

Weavers' Triangle Public Realm Strategy

Supplementary Planning Document

Consultation Statement

This statement has been prepared in order to comply with the requirements of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, for the adoption of Supplementary Planning Documents by Local Planning Authorities.

Produced by Planning and Environment, Burnley Borough Council
August 2011

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 The Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004 (Regulation 17) requires that before a Local Planning Authority adopt a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) they must prepare a statement summarising who has been consulted during the preparation of an SPD, how consultation has taken place, and how any issues raised have been addressed. This is a reflection of the Government's desire to "strengthen community and stakeholder involvement in the development of local communities".
- 1.2 The Council formally adopted a Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) in September 2007, which sets out how the public will be consulted on new planning policy and significant planning applications. As the Statement of Community Involvement is now adopted, all such planning documents will be required to conform to its provisions.
- 1.3 This Consultation Statement has been prepared following the adoption of the Statement of Community Involvement, and aims to reflect the intentions of Government planning guidance for reporting on community involvement in the plan making process. It explains the consultation process followed for the SPD and demonstrates that the Council undertook sufficient public consultations, using its best endeavours, to consult and involve stakeholders, interest groups and the community in the most effective way possible. The document concludes with a detailed summary of all the consultation responses received and how they have been addressed in the final version of the SPD.

2.0 Weavers' Triangle Public Realm Strategy SPD

- 2.1 The Weavers' Triangle Public Realm Strategy has been produced to set out the Council's vision for the future of public realm in the Weavers' Triangle. It is the start of a long term process of change in the Weavers' Triangle providing a clear and exciting vision for how public spaces can be improved and focuses on creating a permeable and well connected area where people are able to access spaces and locations easily; and improving the appearance and use of the Weavers' Triangle with new and enhanced public spaces, better street furniture, improved lighting and signage and a more pedestrian friendly and safe environment.
- 2.2 On the 9th February 2010 Executive approved for consultation purposes the draft Weavers' Triangle Public Realm Strategy. Following approval of the draft the Strategy was subject to a four week period of formal consultation between 7th March and 4th April 2011.

3.0 Sustainability Appraisal

3.1 A scoping study was undertaken which concluded that the SPD does not require a Sustainability Appraisal. The Report was made available to consultees during the period of consultation.

4.0 Pre-production Consultation

4.1 Public consultation has been crucial to informing the aims of the Public Realm strategy. Burnley Council and consultants Camlin Lonsdale have consulted with a wide range of stakeholders over the last four years in preparation of the Public Realm Strategy. This included landowners and developers, heritage and design interests and regulatory authorities. These groups have been consulted through various forms including workshops, meetings and correspondence. Burnley Council has also extensively engaged with Lancashire County Council and in particular the highways department to help inform the content of the Draft SPD.

4.2 Whilst preparing the strategy two consultation events were held by consultants Camlin Lonsdale. Two repeat consultations were held during each of the two events, totalling four overall. At each event, a lunchtime session was held to attract people who work in Burnley or who could not attend an evening session, though the latter was held to attract local people that may work outside the area and therefore not have been able to attend the lunchtime session. The format for the consultation was a power-point presentation followed by a steered debate, with salient points from the audience being recorded on a flip chart for incorporation into the strategy documents.



4.3 The first public consultation event took place on Tuesday 26th June 2007 at Nelson House. Over 200 direct invitations were sent out to stakeholders, businesses and networking organisations as conduits to help reach the wider community. In addition posters were placed in public places and flyers were sent to community halls and public amenity buildings as well as a local press release and website advertising. The presentation shared some of the early

analysis and observations with attendees and aimed to capitalise on local knowledge by capturing the views of the wider community. In turn this stimulated debate on the possible priorities of the strategy. Attendance at the lunchtime session was 48 and the evening session was 32.

4.4 The second consultation event took place on Thursday 20th September 2007 at Nelson House. The invitation and announcement process was the same as the first consultation, but with an increase to the direct invitations to include all residents within and immediately surrounding the Weavers' Triangle. The presentation explained the work that had been undertaken since the first workshop, demonstrating that where possible the comments from the first consultation had been incorporated into the work. This presentation explained the thinking behind the emerging proposals, the options for the public realm map and the strategic locations. Attendance at the lunchtime session was 76 and the evening session was 30.

4.5 Details of the consultations can be found in Appendix One

5.0 Officer and Member Consultation

5.1 Prior to the public consultation stage, consultation was undertaken with Council Officers and key Members of the Council for a two week period in January 2010 to ensure a robust and accurate draft document was produced. The draft Supplementary Planning Document was finalised during February 2010 taking full account of the consultation responses. This then received Executive Approval for the purposes of consultation on the 9th February 2010.

6.0 Statutory Consultation on the Draft Supplementary Planning Document

6.1 The Executive approved the draft SPD for consultation on the 9th February 2010 and public consultation took place alongside the Draft Town Centre Public Realm Strategy, between 7th March and 4th April 2011 for the statutory four week period.

6.2 The Draft SPD, its supporting documents and representation forms were made available for public inspection during normal opening hours at public libraries, council offices and via the council's website. Copies were also available free of charge upon request. A press release with details of the SPD and the public exhibition was issued on 2nd March 2011 and published on the BBC Lancashire News Website on the 6th March 2011.

6.3 The formal consultation included contact with to a wide range of individuals and organisations in accordance with Council's Statement of Community Involvement. In addition to the statutory consultees identified in relevant planning legislations and guidance, other key stakeholders and organisations that have an interest in the Weavers' Triangle and the public realm were

identified by the Council to ensure that the consultation was as inclusive as possible. All are identified in Appendix Two. A letter was sent to specific and general consultation bodies informing them of where they could view the SPD documents and how to submit comments. Appendix Two contains the list of specific consultees that were invited by letter to comment on the Draft SPD and Sustainability Appraisal. In addition, all those with an email address on the council's LDF database of contacts were informed via e-mail.

- 6.4 Consultees were invited (through advertisement, press release and direct mailing) to comment on the draft SPD by submitting written representations to the Council before the closure of the formal consultation period at 5pm on Monday 4th April 2011. Copies of the draft SPD were made available to view in the Contact Centre Burnley, Burnley Town Hall, Burnley Central and Padiham Libraries. A copy was also made available via the Internet on the Council's web site. Printed copies of the documents were made available on request.
- 6.5 A public exhibition was held at the Charity Arch on St James's Street between 10:00 and 15:00 on 10th March 2011 where staff from the Council were available to answer questions. Posters were put up in Burnley Market Hall, Contact Centre, the Town Hall and Burnley Central Library to advertise the event, and copies of the document were also put in these locations for members of the public to view.
- 6.6 The Draft SPD received a total of 112 comments from 17 interested parties during the period of formal consultation. These were from National and Regional bodies, interest groups and individuals. The Draft SPD was well received by a wide range of consultees. The most detailed comments were received from Lancashire County Council, The Prince's Foundation for the Built Environment and British Waterways. Respondents were supportive of the Council's aspiration for regeneration of the Weavers' Triangle and saw the Public Realm Strategy as a positive move towards achieving this aim.

7.0 Key issues and changes

- 7.1 The majority of the representations focussed on making a few detailed comments on specific sections of the SPD. Some comments sought changes which went beyond the scope of what a Public Realm SPD could be expected to cover, including; green infrastructure and biodiversity. These topics are covered in the SPD to a greater and lesser degree, but the Council considered that further information on these topics could not be added without the risk of the SPD becoming too lengthy. There have been no comments received that will result in any major changes to the content or structure of the document. Furthermore, as would be expected with consultation on any document, there

were a number of comments received which, although they may be valid points, were not directly related to the content of the SPD.

- 7.2 Lancashire County Council and British Waterways felt that the document missed a substantial opportunity to support green infrastructure and enhance biodiversity. Some of the changes required would be too detailed for the public realm strategy, and would have resulted in the document becoming too lengthy. However, biodiversity is important and a new objective and guideline have been added to the SPD address this issue.
- 7.3 A significant number of comments from National and Regional bodies clarified, as you would expect, the need for further testing and consultation with them as detailed design work progresses. Changes have been made throughout the SPD to emphasise the need to fully consult with and seek approval from National and Regional bodies as appropriate.
- 7.4 In addition, it should be noted that in the final SPD some minor changes have been made to the structure, content and illustrations to give clarity and to improve its readability.
- 7.5 Appendix Three provides a detailed schedule of all of the consultation responses received along with a commentary by officers on the issues that have been raised. The schedule also highlights where the draft SPD has been revised to address some of these issues. Full copies of all representations have been retained on file and can be viewed on request.

8.0 Appendices

Appendix One	Pre-production Consultation
Appendix Two	Specific Consultation Bodies Consulted on the Draft SPD
Appendix Three	Summary of Consultation Comments and Officer Responses

Appendix One – Pre-Production Consultation

Summary of Workshop 1 - Emerging Themes of the PRS

Workshop 1 Key Issues	a) Pedestrian links	<ul style="list-style-type: none">i) Very limited road crossingsii) Manchester Road station signage & environs needs much improvementiii) Greater balance needed with vehicles – diminish the vehicular territory / dominanceiv) Encourage boating activity
	b) Canalside	<ul style="list-style-type: none">i) Better access needed - more access points and improve existingii) Problem after darkiii) Ecological value vs redevelopmentiv) Encourage boating activityv) The straight mile as potential venue for canalside events
	c) Public Open Spaces	<ul style="list-style-type: none">i) Townley Park, Queen's Park, Thompson's Park – family eventsii) A variety of multi-functional linked spaces for the WTiii) Canal tow path associated spacesiv) An anchor / destination space?
	d) Lighting & Security	<ul style="list-style-type: none">i) Canalsideii) Celebrate architectural heritage & prideiii) Improve orientationiv) Opportunity for artistic lighting and innovation
	e) Transportation	<ul style="list-style-type: none">i) Reduce the dominance of vehiclesii) Improve vehicular access to and within the WTiii) Improve / encourage walkabilityiv) Car Parkingv) Public Transport – currently very limited bus routesvi) Cycling
	f) Other Issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none">i) Youth Inclusionii) Plug in to other developments

20.09.2007

556 Weavers' Triangle Public Realm Strategy
Burnley Borough Council

Summary of Workshop 2 – Comments on the presentation.

a) Pedestrian links

- The public realm should be designed to encourage walking and cycling which is a major priority for many stakeholders, agencies and agendas.
- A crossing is required at Bumham Gate School.

b) Canal side

- Entrance points should be designed to restrict access of mini motorbikes.
- Access points should allow for the disabled; this is currently being restricted e.g. top of Parliament Street.
- Improve access from Queen's Lancashire Way
- Provide permanent residential moorings for which there is great demand; e.g. at Finsley Gate
- Provide facilities for boaters to encourage temporary mooring.
- Include sculpture or heritage trail on the canal side to help bring a series of focal points to this space.
- Investigate links to the Barden Mill Marina proposal.

c) Public Open Spaces

- Consider youth needs of space; e.g. skating.
- Provide some covered areas to provide shelter from rain.
- Public open spaces should include cafés.
- Not all public open space should be hard; also need to provide gardens.
- Link to play strategy and make sure public spaces are family friendly.

d) Lighting & Security

- Lighting should be energy efficient and integrated with CCTV system.
- Lighting from Manchester Road Train Station is particularly important.

e) Transportation

- Consider making Queen's Lancashire Way shared surface.
- Parking for disabled drivers essential.
- Cars and car parks won't regenerate the Triangle.
- Reducing car parking could threaten the success of existing businesses.

f) Other Issues

- Changes to the road network must be careful not to re-create 'rat runs'.
- The three Burnley railway stations require linkages (e.g. shuttle bus) to each other, the Triangle, the town centre and the bus station.
- Transportation proposals need to link in with plans of the Community Rail Partnership re Manchester Road Station.
- Vehicular use of pedestrian priority roads should be restricted in the evenings to encourage nightlife.
- Look at entrance / exit options from junctions of M65 which could ease traffic pressures around the Triangle.

- Avoid excessive signage.
- Use sustainable drainage systems.
- Set up website to facilitate further community feedback and involvement.
- 'The Weave' glass building is not in keeping with existing architecture.
- There should be a children's consultation.
- Can youth groups be involved in part of the design process?
- Westgate should be acknowledged as an important gateway to the Triangle and the town centre.
- The relationship between the opening up of the Triangle as a thoroughfare, and its role as a destination needs further investigation and clarification.
- Who will supply arts?
- What are the different options for funding.

Appendix Two – Consultees invited by letter to comment on the Draft SPD

Statutory Consultees	Statutory Consultees	Local Consultees and Others
Judith Nelson, English Heritage	David Berry, Coal Authority	Brian Hall, Weavers Triangle Trust
Alan Large, GONW	Phillip Carter, Environment Agency	Phil South (representing HLF)
Lindsey Alder, Highways Agency	Kathryn Kelsall, Natural England	Kate Smyth, Disability Access, Todmorden
Stephen Hedley, Natural England	Neil Stevens, LCC Architectural Liaison Officer, Lancs Constabulary	Alison Truman, British Waterways
Paul Worswick, Hyndburn BC	Elizabeth Bolton, Padiham Town Council	Michael Marshall, British Waterways, Operations
Adrian Smith, Rossendale BC	Jackie Flynn, LCC	Regenerate Pennine Lancashire
Neil Watson, Pendle BC	D. Heelan Youth and Community Office	Trinity Ward Councillors
Mike Kirby, LCC	Janet Belfield, Natural England	Burnley Wood with Rosehill Councillors
Alasdair Simpson, LCC	David Bloomer, LCC	Nick Hunt, Mid Pennine Arts
Ian Whittaker, NWDA	P Sheppard, National Grid	Sir Neil Cossons
Gemma Jackson, Environment Agency	British Telecoms, Liverpool	Rosie Fraser, The Prince's Regeneration Trust
Duncan Reeve, LCC Highways	Andrew Leysens, United Utilities	Tom Perry, Prince's Foundation for the Built Environment,
Network Rail Town Planning Team	Ray Worthington, LCC	Neil Pickering, Homes and Communities Agency
English Nature, Wigan	Parish councils – Altham, Briercliffe, Cliviger, Dunnockshaw, Hapton, Habergham Eaves, Worsthorpe with Hurstwood	Gareth Smith, Barnfields
David Hadman, United Utilities,		David Smith, Civic Society
Louise Nurser, L CC		

Appendix Three - Summary of Consultation Responses Received

The following section summarises the main comments received during the four week statutory consultation period from 7th March until 4th April 2011. The summary is presented in tabular form for ease of understanding. If required you may see the original consultation comments – please contact the Policy and Environment on Tel: 01282 425011 or ldf@burnley.gov.uk

Respondent	Summary of Response	Council Response
The Coal Authority	Having reviewed your document, I can confirm that we have no specific comments to make at this stage.	Noted
English Heritage	English Heritage supports the Public Realm Strategy for the Weavers' Triangle and commends this to your members. We do not wish to comment in detail.	Support welcomed
Lancashire CC Marcus Hudson	<p>I trust that the minor amendments and information that I include in this response are helpful and with their incorporation, it is felt that the SPD will make a valuable contribution to the renaissance of Burnley.</p> <p>In seeking to establish the key principles for the design of new public realm the SPD misses a substantial opportunity to support green infrastructure and contact with nature.</p>	<p>Support welcomed</p> <p>It is considered that the strategy recognises the value and seeks to support green infrastructure by strengthening existing and creating new high quality green spaces in appropriate locations. However it should be noted that, with the exception of the immediate canalside environments, green spaces are not characteristic of this historic environment. In enhancing the character of this historically sensitive urban area, the emphasis is on the creation of 'hard' open space. To emphasis the importance of green infrastructure and nature a new objective has been inserted into Paragraph 2.4:</p>

		<p><i>“Maintain and enhance the environment and biodiversity of the canal corridor”</i></p> <p>In recognition of the value of the canal as a wildlife corridor linking the town and country and as such a critical piece of green infrastructure an additional Guideline (WTF10) has been added:</p> <p><i>“Consideration should be given to the promotion of landscape and wildlife enhancements along the Canal to strengthen its value as a wildlife corridor within the urban area. Proposals should take advantage of opportunities to develop new links adjacent to the canal wildlife corridor where these can be included as part of a site layout and landscaping scheme</i></p> <p><i>The Leeds and Liverpool Canal, designated as a Wildlife Corridor in the Local Plan, is ecologically very valuable. It forms a corridor of biodiversity which brings wildlife into and provides a habitat for plants and animals at the heart of the urban area. Additionally, bridges and other canalside built structures make ideal roosting sites for bats and it is likely that species are present along the canal, although they have not been surveyed in detail. Bridges and boundary walls are also important habitats for lichens, bryophytes and ferns.</i></p> <p><i>Much of the nature conservation value of the canal and its associated habitats lies in its wide diversity rather than the presence of particularly rare species. However protected species can be found such as bats.</i></p> <p>The immediate canal environment presents the greatest opportunity for improving the ecology of the Weavers' Triangle. Selective tree and scrub removal, whilst retaining the best examples of mature trees, would present an opportunity to reduce heavy shading and allow more sunlight into the canal and its corridor. By implementing ecological enhancements the Weavers' Triangle would benefit from 'bringing the countryside into the town' thus, not only benefiting nature conservation, but also underlining the town's</p>
--	--	---

	<p>The map provided in Section 4 does not represent Burnley in 1848. It is an extract from a revised OS 1:10,560 map dating to c.1860-1880.</p> <p>In section 2 the inclusion of an objective that relates specifically to the local historical distinctiveness of the area would benefit the SPD. An objective along the lines of that provided in section 1.6.3 of the Town Centre document: <i>“To promote a public realm and built fabric that responds to the latent heritage of the area, without presenting unnecessary constraints to innovation”</i> may be appropriate.</p> <p>Whilst Section 4.2 is entitled Natural Environment, it is more concerned about sun-light, shadows and rainfall, and mention of deciduous broad-leaved trees.</p> <p>There is a suite of Lancashire Biodiversity Action Plans covering urban habitats which should prove useful in broadening the scope of the SPD. In addition the Canal will inevitably be elements within ecological</p>	<p>rural setting and helping education and interpretation of canalside habitats”</p> <p>Accepted. Error corrected by inserting correct plans for 1841 and 1890.</p> <p>Accepted.</p> <p>A new objective has been added to Paragraph 2.4 (previously 2.1)</p> <p><i>“Promote a public realm that responds positively to the heritage of the area, without presenting unnecessary constraints to innovation”</i></p> <p>Accepted. This section has been amended to include a new paragraph (4.13) on Biodiversity as follows:</p> <p><i>“The Leeds and Liverpool Canal, designated as a Wildlife Corridor in the Local Plan, is ecologically very valuable. It forms a corridor of biodiversity which brings wildlife into and provides a habitat for plants and animals at the heart of the urban area. Additionally, bridges and other canalside built structures make ideal roosting sites for bats and it is likely that species are present along the canal, although they have not been surveyed in detail. Bridges and boundary walls are also important habitats for lichens, bryophytes and ferns.</i></p>
--	---	---

	<p>networks, their enhancement in this respect derived from paragraphs 5 (ii) and 12 of PPS9.</p> <p>Section 5.5 deals with lighting, feature lighting, functional lighting and lighting the canal. Artificial lighting can be most disturbing to bats and the proximity of suitable roosting feature in the buildings to foraging corridors, such as the river and canal, make this a matter for some concern. Given that bats carry significant legal protection, bat friendly lighting is a topic for consideration within the SPD.</p>	<p><i>Much of the nature conservation value of the canal and its associated habitats lies in its wide diversity rather than the presence of particularly rare species. However protected species can be found such as bats.</i></p> <p><i>The canal towpath and banks support grassland, woodland and scrub, together forming an important wildlife corridor. Neutral grassland habitat dominates the towpath verges and has potential for ecological improvement. Trees and shrubs have colonised various points along the towpath. Most are self-seeded, fast growing, light demanding British Natives such as <i>Betula pendula</i>, <i>Betula pubescens</i>, <i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i> and <i>Fraxinus excelsior</i>. In particular, a significant volume of canopy has established around Finsley Wharf at the eastern end of the Weaver's Triangle. At this location it would be prudent to carry out an ecological survey and to retain as much of the potentially valuable habitat and visual amenity as possible. This 'green' character continues along the straight mile, although tree cover is typically situated lower than the towpath, on the slopes of the embankment"</i></p> <p>See also new Guideline WTF10.</p> <p>Accepted. Guideline WTF22 (previously WTF21) has been amended to include the following:</p> <p><i>"The impact of artificial lighting on wildlife and habitats will need to be sensitively considered"</i></p> <p>The accompanying text in paragraph 5.84 (previously 5.79) has been amended to read:</p> <p><i>"The canal has ecological value as a wildlife corridor and as such the impact of artificial lighting on wildlife habitats will need to be sensitively considered. Lighting should be designed not to impact on bats or other wildlife using the Canal and its environments as a feeding ground. Bats are particularly affected as lighting schemes can impact on their behaviour and ability to survive. In these circumstances lighting should be directed to the area of need and should not be allowed to spill onto areas of known wildlife activity.</i></p>
--	--	---

<p>Alisdair Simpson, Sustainable Travel</p>	<p>people cycling and walking through the area helping create a safer and more attractive environment and aid regeneration.</p> <p>6.5 It is difficult to cross the road by the Finsley Gate canal access because of restricted visibility on the canal bridge. Would an access onto the canal towpath on the south side of the bridge be possible</p> <p>6.43 Lower Sandygate</p> <p>Whilst I recognize the need to make it easier for walkers and cyclists to cross from Sandygate to St James Street, the proposed design needs more thought. Is there any opportunity to tighten the kerb radius between Queens Lancashire Way and St James Street. Would a central island and zebra away from the roundabout closer to the Sandygate Junction work better for people crossing the road. There is also need to consider cycle and pedestrian linkage with the college, central station and the north side of town via Active Way.</p> <p>6.52 If a canal bridge can not be secured at Burnley Wharf consideration should be given to improve crossing</p>	<p>Noted. This part of the SPD is illustrative only. It is anticipated that further testing and consultation will be required to help inform detailed design work as progress is made towards implementation. In particular detailed investigations will be required for the traffic management and highway proposals to assess their feasibility. An alternative access may be considered more appropriate in consultation with LCC as the Highways Authority.</p> <p>Noted. This part of the SPD is illustrative only. It is anticipated that further testing and consultation will be required to help inform detailed design work as progress is made towards implementation. In particular detailed investigations will be required for the traffic management and highway proposals to assess their feasibility. An alternative access may be considered more appropriate in consultation with LCC as the Highways Authority.</p> <p>See SL2 which proposes a strategically important pedestrian crossing at the Trafalgar Street Junction to serve this purpose.</p>
--	---	---

	<p>facilities of Manchester Road near the Trafalgar Street Roundabout to enable people to get from the station to the canal</p> <p>I have already put forward the following schemes for the LTP</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manchester Rd/Hammerton St junction crossing improvements • Trafalgar St Toucan crossing by the railway station • Queens Lancashire Way crossing improvement from Sandygate to St James Street • Whittam Street link from canal • Canal towpath improvements 	<p>Support welcomed.</p>
<p>Weavers’ Triangle Trust</p>	<p>Support the strategy with a few reservations. We would hope that everything possible is done to retain the Victorian industrial townscape with as few as possible modern intrusions when viewed from the canal, as interest has been shown recently in the use of the area for filming period dramas. Nothing should be done to detract from this.</p>	<p>Noted. Design and Conservation is not necessarily about recreating an exact replica of what has preceded. Instead, it is concerned with protecting and conserving what remains whilst creating a setting that enhances the appreciation of the historic environment. The priority is the reinforcement of a sense of place. Innovation and contrast is just as much a part of conservation as a faithful re-creation of an original. Often the most successful conservation projects incorporate a careful balance of the original and modern interpretation.</p> <p>A new objective has been added to Paragraph 2.4 (previously 2.1)</p> <p><i>“Promote a public realm that responds positively to the heritage of the area, without presenting unnecessary constraints to innovation”</i></p>

	<p>6.11 Any new bridges over the canal should be of a traditional design</p> <p>We would stress the importance of improving road crossings, particular Trafalgar Street (6.4) and Hammerton Street (6.5).</p> <p>5.42 We agree that clear signage is essential but feel that some Victorian style signs should be provided where appropriate</p> <p>5.48 Care needs to be taken with siting public art in this context. Permanent hanging artworks or projections would detract from the industrial nature of the townscape.</p> <p>6.59 and 6.30 - We accept and stress the importance if disabled access to the towpath but we believe that the long ramps at Manchester Road and Walker Hey which have been mooted and</p>	<p>Noted. See comments above.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. It would be inappropriate to specify Victorian reproduction style signing the Weavers' Triangle. In response to the comment, paragraph 5.47 (previously 5.42) has been amended to read:</p> <p><i>“To create a more contextually responsive product a creative approach to signing is required that takes its design cue from the area’s Victorian heritage and the input of local artists and crafts people should be welcomed.”</i></p> <p>Accepted. Paragraph 5.53 (formerly 5.48) has been amended as follows:</p> <p><i>“The large facades of the mill buildings that overlook the canal provide a canvas for projections or the hanging artworks for viewing from the towpath. Equally, where the towpath widens, the pockets of extra space, could house individual pieces of artwork. Care needs to be taken in locating public art so as not to obscure features of architectural interest or to interfere with the workings of the canal or towpath. Advice on the most appropriate location for art installations should be sought from the Council’s Conservation Officer in relation to Listed Buildings and British Waterways”</i></p> <p>Noted. This part of the SPD is illustrative only. It is anticipated that further testing and consultation will be required to help inform detailed design work as progress is made towards implementation. In particular detailed investigations will be required for the proposals to assess their feasibility.</p>
--	---	---

	discarded in the past, could prove impractical and hope an alternative solution can be found.	During this process an alternative solution may be considered more appropriate.
Mr Millard	<p>Concerns about the lack of Plain English, punctuation and spelling. Object to most of the proposals generally. Restoration of buildings at great expense and which have no probable end use.</p> <p>Victoria Mill, Sandygate Mill, Neptune House, Healey Royd Mill and Finsley Mill, Slater Terrace. Not worth bothering with. Too much money already spent and little likelihood of being used.</p> <p>Lighting – whilst improved lighting is to be desired, any increase proposals are in direct conflict with the Government’s policy on energy conservation.</p> <p>Walker Hey Footbridge/canal bank access – such proposed ramps are far too long to be practical. There is easy access to the canal bank at the other points, eg. Inn on the Wharf and Wiseman Street. Manchester Road canal access – the ramp would be too long. Removal of the Calderprint building extension is, to my mind, unthinkable. Other nearby access points are already there.</p> <p>The plans do not seem to have been</p>	<p>Noted and corrections made as appropriate.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. Lighting plays a crucial role in the public realm. The SPD proposes lighting only where it is needed to improve safety and navigation. Maintenance, running costs and energy conservation are key issues that need to be considered prior to any design being implemented.</p> <p>Noted. This part of the SPD is illustrative only. It is anticipated that further testing and consultation will be required to help inform detailed design work as progress is made towards implementation. In particular detailed investigations will be required for the proposals to assess their feasibility. During this process an alternative solution may be considered more appropriate.</p> <p>Not accepted. The document has been derived from a very detailed</p>

	<p>thought out on a practical basis. A complete rethink is needed.</p>	<p>examination of the historical evolution, structure and performance of the existing public realm and road, cycle and pedestrian networks and the development of the strategy has been facilitated by a close working relationship between Burnley Council, Lancashire County Council, stakeholders and the wider public through a series of technical workshops and public consultations.</p>
<p>Pendle Council</p>	<p>The SPD isn't very prescriptive on material types. The SPD quite rightly seeks to keep the introduction of bollards to a minimum.</p> <p>The Whitefield document recognised that original street name plates are in cast iron and suggested options for replacement name plates.</p>	<p>Noted. The Public Realm Framework is not intended to be a prescriptive design code. Sufficient guidance is given on materials to ensure that designs respect the areas unique character. A degree of interpretation is anticipated, and the design team for each scheme should consult all other appropriate design guidance and will retain responsibility for all aspects including materials.</p> <p>Noted. It would be inappropriate to specify Victorian reproduction style signing the Weavers' Triangle. In response to the comment, paragraph 5.47 (previously 5.42) has been amended to read:</p> <p><i>"To create a more contextually responsive product a creative approach to signing is required that takes its design cue from the area's Victorian heritage and the input of local artists and crafts people should be welcomed."</i></p>
<p>Mr Paul Smith</p>	<p>This is another pipe dream and should be rethought. It is time to realise that heritage schemes aren't viable and a viable development scheme should be worked up in this declining area. A development plan should be worked up which will deliver prosperity and jobs for the town. If that means demolition of mills and other buildings so be it.</p>	<p>This document has been prepared in the context of current regeneration initiatives for the Weavers' Triangle aimed at realising the area's potential as a unique and vibrant historic quarter and employment generator and is the start of a long term process of change. Regeneration of the Weavers' Triangle will be phased over a number of years. There are likely to be a number of different developers and it is essential that the treatment and quality of the public realm is consistent throughout the Weavers' Triangle irrespective of developer or timescale.</p>

<p>Sustrans</p> <p>Peter Foster, NW</p>	<p>We fully support the objectives of the strategy under Section 2.</p> <p>Wherever possible, please ensure that crossings at busy junctions and of busy roads are designed to both help pedestrians and cyclists. Similarly in any pedestrian areas, can you ensure that cyclists are allowed through out of core hours, before 10am and after 4pm</p> <p>Within the Weavers' Triangle we would like to see the towpath improved along with much improved access points, some of which should be by ramp rather than steps.</p>	<p>Support welcomed.</p> <p>Noted. It is anticipated that further testing and consultation will be required to help inform the details as progress is made towards implementation. In particular detailed investigations will be required for the traffic management and highway proposals to assess their feasibility.</p> <p>Noted. These improvements are proposed as early gains projects within Paragraph 7.4 of the SPD.</p>
<p>Environment Agency</p> <p>Gemma Jackson</p>	<p>We have no objection in principle to the SPD. However we wish to make the following comments:</p> <p>4.19 We support the inclusion that drainage systems should be sustainable and designed to cope with extreme downpours. Surface water run-off can be managed through the use of sustainable drainage systems and we advocate their use.</p> <p>The River Calder flows through part of the SPD area as illustrated on Page 4. The River Calder is a designated 'main river' and therefore under the terms of</p>	<p>Support welcomed and recommendation for early consultation on development in close proximity to the River Calder is noted.</p>

	<p>the Water Resources Act 1991 and the Land Drainage Byelaws', the prior written consent of the Agency is required for any proposed works or structures in, under, over or within 8 metres of the top of the bank of the River Calder. Early consultation with the EA is therefore recommended for any development in close proximity to the River Calder.</p>	
<p>The Prince's Foundation for the Built Environment</p>	<p>5.2 Leeds and Liverpool Canal</p> <p>5.2.3 We question the suggestion that the chamfered sandstone blocks along the canal edge be used to replicate the vernacular in a contemporary language when the area is said to celebrate its historical attributes.</p> <p>WTF 10 Suggestion... <i>The palette should be restricted to traditional, quality materials such as natural stone and subtle detailing should compliment the historic architecture with simple, clutter free and functional, robust space in the proposed public squares.</i></p> <p>Traditional spaces such as streets, squares, bridges and tow paths should be designed in a way that frