car park forms part of the ancient archery butts and only became a through route when the top end of the road was created in the late 15th/early 16th century. This historic character should be strengthened, by design, with better signposting of the links to St Mary's Church through the College Garden and along the Tink-a-Tank. |

Summary of Responses

Site 13a and 13b Car Parking (small car parks) on Castle Lane

| Ref no: | |
|---------|--|
| 01 | Overdevelopment if housing is put here. |
| 02 | Have a visitor kiosk outside Town Gate. |
| 03 | 13b should remain parking for local residents. |
| 04 | Doesn't need another dwelling opening. |
| 05 | Particularly inappropriate and vague. |
| 06 | Disagree, Leave well alone. |
| 07 | Only if this is not to be later used as a drop off and collection point by the castle. |
| 08 | The proposal is dammed by its owned statement, 'a sensitive site in an historic setting which cannot be altered'. |
| 09 | Disagree, leave well alone and apparently the plan is wrong as it takes in part of a privately owned listed building. |
| 10 | Leave well alone – night time parking for restaurants and well used during the day. Site 13b Forget it – much is privately owned. |
| 11 | Disagree. There is an error on the plan. The car parking area is popular for those using banks, retail units and restaurants in the High Street and Jury Street and means traffic and parking is reduced on a main road in the town centre. The Registry Office is close by and it is the nearest place to park. Car parking for restaurant patrons in the evening is already difficult and may explain why Castles Restaurant in Castle Lane is once again on the market. |
| 12 | The redevelopment of '13a' would strengthen the visual link up Castle Street, but '13b' should be retained as a car park, particularly since it is heavily used. |

Summary of Responses
Site 14 New Street Car Park

| Ref no: | |
|---------|---|
| 01 | Retain car park. |
| 02 | Attracts traffic into centre. Residential/commercial/office is preferable. |
| 03 | Retain site. |
| 04 | Leave as car park. |
| 05 | Please don't take away the car park – it's the only central parking. Increase the parking with underground parking and first storey parking too. Spend the money here. |
| 06 | Craft and art space for practice and sales. Either covered market style or small retail space. |
| 07 | Leave alone. |
| 08 | The car park is vital and must be retained – it is also surrounded by privately owned commercial property over which the planners have little control or influence. |
| 09 | An expensive and unnecessary suggestion. Make better use of the car park now |
| 10 | Leave as it is. |
| 11 | The only truly town-centre car park – vital to leave it as it is. N.B. Sunday parking, undercover in Leamington Royal Priors £1.50 all day. New Street Warwick in the open 50p for half an hour - £2.20 for up to three hours. |
| 12 | We would be concerned about the potential impact of the proposed development on the New Street Car Park site as this may impact adversely on our adjoining Church Street premises, our plans to establish these firmly as our UK HQ and the existing planning permission for expansion there. |
| 13 | Disagree. This is a very popular car park well utilised by visitors and locals alike. It is open and flat with good access giving a feeling of safety for those who use it - in particular the elderly and infirm. |
| 14 | New Street should be a viable town centre car park. |
| 15 | Retain as a car park – it is too vital to lose as a town centre car park. |
| 16 | This is a well-used car park, in the town centre, and should be retained. Redevelopment (except across the frontage) would be difficult due to its restricted shape and size. |

Summary of Responses
Site 15 West Rock Car Park

| Ref no: | |
|---------|--|
| 01 | Impossible to visualise what this would look like without drawings. |
| 02 | Not if the residential is too high. Will any small one-bedroomed flats be provided for single people? Keep some open space. |
| 03 | Retain as is. |
| 04 | The existing Sainsbury's car park is wholly underutilised and perhaps there is merit in including this area as a part of the 'synergy' with Sainsbury's in a comprehensive development. |
| 05 | No change should be contemplated. |
| 06 | An expensive and unnecessary suggestion. Make better use of the car park now. However, if building on this site was considered suitable the car parking for visitors and residents could be enhanced by entering into a partnership with Sainsbury to make their car park pay and display, in a similar manner to St Marys Land i.e. 2 hours free after which payment is required. |
| 07 | Nobody likes the haul up the hill to the Square and development will be difficult due to geological problems in that area. |
| 08 | OK long term. |
| 09 | Disagree. Once again the fact that new residential developments require additional car parking seems to be ignored. This means that existing spaces will be lost. The views of the racecourse are part of the character of the town and will be destroyed. |
| 10 | This site, because it is on a steep slope lends itself to development of a residential block with car park below ground. |
| 11 | More information about the viability of this scheme is required and should include reference to the appetite of investors and mortgagees towards a development that will provide residential units above a public/private car park. |
| 12 | This is a heavily used car park forming a link between Sainsbury's and the town centre, and should be retained or made into a two-level car park. |

Summary of Responses
Site 17 Priory Road/Chapel Row

| Ref no: | |
|---------|---|
| 01 | Useful car park but is not well known. Improve signage. |
| 02 | Feels like this would be a case of overdevelopment and risk further destruction of town's character. |
| 03 | Retain parking in Smith St. |
| 04 | More information about the viability of this scheme is required and should include reference to the appetite of investors and mortgagees towards a development that will provide residential above a public/private car park. |
| 05 | Complete madness - have the councillors visited Smith St on a Friday/Saturday night & tried to park? My Partner has a permit for Priory Road Car Park but can't get on the car park; all double parked on Smith St as well - how will putting a building on the car park help this with further need for parking from new residents, parking is an issue right now and needs addressing. |
| 06 | Leave it as it is. |
| 07 | The site definitely needs to be better integrated with the local facilities. |
| 08 | There is no proof that this car park is under used – see my comments re the parking survey. The suggestion that a building be demolished to make access from Smith Street is a nonsense as is the removal of on street parking from Smith Street which is absolutely vital for traders here, both for customers and for their own use (nowhere in this document is account taken of the fact that many traders have no parking facilities). 'Extending the education facilities', by which I assume the Plan Partnership is referring the Kings High, should be resisted at all costs. The insidious development of their buildings has already adversely affected the built and social environment of this area. |
| 09 | The only thing wrong with this area is no proper signage to say that it serves Smith Street. |
| 10 | This is desperately needed by Smith Street shops and residents. Better signage required and improved link through to Smith Street. |
| 11 | Disagree. It is understood that there is a suggestion that a house/houses should be demolished and access made from Smith Street into the existing Priory Road car park. Smith Street is an important exit road out of the town to the east. Apart from Priory Road it currently provides the only eastern exit north of the river from the town centre. It is narrow and the pavement route is used by school children from King's High and other local schools to access the train station. To have further vehicles attempting to drive in or out on to such a narrow road is beyond comprehension. The knocking down of existing houses and the alteration of the street scene was not something requested by residents in the last consultation. |
| 12 | This site is almost level and too small for the above treatment, given that access for deliveries and emergencies to the rear of all the properties surrounding the car park is essential. |
| 13 | I do not support your proposal to remove on-street short 'stop-off' car parking on Smith Street. Retail outlets will suffer, shops will close and the street will die as a viable commercial entity, as has occurred in some other towns where on-street parking has been removed. |
| 14 | The scope of this scheme is uncertain and raises questions about its viability without any evidence/input about land |

| | |
|----|--|
| | ownerships, leases and the ambitions of owners and tenants. |
| 15 | This car park is normally fairly heavily used, although the pedestrian link to Smith Street via The Knibbs is not well signed. When there is an event on, such as at the castle or King's High School, it is fully used. This level of use, and its size and shape, suggests that there is very limited scope for residential development. |

Summary of Responses
Site 21 Castle Stables

| Ref no: | |
|---------|---|
| 01 | This is a sensitive site so development would have to be sensitive. |
| 02 | Vehemently object to development which would completely change outlook from adj. property. Impact on privacy and tranquillity for residents of Eastgate Mews. |
| 03 | No work has been done to assess impact of traffic so why propose it. |
| 04 | Object. Is a well-used car park particularly during term time by teaching staff. Not suitable for development. Access would be totally unsuitable of Castle Hill and Castle Lane. Would require partial demolition of historic boundary wall and possibly be in conflict with adjacent Castle Lane junction. Would require felling of many trees spoiling setting of castle. No evidence that a hotel is needed. |
| 05 | Strongly object. Even with underground car parking it is bound to dwarf surrounding historic buildings. |
| 06 | I think it was a big mistake to include this in the town plan (Stables car park), the land is owned by the castle and were they to develop this car park then they would need to go through normal planning process. It would be detrimental to the properties on Castle Lane, and inevitably increase traffic. I have concerns about parking for residents in Castle Street. It is already difficult to park along the castle wall at the best of times, but by reducing car park spaces by the town castle gate, will make it even harder. |
| 07 | No need for a hotel-unsuitable site & would increase traffic. |
| 08 | Should be kept as low level parking. What about the old toilets adjacent? |
| 09 | Concerns as to the viability of a scheme involving car parking with residential 'over'. |
| 10 | Strongly opposed to development of this site on the grounds of a) historic setting b) traffic generation. To create a feasible development site would require the large scale removal of trees, the development within the castle walls and adjoining one of the main approaches to Warwick and would massively detract from the setting. Residential development would increase traffic on Castle Lane, a very narrow one way street with limited safe exits on to the major road system, while hotel development would require new access of Castle Hill, which would require substantial demolition of the historic wall and exit onto Castle Hill, thereby increasing traffic though Eastgate (see above). There is no evidence presented or any hint that such evidence exists - that a hotel so close to the castle and with such poor road access would be attractive to the market. |
| 11 | Use of Castle Stables car park, for a hotel is totally inappropriate. No need for extra accommodation in Warwick and not on such a site. |
| 12 | The large hotel on the Castle be moved down to the large car park site on Stratford Road. |
| 13 | If built where would the entrance be situated? Residents would not be happy. |
| 14 | Not a good site and there are poor qualities of hotel accommodation anyway. Sort these run down hotels before building new ones. |
| 15 | Development should never be considered on this site, too important as entrance to major historic building. The castle is an important attraction. Dangers of it becoming more and more like a 'Disney' site. Further turning off Castle Hill and Castle Lane |

| | |
|----|--|
| | would be dangerous. |
| 16 | Leave it as it is. |
| 17 | Doesn't need a hotel or residential on it. |
| 18 | Particularly inappropriate and vague. |
| 19 | Because of heritage nature of area, redevelopment is questionable. Have as car park for Castle/Smith St and town. |
| 20 | Leave alone for the time being - I suspect that the negotiations with the Castle would scupper this anyway. |
| 21 | We are not inherently opposed to a proposal to develop the Castle car park. To be acceptable however, this will have to be done very sensitively and in keeping with the historic nature of the site and adjacent properties. It must not increase the level of traffic along Castle Lane and the proposal to access from lower down Castle Hill would seem to address this - at least from the eastern end of Castle Lane. (The document makes no mention of an exit to the west?). From the point of view of this property it will also be important to preserve the screen of trees which presently exists. Finally, any building which overlooks the properties on the opposite side of Castle Lane or 'devalues' them will not be welcome. On the wider subject of a further hotel in Warwick the documents do not make the case for additional hotel accommodation in the town. Is Warwick short of hotel accommodation? What are the occupancy rates for the hotels which already exist? New hotels are invariably built by hotel groups. Do the planners have in mind which hotel group would wish to add to hotel accommodation in the town? |
| 22 | I do not believe that this would support the overall objective of preserving Warwick's distinctive architectural and cultural heritage and could potentially blight part of our town. While I agree that we need to look at boosting the amount of rooms available for visitors to stay in, I believe that we need to look for other alternatives which are more in keeping with the town's character. |
| 23 | Earlier the Partnership has accepted that there is no need for additional visitor accommodation, so why is this even being raised again? This suggestion is an offence to the historic nature of the town, and there is no way that Merlin will be sensitive. As a neighbour of the Castle I can assure you that they have no concern for their immediate neighbours and it is a constant battle to get them to control their visitors at night events in the car park. There are constant issues of noise from drunken visitors, and loud staff whenever there is an event on and this continues up until 2 am. Should this be developed as another part of the castle, life for local people will be totally intolerable. The hotel would be a venue for wedding parties, stag parties and other noisy events, whose attendants would have no regard for the fact that they are in a residential area. The Castle has a sad track record of controlling its rowdy visitors to date. The front of the hotel would always be frequented by smoker shad late night revellers. The hotel would bring no benefit to the town businesses, as Merlin will issue all inclusive tickets for coffees, lunches and entrance to the Castle, so the town would merely be a back drop to their profit making. Local property prices would be slashed as a result. Castle Lane would suffer even more traffic and noise. This strategy is totally inconsistent with the Partnership's vision statement and its earlier preferred options/views. |
| 24 | The aim of the 15 year project is to breathe new life into the town. The development of the Stables car park as a hotel will only benefit Warwick Castle. It is a known fact that visitors to the castle do not venture into the town. Car parking. I agree with the suggestion to move Shire Hall parking facility to the Linen Street Car park which is greatly underutilised. The release of the Barrack Street Car park would then allow this site to be developed further, as a major car park for visitors, or alternatively as the centre for a new hotel. Visitors to the hotel would then automatically visit the town on their way to the Castle. Warwick is a lovely place to live but it is sad to see the demise of the shops, so many open and close; everything must be done to encourage more visitors to our County town. |

| | |
|----|--|
| 25 | This is not aspirational it is objectionable to all of us who live in and by listed buildings and a grade 1 heritage site. Castle Lane is very narrow and already dangerous for pedestrians. I object to this suggestion when a proposed hotel at the race course was not given consent, where it has a far larger site to accommodate parking and cars and does not have the same listed building and conservation issues. This should be removed from any future proposals. There may be no specific plans submitted or ideas developed for the site, but I do not want this to be left open as an option. It is and will be disastrous and unsympathetic to the surrounding site. |
| 26 | Surely a joke! This is privately owned historically sensitive land over which the Councils have no influence. Building anything on this site would be strongly resisted by residents and is not currently a consideration of the Castle owners. |
| 27 | I can't believe that you can even suggest this on such a sensitive site having refused planning for a hotel at the Race Course. |
| 28 | Support. |
| 29 | The preferred option development in the Castle Stables car-park is inappropriate and not suitable for such a historic setting, It would severely compromise Warwick Castle's unique identity and would cause irreversible harm to the historic make-up of the whole town. The elevated position of the site means that any large development would dominate the approach to the town and the unique views will disappear and be replaced by a modern (probably chain) hotel, a common site throughout out the UK. This is an important approach to the town centre. Any development in this area would spoil the wonderful views experienced by thousands of Warwick residents and tourists as they walk up Castle Hill or along Castle Lane, where they regularly stop to take pictures. Warwick Castle is owned by an organisation that is purely focused on making profit, not on the welfare of the town of Warwick for future generations. The motivation for a hotel or residential development, on this site, as with the recent banking crisis will be for the short term financial gain of a small number of people, who have no regard for the consequences of their actions. The preferred option will require massive excavation of a grade 1 listed site, of great historic significance. This will incur huge expense, be environmentally damaging and could potentially destroy Warwick's cultural and historic heritage forever, with no apparent benefit to the town. |
| 30 | No. Unwelcome and totally inappropriate development. Prime heritage trail along Castle Lane and much needed attractive car park for easy access to the castle. |
| 31 | Disagree. The site is in an extremely sensitive area and building on it will destroy views of the Castle enjoyed by visitors and residents as they walk through the town. Access to the site is extremely difficult and can only result in additional traffic in an already busy area. |
| 32 | Any development next to the castle is inappropriate and not suitable in such a historic setting. This will not protect the castles' individual characteristics and identity' and would cause irreversible harm to the setting of the castle. Developments cannot be considered suitable in such a historic setting when the objective of the plan is to enhance historic views, not to obscure them, to make 'vistas which make the buildings a fine backdrop to the public spaces', not to remove one of the finest vistas that Warwick has. The elevated position of the site will cause any development here to dominate the approach to town from this direction and a unique setting will disappear and be replaced by a modern hotel, a common site though out the UK. This is an important approach to the town centre. Any development in this area would spoil the wonderful views experienced by thousands of Warwick residents and tourists as they walk up Castle Hill or along Castle Lane, where they stop to take pictures of the towers over the historic wall. The castle is owned by an organisation that is purely focused on making profit. Usually buildings of national importance are not by such organisations and therefore have greater focus on leaving a legacy for future generations. This is one of the reasons no other developments have been allowed over the castle site. The banking crisis shows |

| | |
|----|--|
| | <p>how much emphasis modern profit orientated businesses place on short term gain and do not have due regard for the consequences of their actions. . The fact that there is a proposal at all to build either a hotel or a residential development so close to the castle appears to support the view that short term profit is the aim. We do not know how long the present owners will own the site and what future owners would do with the Castle. The preferred option will require massive excavation meaning that any mistakes cannot be rectified by future generations. This will be financially very expensive and environmentally damaging. Trees behind the wall will be replaced by a hotel. How will any development here 'exploit the views as people go into and out of the town centre,' making it more appealing for both local people and visitors? Can you give me examples of a sympathetic new development next to such an important national monument? Should we build a hotel or houses on the car parks next to Stonehenge or next to the old house in Alton Towers? Why would we deprive people of the view similar to that Warwick District Council has used as its symbol in all its publications? Who believes that the present views will be enhanced by building a hotel here? If the present state of the Castle Stables is deemed detrimental, why has an approach not been made to the present owners to ensure that the area looks presentable? If there was a requirement for a hotel in this area, the present site of Neville Court could have been developed into a hotel, but the decision was taken just over 10 years ago to make this a residential area. Why was the demand for a hotel not present then and what impact will a hotel have on this development?</p> |
| 33 | <p>The proposal that residential or hotel development should be considered is contrary to the Warwick Vision of protecting historic buildings and street scenes. Further development within the Castle walls on a heritage site adjacent to this Grade I Listed building is totally incongruous with the town centre objectives. This area should preferably be beautifully landscaped, as an alternative pedestrian access from the station approach with perhaps some disabled parking or if Warwick Castle is serious about people wishing to park there, they should consider reducing their daily fee from £10. Increasing visitor accommodation in the town centre was not considered necessary or indeed included in the preferred options.</p> |
| 34 | <p>Warwick Castle strongly supports the consideration of Site 21, the Castle Stables car park site for hotel development. Warwick Castle agrees that the site can be better utilised and that it has the potential to make a greater contribution to the town and the approach to the town centre. Additional tourist accommodation is needed in the town and the allocation of the site for hotel uses creates the opportunity to meet this need and further enhance the visitor offer in this historic town. Warwick Castle agrees that the site will need careful analysis and design to achieve an appropriate scheme, sensitive to the location. Whilst 2 storey building(s) may be the predominant height the plan should indicate that the overall scale and massing will be an output of a detailed design exercise.</p> |
| 35 | <p>Idea should be dropped. I am uncertain about the commercial viability of this proposal. The town centre hotels that already exist seem to struggle. It also seems to be an inappropriate use of the car park land. A reasonably well landscaped car park is more in keeping with the traditional use of this land. There might be a case for a small building with much lower impact on the site of the disused public lavatories</p> |
| 36 | <p>Scale and form of future development in proximity to significant and sensitive heritage assets. Archaeological implications of underground car parking; entry and egress arrangements. Can it be successfully integrated into the townscape? These matters apply to all other proposed underground car parking in the town centre.</p> |
| 37 | <p>We would raise concerns as to the viability of a scheme involving car parking with residential "over".</p> |
| 38 | <p>This car park is generally well used by castle visitors and has been part of the open landscape forming the setting of the castle and the buildings on Castle Street (including the present Stable Block) since the time of the medieval vineyard. It is only now a</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| | visually separate area due to the planting of the belt of Leylandii. This historic character is an essential part of the character of the Conservation Area. In addition, to make a vehicle access from/onto Castle Hill would create a substantial traffic hazard since this is a very busy road, is on a hill, and would be too close to Castle Lane. The visibility splays required would also result in the removal of the 'listed' boundary wall. This site should not, therefore, be developed. |
|--|---|

Summary of Responses
Site 26 Market Hall

| Ref no: | |
|---------|---|
| 01 | Museum has just been refurbished. Move Tourist information Centre here. |
| 02 | Why remove museum to gain more shops when there are vacant retail units in town centre. |
| 03 | Don't see how opening up the ground floor of the Market Hall as a covered market will work. More market stalls will not attract more people to the town centre and will set the town up for more failing businesses. After dark, an open Market Hall will increasingly attract vandals, drinkers and drug users and in time would become little more than an open toilet. This has happened in other market towns with open market hall buildings. The Market Hall has been a museum since the early 18th century. Redevelopment of the Market Hall Museum as a heritage hub and visitor/community resource for the town would create a much better centre-piece and gateway for what Warwick has to offer. Given the age and construction of the building, structural considerations would make it near-impossible to remove the windows and doors without degrees of structural failure. |
| 04 | Please do not remove traffic from this area-look what happened when the Market Square was redeveloped-it took the very soul out of Warwick. |
| 05 | Market Hall should be left as it is; a lot of money was spent not that long ago on making it nice. I think it will be a waste of money. |
| 06 | No. Sitting 'outside' the pubs and cafes would not feel the same with a roof (and surely that has to be way too expensive?) Use the money for a park and ride. |
| 07 | Too small for covered market. Heritage centre with display about history in Warwick and shop and cafe is better option. |
| 08 | I like the idea. |
| 09 | Wonderful idea to remove the Museum and open arches and have a covered market. Warwick has no area for events – could upstairs be used in any way? |
| 10 | No. Sitting outside the pubs and cafes would not feel the same with a roof (and surely that has to be way too expensive). Use the money for a park and ride. |
| 11 | Opening up the Market Hall for trading would seem a reasonable idea (if the St John House development was viable) – but for market traders, farmers markets and community trade on all days of the week. The document here is also contradictory – having earlier rejected traffic restrictions/pedestrianisation it now appears to be proposed! Why restrict the parking to very short stay (in fact what is meant by 'very short stay'?) Parking here is essential for at least 1 hour periods. Disabled parking should be limited to the same short periods as all other users. As mentioned earlier parking needs better control and management now. There is also a need to enhance the Market Square other than allowing the pubs and café's to put out tables. By returning the Market Hall to its original use this could create space, which would not have to be given over to traders, for some central feature such as a sculpture or garden feature (or even a fountain – which used to stand there). The awful term of 'Niche Retail' again appears here which I have already commented on. |
| 12 | Disagree - it's the remainder of our bland Market Square that requires an uplift to make a sense of "arrival". If you must move the Museum why not to the vacated courts? |

| | |
|----|--|
| 13 | Fully support the use of the Market Hall for retail use and think this would give a focal point to the town centre. |
| 14 | It would be a great idea to reinstate the Market Hall to its former use, as an all-weather market facility, with opportunities for themed markets, arts and crafts throughout the year, offering both people living in the town and visitors a major reason to shop in Warwick town centre. When visiting European destinations, you often visit a town on market day to get the opportunity to sample local produce and purchase local crafts and artefacts, there is no reason why Warwick couldn't do the same. The issue of car park utilisation requires further review, as the statistics provided are out of date and inaccurate. My own observations are that the existing off-street parking is not well signposted or publicised. However, our shops seem to benefit from the current on-street arrangements. Can I therefore suggest that this issue is made part of a wider plan that includes transport provision, traffic and roads? |
| 15 | Keep the Museum where it is – why did we spend so much money to improve it only to rip it all out again? It needs to be here in the centre of town. We already have two top class butchers in Warwick, and two bakeries. Greengrocers have proved unsustainable and the Saturday & Farmers Markets already supply a lot of local needs. The "Cafe Culture" idea makes my blood boil. |
| 16 | Disagree. I accept that the visual improvement of existing buildings and the addition of flowers and public seating in the Market Square area would assist however, the proposal that the removal of traffic and parking from the area will create a café culture is not viable. The number of pedestrian areas suggested in the plan will make Warwick in to a mini version of Coventry City Centre. A place where no one wants to go! The plan appears to dissect the centre of Warwick Town Centre. |
| 17 | A good idea to try to promote it as the centre of the town. Any changes will need to allow the Market Hall to operate in all weathers. |
| 18 | We welcome some of the aspects of this preferred option such as improving the Market Place, greater control over traffic and parking and promoting a greener and more pleasing environment in the area. However, we do not agree with the specific proposal to develop the Market Hall into a covered market. Whilst we accept the desire to promote the original use of buildings were possible, we feel that in this case it is inappropriate. The use of the Market Hall as a Museum was established 176 years ago and in 1932 it became the first county council run museum in the country. This long term legacy and strength in identity and historic character as a museum and a centre of heritage and culture in Warwick should not be dismissed lightly. The Market Hall Museum is an intrinsic part of the local distinctiveness and unique character of the town centre; it is one of the current strengths of Warwick, one of its unique selling points and can be used to help drive further footfall and economic success. The current use as a museum has many benefits to the town centre and aligns directly with the vision and key objectives identified in this document. HCW are currently bidding for Heritage Lottery Funding for a substantial project to develop the Market Hall Museum further as a hub of heritage and culture for Warwick and Warwickshire. The benefits are many including attracting greater variety and numbers of people into the centre of Warwick with them staying for longer and spending more. Conversely the proposal of a covered market at Market Hall leaves many questions unanswered: • Where is the evidence supporting the development of a covered market at Market Hall? Have other covered markets been researched? • Has a feasibility study been carried out testing the economic viability of this proposal? Have the costs of altering the Market Hall into a covered market, the on-going building maintenance costs and the viability as retail space been considered? • There is no detail to explain what would happen to the first and second floors of Market Hall, will the proposal maximise the buildings use? • The proposal as a covered market appears to limit the use of the building. Have other options been considered? The preferred option in the document for the use of Market Hall appears to be commercially driven rather than culturally and while there are |

| | |
|----|---|
| | some benefits to an improved retail area, the continued use and development as a museum and centre for heritage and culture would appear to fulfil the vision and key objectives of the Warwick Town Centre Plan much more appropriately. We do not believe that the opening up of the Market Hall as a covered market is necessary to drive other improvements to take place around the Market Square or the town centre. Certainly the proposals by HCW for the Market Hall in the HLF bid can equally be seen as a catalyst for this. It is our recommendation therefore that this site and preferred option be substantially revised to account for the current use of the Market Hall as a museum or be removed from the document. |
| 19 | Implications of a change of use on the current activity and of any potential associated works. Recommendations: Confirm how the current schematic proposed initiatives will be further developed and informed. Clarify how design quality of future development and public realm works can be ensured. Demand design excellence. Apply 'Streets for All' and 'Manual for Streets'. Address how the day to day management, repair and maintenance of the town centre will be coordinated to ensure it is appreciated as having a critical role in the conservation of the historic environment. Explore opportunities to declutter. Confirm the scope and role of the proposed Conservation Management Plan. For future users of this Plan demonstrate diagrammatically how it relates to the higher level District wide Local Plan and other subservient relevant planning documents. |
| 20 | I have reservations over your proposals for stopping through traffic in the Market Square fearing that life and vitality may be lost at certain times of the week, and in part affecting some businesses (other than the cafes and pubs) that already complain that The Mop reduces their takings. |
| 21 | The current use of the hall as a museum is a waste of space. Probably one of the best buildings in the square it should be an eatery / deli like Carluccios. The second floor of the hall should have a live music licence for Jazz etc. Warwick is changing - more and more people are leaving London and coming to places like Warwick, just look at the eateries that have already opened in the last few years. The Square needs trees etc. Think big and acknowledge that Warwick is changing. |
| 22 | If the ground floor museum were to be moved, the arches could be opened up, but infilled with full height glazing, and the space used for permanent shop stalls. |

Summary of Responses
Site 29 Eastgate

| Ref no: | |
|---------|--|
| 01 | Very busy intersection. Vehicles often make illegal turns endangering pedestrians, including turning left from Jury Street in The Butts and left from Castle Hill against a red signal when traffic is allowed to go straight ahead into The Butts. Changes must improve pedestrian safety, including a safe route across Castle Hill. |
| 02 | Smith Street, should be pedestrianised. |
| 03 | It is impossible to tell what (if anything) is proposed: rebalancing space might mean reducing traffic capacity, but this junction is critical to operation of surrounding road system. Don't know how Smith Street is to be 'better connected' to the Town Centre but there are significant traffic implications and it is unlikely on recent evidence that these have been thought through. |
| 04 | Needs doing asap. |
| 05 | Preferred option not understood. Even with possible future reductions in traffic volumes, this will still be the de facto crossroads of the town. Potential improvements for pedestrian permeability have already been identified but not actioned. The Forum agreed some 4 years ago to hold a 'conference' on the complexities of the traffic dynamics in the Castle Hill area, and affecting all of the local streets. Until this discussion takes place the issues will remain poorly understood and will lead to wrong proposals. |
| 06 | This should and could have attention immediately. The biggest issue here is the lack of any safe pedestrian / cyclist access to Smith Street from all approaches at this junction. The installation of phased traffic light crossings at this point across all roads would assist in this and also slow traffic and perhaps discourage some of the unnecessary through traffic. |
| 07 | Don't understand what you are trying to do. I believe that about four years ago there was to be a conference on the complexities of the traffic dynamics in the Castle Hill area, and the effect on all of the local streets. This has never taken place to my knowledge and should precede any other plan. |
| 08 | No idea how this "balance" is proposed – the wide archway under Eastgate provides parking for residence above. The parking spaces outside Landor House are possibly the most heavily used in Warwick, during term time especially. |
| 09 | Disagree. The visual plan appears to make access from Castle Hill into Jury Street or the Butts almost impossible. The gradient of the hill and width of the streets doesn't appear to have been taken into account. Has a plan for traffic already been prepared? Is it proposed that Castle Hill become a one-way road? What about emergency vehicles? |
| 10 | Immediate need is to prevent the owner of the Eastgate from using the arch as a private car parking space. |
| 11 | This area is laid out to meet vehicle traffic requirements and it is difficult to see how it could be improved, visually. It is not clear what is meant by "opening between Smith Street and the rest of the Town Centre". |

Summary of Responses

Site 30 Pedestrian Route into Town from Castle

| Ref no: | |
|---------|---|
| 01 | Reinstate the zebra crossing on Jury Street. The new crossing is grey and brown drivers and pedestrians don't understand the colours. Zebra crossing should be black and white as in the highway code. |
| 02 | No rationale for this. |
| 03 | Work in progress and will require major redesign and rework to make it suitable for the disabled. |
| 04 | What would the planned route into town be from a hotel in the stables? |
| 05 | Castle Street and Church Street are shown as pedestrianised. This has just gone through a public consultation and was wholeheartedly rejected. We want movement of traffic through our town centre we do not want to see it as an empty shopping mall. I object to this as a preferred option and if the glossy book misrepresents what the preferred option looks like, the book should be amended and redistributed so that we can understand what it says and can take part in a clear and unambiguous consultation. If the plan is wrong please amend it and let us be consulted about matters which have been correctly stated. |
| 06 | Whilst this has already been subject to development there are serious flaws in the design in respect of the crossing area (and the others on High Street / Jury Street) which need to be urgently addressed. The biggest problem is that neither motorist nor pedestrians have any concrete information or guidance re the use of the crossing areas. This can be easily rectified by using either one or both of the systems which have been in use in similar situations on the continent for many years; a) have a sign at each end of the area – east and west entrances to Jury Street/High Street – which informs drivers that there are 4 pedestrian crossing areas (this is normally done pictorially and numerically and frequently accompanied by flashing lights similar to school crossing patrol area lights) and / or b) placing a pictorial sign on the central metal barriers at each crossing point – which at the moment has a 'keep left arrow' fixed to it – to indicate that it is a crossing area. This will avoid the dangerous confusion which occurs at the moment and could be instigated easily and cheaply now. |
| 07 | This has been scuppered by the lack of any crossing facility (able and especially disabled) over High Street/Jury Street. |
| 08 | Pedestrian route via Castle Street to St Mary's Church already exists. A proper sign outside the "Town Gate" would do more to encourage/help tourists to find the town. |
| 09 | We are unaware of plans to pedestrianise Church Street. These would affect access to our Church Street premises and our plans to establish these firmly as our UK HQ. All well considered and appropriate plans relating to improved vehicular and public transport access are welcome as are such plans to improve and increase central car parking facilities. The positive impact on business in Warwick would need to be a primary concern of such plans. In particular, commercial deliveries into and out of Warwick must not be adversely affected. Indeed this is a key area that needs improvement if we are to have a thriving town centre. |
| 10 | Although it is stated that work is underway, has any consideration been given to the access to St Mary's Church, the shops and offices in Church Street and the residents? The pedestrian route crosses the High Street. Once again, the plans appear to dissect the centre of town making access impossible. |
| 11 | Attempts have been made to link the castle to the town centre for many years (including the creation of the existing pedestrian |

| | |
|--|--|
| | gate in the boundary wall) but the basic problem is the fact that this wall exists. The resurfacing of High Street/Jury Street has not improved the situation since there is no concept of the pedestrian having priority, the humps simply slowing traffic down at those points (without the usual hump markings) but not telling drivers to let pedestrians cross. |
|--|--|

Summary of Responses
Subject – Economy

| Ref no: | |
|---------|---|
| 01 | The traffic strategy is wrong. Through traffic needs to be managed, not curtailed and people who want to visit the town need to be helped to do so. Alcester have free parking, and so should Warwick. |
| 02 | Objectively think about what brings paying customers/ visitors- it is a motor vehicle. This anti car and pro pedestrian approach - will kill the economy of the town. |
| 03 | The economic strategy needs to go beyond buildings and advertising folk festivals. Where is the focus in developing a replacement industry for the 'county town' functions that have been removed from the centre of Warwick? Removal of parking is not going to help residents or local business. We need to be asking how to fill spaces not take them away - why are we being so negative where is the positive thinking! Replacing Barrack Street Offices is good if they are replaced by offices and not relying on shops filling the space. The number of parking spaces should be retained and action taken to develop business that fills them. Additional hotel space in the centre of Warwick is over-due but do not expect people to travel here, with their suitcases on bikes - as has been previously suggested! Accommodation in the Masonic car park needs to take into full account maintenance of their parking requirements and protection of the view of Alderson house from Back Lane. |
| 04 | A permanent covered market would seriously detract from the open space feel of Market Square, use New Street car park instead. |
| 05 | Again full of sound bites with little or no meaning. |
| 06 | My suggestion based on the current economic climate would be to spend as little of "public money" as possible to prevent any need to ask for more until the Country's economy improves and we come out of recession. |
| 07 | Don't have enough information to comment. What basis was used to designate the 30 'preferred' sites? |
| 08 | I don't think we should be entertaining any major developments that are going to create more through traffic in the town centre until we have addressed the 80% through traffic issue. |
| 09 | Very interesting. Very clear. Site 30: The footpath on Castle Street. Not friendly to wheelchairs or the less youthful. Replace with smooth slabs. Site 3: We're used to it. This car park is useful and on a good site, but if demolished please use site for residential - marvellous views, central location, high density, zero carbon, prestige site. |
| 10 | Mostly rhetoric. However traffic and access proposals show lack of up-to-date information and genuine understanding of movement patterns. No explanation of 80% figure: what survey work, what boundary, what road system? Where are they going and why? What alternatives are proposed? Shuttling bus proposal is rubbish. There are good daytime bus services now but they are little used except by elderly/car less. |
| 11 | Just plonking a residential block on a car park (sites 16 & 17) shows very little thought and does nothing to address parking issues or the major issue of shop/office utilisation. |
| 12 | Again feels a bit woolly so it's hard to argue with. |
| 13 | Well, it's not really a strategy - it's a collection of vision statements. What concerns me is that the options are embarking on 15 years of turmoil with no strategy. None of the options are attempting to provide specific solutions – it's not outcome based. |

| | |
|----|--|
| 14 | You cannot expect the public to comment on this. |
| 15 | In essence. No lively public daytime spaces please. |
| 16 | Please explain what the strategy is. Any such plan would have to create income. |
| 17 | Need to incentivise impact 'knowledge economies niche'. Facilitate communities. |
| 18 | This strategy at present is bordering on the strangulation of a historic town. Shame on you. |
| 19 | To develop existing buildings for different uses with the intention to increase controls over listed buildings in the conservation area. There must be compromises in some cases. |
| 20 | Do not want Market Hall to be developed for retail niches. There is a charter to allow it to be in the town centre. |
| 21 | Return High Street to a safe pedestrian crossing. |
| 22 | Total rubbish. You cannot have visitors and no traffic. The coach people from the north of the country do the charity shops and the factory shop and no more. |
| 23 | The Council's policy for retail in Warwick Town Centre is unclear, and does not provide sufficient direction or justification in order to deliver the stated economic objectives. The Town Centre Area Action Plan document should set out a clear strategy for retail within the town centre area, including the following: • The strategy for Warwick town centre including its position in complementing the role of Leamington Spa; • How the residents aspirations for the town centre will be met; • How investment will be encouraged; • Defining a town centre boundary; In addition, there is no justification for excluding the option for "increasing the number of retail units through new developments". As a strategy, this is therefore unjustified and unsound. |
| 24 | Based on a high cost high returns model this is contradictory in that it may attract some businesses, but not those which will address the demands of residents, the so called 'local needs'. National businesses looking for high returns look to the demographics of any catchment area using sophisticated modelling, none of which has been referred to here and most of which in my experience would preclude such businesses from establishing themselves in Warwick. It is already compromised by previous planning decisions, as I have suggested above. The suggestion that underground car parks could be encouraged is nonsense, the cost alone precludes this from ever taking place, never mind the years of disruption it would cause to residents and traders. The suggestion that some on street 'surface' parking could be removed/reduced would be extremely damaging for many businesses that rely on such facilities for attracting and retaining customers. The ability to park for short periods near commercial premises is extremely valuable. Unfortunately at the moment it is not well regulated e.g. people park with apparent impunity on the footway as do holders of disabled badges park in areas which cause an obstruction. The Mop Fair has outgrown – literally by the use of large and heavy equipment – its place in the Town Centre and there is little evidence of any great social or economic benefit to the town. Action should be taken to remove it to another location, such as St Nicolas Park. Its continued presence also affects any plans to enhance the Market Square. |
| 25 | We agree with the aim of increasing employment in knowledge based businesses, professional services and creative industries. DCA, as one of Europe's leading product design consultancies, is a prime example of what Warwick can achieve in these sectors. We are concerned though that the development needs of such organisations are not explicitly noted as of equal importance (at least) to the conservation/heritage needs of the town. Site 1 - DCA has made a major investment in the creation of a second significant studio and office space in this building. Currently 60 DCA staff work here, with an expensive fibre optic communications link to our Church Street premises and a suite of high quality visitor meeting rooms. Site 14 - we would be concerned about the potential impact of the proposed development on the New Street Car Park site as this may impact adversely on our adjoining Church Street premises, our plans to establish these firmly as our UK HQ and the existing |

| | |
|----|--|
| | <p>planning permission for expansion there. Site 30 - we are unaware of plans to pedestrianise Church Street. These would affect access to our Church Street premises and our plans to establish these firmly as our UK HQ All well considered and appropriate plans relating to improved vehicular and public transport access are welcome as are such plans to improve and increase central car parking facilities. The positive impact on business in Warwick would need to be a primary concern of such plans. In particular, commercial deliveries into and out of Warwick must not be adversely affected. Indeed this is a key area that needs improvement if we are to have a thriving town centre. A1 Warwick is ideally located to become a technology and design hub for the UK. Local educational establishments have excellent reputations for engineering and design. There are science parks and technology parks and successful technology companies like DCA, JLR, Aston Martin, Ricardo etc. There is an outstanding industrial heritage surrounding Warwick, whilst niche manufacturers continue to flourish - serving businesses like DCA. This together with great transport links inside and outside the UK, should attract businesses to the region. Improved access to the town centre and overtly pro-business development policy would see them also locating centrally, bringing employment and consumers to the heart of Warwick. We are heartened by the statement 'positively promote the town centre to potential businesses and investors' and would like to add our ideas and support to specific schemes targeted at prioritising this goal. Investing the future of Warwick so heavily in supporting the needs of visitors to the castle seems a very high risk, single strand strategy. The castle's aim will surely be to retain their audience and their associated spending power for the entire day, not to allow them to leak into Warwick Town Centre. We must develop an economic model that is more diversified and robust and encourages a wider range of potential sources of income. Local businesses within Warwick provide one such opportunity, generating employment, good PR for the town and high levels of retail activity. We are very positive about Warwick, but need more positive and balanced pro-business support to be clearly illustrated by the Council in their strategy and, of course, demonstrated in their actions. We are very happy to discuss our views and ideas regarding the design and technology hub opportunity that Warwick has available to it. DCA did not raise issues at the last consultation as we were not aware that a process with such far reaching implications for business in Warwick was on-going at the time. As we hope the Partnership will see from our responses above, we are now engaged and keen to discuss our views and how DCAs goals as one of Europe's leading product design consultancies, can work synergistically alongside those of Warwick to great effect.</p> |
| 26 | <p>Conservation and enhancement of the historic buildings and the public spaces for which they form the backdrop are the foundations of this economic strategy. Vistas which make the buildings a fine backdrop to the public spaces. These are comments in the plan which do not appear to be supported by the recommendations to build a hotel in the Stables Car Park.</p> |
| 27 | <p>The strategy comments on the visitor economy as a sector in general decline. The economic situation is having an impact on all sectors, not just tourism. What the strategy ought to acknowledge is the need for businesses to be able to adapt, and quickly, to new opportunities. The Plan cannot prescribe how businesses act: it should set a positive framework (in line with the principles in the NPPF) to encourage development. Where new development is referred to (P17) it should welcome the redevelopment of any poor quality development - that would involve demolition. To try to resist demolition may prevent a beneficial scheme being implemented in the town centre.</p> |
| 28 | <p>Pleased that the last bullet point on left-hand side of page 16 states that the range and scope of cultural activities will be strengthened. However, there is no description in the document about the town's cultural strengths nor any reference to its cultural activities. We strongly suggest that page 7 reflects the National Planning Policy Framework where item 23, regarding the vitality of town centres, states that a range of suitable sites should be allocated to meet the scale and type of retail, leisure, commercial, office, tourism, cultural, community and residential development needed in town centres. This could also be achieved by adding the word 'cultural' before the word 'attractions' in the fourth bullet point on the right-hand side of page 7.</p> |

| | |
|----|---|
| | The Site Opportunities section on page 17 should also include the term 'cultural attractions' to reflect the NPPF and your Vision. I am a resident of Warwick and my business is located here. My family has been in Warwick for 3 generations before me. You have a number of my family's memorabilia at your records office in Priory Park, and I am passionate that the Town does not lose its historic character by inappropriate development. Having now had the opportunity to review the Council's plans, I am happy to give my support to all of the cited development proposals, except for one, and with reservations for two others. |
| 29 | In my opinion the Mop Fair has a negative impact on the economy and reputation of Warwick - any such provisioning for this event should be dramatically scaled back or it should be entirely removed from the town centre. This opinion is held by all other residents I know. I do not think there is a need to make public spaces more 'lively' - in my opinion the people of Warwick choose to live here because, on the whole, it is a peaceful, quiet and safe town. I think that the feeling of open spaces (be that town car parks, gardens, wide pavements) add to the charm and character of Warwick, and I feel that it would be a mistake just to develop on land because we can. Any additional development must be in character for Warwick and not crowd/upset the existing residents or detract from the charm of the current town centre; particularly around the castle. |
| 30 | All economic activity needs to be in keeping with the historic and environment. Large retail companies need to give way to local independents. |
| 31 | Let market forces dictate the mix and value of property within the town itself and only allow a preconceived mix of housing in the periphery. |
| 32 | Think as if you were in the place of the business relying on people coming through the door- think it through! |
| 33 | The Coffee Tavern at the corner of New St and the Old Square (pictured on page 3) would make a good location for a restaurant. Shire Hall does nothing for the Market Square appearance and should be put on notice along with the Barrack St car park. |
| 34 | Add: Work towards improving access to high speed broadband for residents and businesses and the provision of well-advertised free broadband access at hotspots around town. |
| 35 | Can only answer this on a 'site by site ' basis. The detail is insufficient to make judgement or offer alternatives Some of the suggestions look attractive if somewhat 'speculative and wishful. |
| 36 | We fully acknowledge that the town needs to draw in and cater for visitors in order to remain a viable economic unit. However the town also needs an indigenous resident population to keep it viable as a living, working community. It is therefore vital that the needs of the resident population are adequately catered for by local businesses. |
| 37 | Put a hold on the various expansions of residential development particularly Europa way/Myton Road and Stratford Road until you have sorted out the town centre traffic. If you can't agree a solution then we have to stop trying to fit more people into the town. |
| 38 | MOP fair - largely unpopular due to disruption/noise - why not work with local food/retail outlets to create a more 'summer Victorian evening' which is popular with everyone. Bring back parades/carnival to town centre Summer cinema/theatre screenings in square. |
| 39 | The proposed enhanced walking route connecting to buses should actually involve the construction of a direct cycle/footpath from the station straight into the priory park and into the town. |
| 40 | A cafe culture will not exist in Warwick until incompatible businesses are removed e.g. 'Bet Fred' and the problematic Wetherspoon's pub. |
| 41 | A sound economy would be the means through which surpluses generated can be reinvested. It is fundamental to the success |

| | |
|----|--|
| | of the project. Key components of the options are the sale of public sector assets in the form of sites and buildings and it is important for the future of Warwick that the town benefits from these sales - not just from the new developments that will take place but from the reinvestment in Warwick of the proceeds of the sales and disposals. |
| 42 | Very important to develop the sense of place. I also think that in general people prefer surface car parking. |
| 43 | Leper Hospital could be a meeting venue i.e. beer festivals as in Norwich. Would National Trust be able to get involved? St John's needs attention with the parking being laid out to allow more cars to park. When Smith Street closed for folk festival it was fantastic. The businesses did a really good trade. Could Smith Street/High Street/Jury Street be closed to traffic? |
| 44 | I would like to see any new buildings go into the town and not take the countryside. Make the houses in the town affordable ones. If factory units are not used then put houses in their space. Especially if they have been left empty for a number of years. |
| 45 | Far too much car parking is for free council parking. Car parking is not well signposted for visitors. |
| 46 | If a car park is under-utilised why not offer this as "free parking" which will help everyone and free up on street parking for much needed shoppers who just want to pop in - thereby helping business. |
| 47 | I don't see any major project apart from using the market hall as a market that says "we've arrived" With several fabulous buildings lying empty surely there's an opportunity to do something creative with them? |
| 48 | Draft a proper strategy and deliver to specific outcomes. |
| 49 | We like our peaceful little town. Don't understand about the market hall- too ambitious perhaps. |
| 50 | I'd like a bolder scheme which starts with more parking provision for visitors in the vicinity of market square. Agree with some aspects of access, public spaces and historic buildings but don't sound too practical. |
| 51 | Generally we need to strengthen the daytime economy of the town centre to meet local needs and reduce the tendency to go to Leamington because "you can't buy it in Warwick". Two changes are needed, and possible: Move the museum from the ground floor of the Market Hall, and open up the arches to return the building to its earlier appearance, and invite market traders to occupy it every day. Equally vital – get the Mop out of the Market Place: its use for six days a year dominates and ruins its use for the remaining 359 days, and provides no benefit for the town's traders who lose substantial income. Ensure the historic buildings for which the town is famous to retain their character, whilst being used. |
| 52 | OTHER ISSUES 2014 is the 1100 anniversary of the founding of Warwick this is a significant opportunity to promote the town. Two projects spring to mind: Seek City Status for Warwick I understand this is entirely in the gift of the monarch by Royal Charter see http://www.ukcities.co.uk/status/ I note we already have a Bishop of warwick, a lot of history, an administrative function, defined area and an ancient council . see also http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/City_status_in_the_United_Kingdom If we bid now even if it was not granted it would raise the profile of the town. Major cultural event/ festival to last for the year. I suggest we have a year round cultural festival, But as a focal point do something involving popular street art, which would be fun, involve the local community and attract a lot of visitors to boost the economy. Examples include the well-known Cowparade http://www.cowparade.com/ With fibre-glass colourful street art, which after exhibition is then auctioned for charity. Perhaps the base model could be a bear and ragged staff for Warwick? Planning would need to start now, especially if artists were invited to design some of the statute. Imagine works by artists and designers such as Damian Hurst , Tracey Ermin, Chris Ofli, the Chapmanbrothers but also maybe local organisations i.e. Jaguar , Aston Martin, Warwick University, Warwick Castle, etc? Similar projects include: Bath Pigs in 2008 http://www.kingbladudspigs.org/ Dortmund Rhinos in 2005 http://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dortmunder_Nashorn Penguins in Wuppenthal 2006 |

| |
|---|
| <p>http://www.pinguinale2006.de/htdocs/index.php?sID=01 Nigel Hamilton! Warwick Town Centre Plan, Local Development Framework 12 Bear Fever http://www.bearfever.org/ Go Elephants Norwich http://www.goelephants.co.uk/gallery.aspx Localism This appears to be a major theme of the current Government. It should be embraced with a bottom rather than a top down approach to the Local Plan, with a great emphasis on the views of the Town Council and local Civic Society on what the future of Warwick should be. If these views are at variance with the WDC Planners views perhaps it suggests they are out of touch with what people want and have not bought into the localism agenda yet!?</p> |
|---|

Summary of Responses

Other Suggestions and Potential Sites

| Ref no: | |
|---------|---|
| 01 | Opportunities for The Coffee Tavern at the corner of New Street and Old Square which should be reviewed. |
| 02 | On street parking must be retained for residents. |
| 03 | New build must be sympathetic to mainly Georgian architecture – no repeat of Market St or ghastly Shire Hall. Retain greenery. |
| 04 | Stop anti-car campaign. |
| 05 | Like suggestion of underground car parking. |
| 06 | Cramming more residential development into the town centre is neither necessary nor desirable. |
| 07 | Car parks under residential will become ghettos that people dare not use. |
| 08 | More greenery in Market Place. Remove parking – it blocks views/shop fronts. Improve Saturday market layout – burger/fish vans block view of shop on Saturday's – loss of link to Swan Street. Could be generally more interesting. |
| 09 | Need cycleways. No proposals but is supposed to be a priority. |
| 10 | Pity there are no proposals for reduction in traffic. |
| 11 | Comments have not been invited to comment on proposed changes to road system within town centre that are apparent from sketch plans. |
| 12 | If parking in Castle Street is also reduced (or scrapped) in order to pedestrianise the street, then I cannot see how residents would be able to park at all, and will certainly devalue our homes, if no close-by parking is available. The pedestrianisation of Church Street is also a ridiculous over provision. Again, precious on street parking for residents and the businesses will be compromised. There is already a wide pavement- the problem is getting across the High Street without being killed. By encouraging pedestrians to enter the town centre by this route the businesses on High Street and Swan Street will be overlooked. You need to give pedestrians well sign posted routes in both directions. |
| 13 | Think about including plans for a residential nursing home for the elderly. Currently it is necessary to find a bed in Leamington or Rugby. There is no residential care provision for the elderly/infirm person. |
| 14 | Create garden trails as well as historic trails. |
| 15 | Where 'residential with car parking under', I hope this doesn't mean a glut of apartments. Warwick needs more small houses with gardens and parking. Many older people would like to 'downsize' but do not want a flat. |
| 16 | There is a general assumption that if there is a space without a building on it then it's a waste. Sometimes space itself is important. |
| 17 | You will ruin Warwick with all this housing. |
| 18 | The Town Centre Plan should identify aspirations for the Town Centre and then consider how these can best be achieved. However, instead the Plan identifies a number of Opportunity Sites and then considers the suitability of each site for the following uses: residential, retail, offices, leisure, hotel, visitor attraction, car parking, community facility, health facility and service provision. This approach has the effect of restricting the growth options available for the town and will potentially cause the Town Centre to stagnate and consequently decline. To avoid the above situation the Council/Town Centre Partnership |

| | |
|----|--|
| | <p>should first consider what development should be supported and encouraged in the town centre and then identify where these uses might best be located. This process will also confirm whether there is a need to expand the town centre in order to realise the Town Centre vision. An example of the above, from our discussions with the Council in relation to the Racecourse Hotel Planning application, it is clear that the principle of a town centre hotel is supported. However, the Town Centre Plan does not confirm support for a Town Centre hotel. The only reference to potential new hotel accommodation being in relation to the Castle Stables Opportunity Site, which is identified as suitable for residential or hotel development. Therefore there is no firm commitment of support for a hotel or any other land use in Warwick Town Centre. Our client considers that the town centre should be extended to include adjacent land at the Racecourse. This land should then be added to the list of Opportunity Sites contained in the Town Centre Plan, and identified as having potential for leisure, hotel and visitor attraction provision. This will provide a supportive planning framework for the Racecourse to develop and remain viable in future years and assist in strengthening the relationship between the Town Centre and the Racecourse in line with the Town Centre Plan objective.</p> |
| 19 | <p>The preferred options paper clearly indicates development of central town car parks, with the result that the preferred options will lead to a vastly reduced parking provision in the centre of Warwick. I object to this as a preferred option. • The parking data is seriously flawed as set out in correspondence. This information is blatantly misrepresented in the Town Centre Plan Preferred Options glossy book. The result is that it discredits what is set out in the book which is clearly unreliable. Town Centre Car Parks should emphatically not be developed. A better preferred option is to retain all town car parks and to make them more accessible by applying sensible parking tariffs, better lighting, signage and to encourage better use of the existing car parks. Despite what W:RIT will say, the car is our friend, it brings businesses into town, it invites investment, it invites visitors, shoppers and people who want to use the well-established and vibrant restaurant and pub trade which is a feature of Warwick and which encourages people to use Warwick as a destination for the day or evening. Do not sell or develop our car parks. They are crucial to our economy. • Parking generally: again W:RIT want to see Warwick paved over and to get rid of cars. Do not pedestrianise Old Square: the businesses will fail. They want people to get to their businesses and to park and to browse. Do not get rid of parking in Smith Street, it will kill what is already a challenging trading position in our town. If I visit Smith Street with dry cleaning or to get a vacuum cleaner serviced I want to go by car and to park outside of the businesses which I use.</p> |
| 20 | <p>The consultation document is complex: how is a lay person supposed to answer a question such as "Do you support the Draft Economic Policy....Would any of the Preferred Options be inconsistent with the Economic Strategy? Do you have any other suggestion? Yes, where is it, how long did it take to put together, is it understandable to the man or woman in the street, do you intend the person answering to submit an alternative economic strategy?</p> |
| 21 | <p>Improved walkways and signage from the railway station can also be achieved and have a major impact on the visitor experience.</p> |
| 22 | <p>I was not aware of the consultation process that led to the re-landscaping of the High Street/Jury Street. If I had I would objected to the fact that there are no marked pedestrian crossings, making it dangerous particularly for young children, disabled and the elderly. I have also noted that The Guide Dogs for the Blind no longer use Warwick to train their dogs. This is a plan that clearly hasn't worked. I strongly believe that if more Warwick residents and businesses had been involved in the initial planning process and consultation, there would have been a more successful outcome. Please don't make the same mistake again.</p> |
| 23 | <p>These options do not address the paucity and the unattractiveness of current parking. Below level parking will not work.</p> |

| | |
|----|--|
| 24 | Many good ideas, but we need more parking in the town, not less, to attract visitors and other shoppers. The proposal to make Priory Road car park, and West Rock, residential with car park beneath must result in many fewer car parking places. This is because spaces will be needed to support the building above, and every flat will need one parking place, and many will take two or more. Priory Road car park is used to the full, both in daytime and in the evening, providing useful parking to serve the shops & restaurants in Smith Street. If parking is reduced it will have an adverse effect on trade. These comments apply to most of the car parks in the proposal. The population of Warwick has expanded considerably in recent years and there is a limit to the structure required to serve this growth. We are in danger of spoiling this lovely town in order to accommodate even more people. The townspeople and the Council have a duty to pass to our children a town which is not significantly poorer in quality than that which we are privileged to enjoy. |
| 25 | An evident commitment in the Plan to seeking to ensure appropriate contextual high quality new development and the conservation and future viability of key historic buildings in the town is recognised. However we would appreciate an opportunity to discuss certain suggested proposals in the Plan. As currently described a number appear potentially contentious and it would be helpful to have your explanation of the initiatives in further detail. (English Heritage) |
| 26 | It would appear, having talked to shop owners including Chamber of Trade members, that there has been scant communication prior to the issue of this latest document since the consultation and report in 2010. With a possibility, we are told, that this plan may take 15 years or longer to come to fruition, the council tenants in Market Street and Market Place (some of whom have been there 25 years) quite rightly are concerned as to their future and where they might be moved to and when. In our instance you have now placed a planning blight on the apartment that we own in Market Street, making it impossible for us to sell for as long as it takes to resolve the scheme. Similarly traders are now blighted if they wish to sell on their leases. Haven't Warwick traders gone through enough pain already? Did nobody see the ramifications concerning the timing of the publication of this plan for tenants, traders and owners alike which, as far as we can see, is to tout it around in the hope that a developer will take on the task of redevelopment at a time when funding is high impossible, rather than get somebody on board first. As for the plan itself, if the "makeover" of Market Square and the "traffic calming" of High Street and Jury Street are anything to go by god help us. |
| 27 | Great care should be exerted with reuse of existing land and property. Short term financial gain to the public bodies should not be at the expense of the historic integrity of the town centre. No new building should be allowed on the existing open spaces, parks and green belt around the town centre. Any major alterations to existing buildings or rebuilding on their sites within this area should meet rigorous standards, and always respect, harmonise and enhance the historic core and existing buildings. There is a perception that the WDC is in thrall to business interests, who are interested in making a quick buck rather than the long term interests of the town and region. •Yes there may be a case for reuse or redevelopment of some sites; but some of the ideas mooted are probably unrealistic or detrimental to the town centre. •Larger scale development would better be considered for some of the retail, industrial and business "parks" outside the town centre. These "brown field sites" could be re-examined for how they are allocated for employment, leisure and housing uses. By location, scale, area and existing infrastructure they should be the prime areas for "development opportunities". Before demolishing existing office and retail space perhaps a comprehensive effort should be made to market it and seek reuse. Perhaps a centralised agency to proactively list and "sell" the opportunities could create employment opportunities at low risk and low cost- giving the option of private landlords to also actively participate. Unused office space could be marketed to start-up businesses on short term lets below regional average prices. • Centralised services such as secretarial support, car parking and meeting rooms could be established and charged on a usage basis, and basically furnished office suites provided on rolling two month contracts, with maintenance |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>provided by the lead agency. • Some offices should be converted back to residential use- i.e. the many empty floors in historic town centre buildings- this should be facilitated by the Council. Empty Retail Space Although much of the space seems to be rapidly churned into new businesses, there should be mechanisms and incentives within the plan if this does not remain the case in future. • Short term rolling contracts below regional average rents could be provided in what are otherwise empty publicly owned property- again allowing private landlords the same terms and participation. This could be restricted to targeted types of retail if there is a perceived local need. • If spaces still remained unused; perhaps some could be offered to community groups for nominal rent again on short term rolling contracts, rather than leave them empty. • Some empty shop windows could be used to display objects from the Warwickshire Museum Service and County Records Office Archives. Commission some cabinets and displays which could be easily moved from unit to unit as they become available rather than leaving empty spaces. Large scale redevelopment finance remains unlikely in the short to medium term, due to restraints on bank liquidity and the parlous state of most UK property developers.</p> |
|--|--|

Summary of Responses

Further Comments

| Ref no: | |
|---------|---|
| 01 | Opportunities for The Coffee Tavern at the corner of New Street and Old Square which should be reviewed. |
| 02 | On street parking must be retained for residents. |
| 03 | New build must be sympathetic to mainly Georgian architecture – no repeat of Market St or ghastly Shire Hall. Retain greenery. |
| 04 | Stop anti-car campaign. |
| 05 | Like suggestion of underground car parking. |
| 06 | Cramming more residential development into the town centre is neither necessary nor desirable. |
| 07 | Car parks under residential will become ghettos that people dare not use. |
| 08 | More greenery in Market Place. Remove parking – it blocks views/shop fronts. Improve Saturday market layout – burger/fish vans block view of shop on Saturday's – loss of link to Swan Street. Could be generally more interesting. |
| 09 | Need cycleways. No proposals but is supposed to be a priority. |
| 10 | Pity there are no proposals for reduction in traffic. |
| 11 | Comments have not been invited to comment on proposed changes to road system within town centre that are apparent from sketch plans. |
| 12 | If parking in Castle Street is also reduced (or scrapped) in order to pedestrianise the street, then I cannot see how residents would be able to park at all, and will certainly devalue our homes, if no close-by parking is available. The pedestrianisation of Church Street is also a ridiculous over provision. Again, precious on street parking for residents and the businesses will be compromised. There is already a wide pavement- the problem is getting across the High Street without being killed. By encouraging pedestrians to enter the town centre by this route the businesses on High Street and Swan Street will be overlooked. You need to give pedestrians well sign posted routes in both directions. |
| 13 | Think about including plans for a residential nursing home for the elderly. Currently it is necessary to find a bed in Leamington or Rugby. There is no residential care provision for the elderly/infirm person. |
| 14 | Create garden trails as well as historic trails. |
| 15 | Where 'residential with car parking under', I hope this doesn't mean a glut of apartments. Warwick needs more small houses with gardens and parking. Many older people would like to 'downsize' but do not want a flat. |
| 16 | There is a general assumption that if there is a space without a building on it then it's a waste. Sometimes space itself is important. |
| 17 | You will ruin Warwick with all this housing. |
| 18 | The Town Centre Plan should identify aspirations for the Town Centre and then consider how these can best be achieved. However, instead the Plan identifies a number of Opportunity Sites and then considers the suitability of each site for the following uses: residential, retail, offices, leisure, hotel, visitor attraction, car parking, community facility, health facility and service provision. This approach has the effect of restricting the growth options available for the town and will potentially cause the Town Centre to stagnate and consequently decline. To avoid the above situation the Council/Town Centre Partnership |

| | |
|----|--|
| | <p>should first consider what development should be supported and encouraged in the town centre and then identify where these uses might best be located. This process will also confirm whether there is a need to expand the town centre in order to realise the Town Centre vision. An example of the above, from our discussions with the Council in relation to the Racecourse Hotel Planning application, it is clear that the principle of a town centre hotel is supported. However, the Town Centre Plan does not confirm support for a Town Centre hotel. The only reference to potential new hotel accommodation being in relation to the Castle Stables Opportunity Site, which is identified as suitable for residential or hotel development. Therefore there is no firm commitment of support for a hotel or any other land use in Warwick Town Centre. Our client considers that the town centre should be extended to include adjacent land at the Racecourse. This land should then be added to the list of Opportunity Sites contained in the Town Centre Plan, and identified as having potential for leisure, hotel and visitor attraction provision. This will provide a supportive planning framework for the Racecourse to develop and remain viable in future years and assist in strengthening the relationship between the Town Centre and the Racecourse in line with the Town Centre Plan objective.</p> |
| 19 | <p>The preferred options paper clearly indicates development of central town car parks, with the result that the preferred options will lead to a vastly reduced parking provision in the centre of Warwick. I object to this as a preferred option. • The parking data is seriously flawed as set out in correspondence. This information is blatantly misrepresented in the Town Centre Plan Preferred Options glossy book. The result is that it discredits what is set out in the book which is clearly unreliable. Town Centre Car Parks should emphatically not be developed. A better preferred option is to retain all town car parks and to make them more accessible by applying sensible parking tariffs, better lighting, signage and to encourage better use of the existing car parks. Despite what W:RIT will say, the car is our friend, it brings businesses into town, it invites investment, it invites visitors, shoppers and people who want to use the well-established and vibrant restaurant and pub trade which is a feature of Warwick and which encourages people to use Warwick as a destination for the day or evening. Do not sell or develop our car parks. They are crucial to our economy. • Parking generally: again W:RIT want to see Warwick paved over and to get rid of cars. Do not pedestrianise Old Square: the businesses will fail, they want people to get to their businesses and to park and to browse. Do not get rid of parking in Smith Street, it will kill what is already a challenging trading position in our town. If I visit Smith Street with dry cleaning or to get a vacuum cleaner serviced I want to go by car and to park outside of the businesses which I use.</p> |
| 20 | <p>The consultation document is complex: how is a lay person supposed to answer a question such as "Do you support the Draft Economic Policy....Would any of the Preferred Options be inconsistent with the Economic Strategy? Do you have any other suggestion? Yes, where is it, how long did it take to put together, is it understandable to the man or woman in the street, do you intend the person answering to submit an alternative economic strategy?</p> |
| 21 | <p>Improved walkways and signage from the railway station can also be achieved and have a major impact on the visitor experience.</p> |
| 22 | <p>I was not aware of the consultation process that led to the re-landscaping of the High Street/Jury Street. If I had I would objected to the fact that there are no marked pedestrian crossings, making it dangerous particularly for young children, disabled and the elderly. I have also noted that The Guide Dogs for the Blind no longer use Warwick to train their dogs. This is a plan that clearly hasn't worked. I strongly believe that if more Warwick residents and businesses had been involved in the initial planning process and consultation, there would have been a more successful outcome. Please don't make the same mistake again.</p> |
| 23 | <p>These options do not address the paucity and the unattractiveness of current parking. Below level parking will not work.</p> |

| | |
|----|--|
| 24 | Many good ideas, but we need more parking in the town, not less, to attract visitors and other shoppers. The proposal to make Priory Road car park, and West Rock, residential with car park beneath must result in many fewer car parking places. This is because spaces will be needed to support the building above, and every flat will need one parking place, and many will take two or more. Priory Road car park is used to the full, both in daytime and in the evening, providing useful parking to serve the shops & restaurants in Smith Street. If parking is reduced it will have an adverse effect on trade. These comments apply to most of the car parks in the proposal. The population of Warwick has expanded considerably in recent years and there is a limit to the structure required to serve this growth. We are in danger of spoiling this lovely town in order to accommodate even more people. The townspeople and the Council have a duty to pass to our children a town which is not significantly poorer in quality than that which we are privileged to enjoy. |
| 25 | An evident commitment in the Plan to seeking to ensure appropriate contextual high quality new development and the conservation and future viability of key historic buildings in the town is recognised. However we would appreciate an opportunity to discuss certain suggested proposals in the Plan. As currently described a number appear potentially contentious and it would be helpful to have your explanation of the initiatives in further detail. (English Heritage) |
| 26 | It would appear, having talked to shop owners including Chamber of Trade members, that there has been scant communication prior to the issue of this latest document since the consultation and report in 2010. With a possibility, we are told, that this plan may take 15 years or longer to come to fruition, the council tenants in Market Street and Market Place (some of whom have been there 25 years) quite rightly are concerned as to their future and where they might be moved to and when. In our instance you have now placed a planning blight on the apartment that we own in Market Street, making it impossible for us to sell for as long as it takes to resolve the scheme. Similarly traders are now blighted if they wish to sell on their leases. Haven't Warwick traders gone through enough pain already? Did nobody see the ramifications concerning the timing of the publication of this plan for tenants, traders and owners alike which, as far as we can see, is to tout it around in the hope that a developer will take on the task of redevelopment at a time when funding is high impossible, rather than get somebody on board first. As for the plan itself, if the "makeover" of Market Square and the "traffic calming" of High Street and Jury Street are anything to go by god help us. |
| 27 | Great care should be exerted with reuse of existing land and property. Short term financial gain to the public bodies should not be at the expense of the historic integrity of the town centre. No new building should be allowed on the existing open spaces, parks and green belt around the town centre. Any major alterations to existing buildings or rebuilding on their sites within this area should meet rigorous standards, and always respect, harmonise and enhance the historic core and existing buildings. There is a perception that the WDC is in thrall to business interests, who are interested in making a quick buck rather than the long term interests of the town and region. •Yes there may be a case for reuse or redevelopment of some sites; but some of the ideas mooted are probably unrealistic or detrimental to the town centre. •Larger scale development would better be considered for some of the retail, industrial and business "parks" outside the town centre. These "brown field sites" could be re-examined for how they are allocated for employment, leisure and housing uses. By location, scale, area and existing infrastructure they should be the prime areas for "development opportunities". Before demolishing existing office and retail space perhaps a comprehensive effort should be made to market it and seek reuse. Perhaps a centralised agency to proactively list and "sell" the opportunities could create employment opportunities at low risk and low cost- giving the option of private landlords to also actively participate. Unused office space could be marketed to start-up businesses on short term lets below regional average prices. • Centralised services such as secretarial support, car parking and meeting rooms could be established and charged on a usage basis, and basically furnished office suites provided on rolling two month contracts, with maintenance |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>provided by the lead agency. • Some offices should be converted back to residential use- i.e. the many empty floors in historic town centre buildings- this should be facilitated by the Council. Empty Retail Space Although much of the space seems to be rapidly churned into new businesses, there should be mechanisms and incentives within the plan if this does not remain the case in future. • Short term rolling contracts below regional average rents could be provided in what are otherwise empty publicly owned property- again allowing private landlords the same terms and participation. This could be restricted to targeted types of retail if there is a perceived local need. • If spaces still remained unused; perhaps some could be offered to community groups for nominal rent again on short term rolling contracts, rather than leave them empty. • Some empty shop windows could be used to display objects from the Warwickshire Museum Service and County Records Office Archives. Commission some cabinets and displays which could be easily moved from unit to unit as they become available rather than leaving empty spaces. Large scale redevelopment finance remains unlikely in the short to medium term, due to restraints on bank liquidity and the parlous state of most UK property developers.</p> |
|--|--|

WARWICK MOP SURVEY

Warwick Mop Fair Review

During 2012, the Warwick Town Centre Partnership consulted on Preferred Options for the Warwick Town Centre Plan. That Plan includes a commitment to “Review the effect of provision for the Mop Fair”.

To inform the review, Warwick District Council is conducting a survey to collect the views of residents and businesses. The survey is being sent to each home and business within Warwick Town Centre, and made available at the Council's offices and on its website for anyone else who wishes to complete it. Please complete the survey below and return it:

- ▽ By post to...
- ▽ By e-mail to...
- ▽ Via the web...

In completing the survey it may help you to be aware of the following:

- Warwick District Council has the right to relocate – or alter the boundaries of – the Mop Fair subject to accommodating the public benefit;
- Warwick District Council is entitled to re-let the right to operate the Fair to other bodies;
- Warwick District Council is entitled to control what amusements are provided for the public's benefit.

What is the effect of the Mop Fair on you as an individual or business? Please provide, as far as possible, quantified evidence of this effect.

What in your view is the broader effect of the Mop Fair on the town, its economy, its streetscape and its image?

The Mop Fair is now held on the Friday and Saturday of two weekends in October. If the Mop Fair continues, should it be held at a different time of year, or for more or fewer days, and at the weekend or in midweek?

The Mop Fair now consists of large modern fairground machines and smaller stalls, and is accompanied by amplified sound. If the Mop Fair continues, should it remain in its present format, or should it consist of other equipment – for example, the historic material often present at the November Victorian Evening.?

If the Mop Fair continues, should it remain in the Market Place and adjacent town centre streets?

If not, where else should the Mop Fair to be based?

Is there any other comment which you would like to make about the Mop Fair and its future?

We would like some information about you to help us understand the results of the survey

Are you replying as a resident / employee / business?

What are the *first five* characters of the postcode of, the business or residential address from which you are responding? (For example, if your postcode is CV34 5QW, please reply CV34 5)

Are you male or female?

What is your age group: under 18 / 18-40 / 41-59 / 60 or over

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey.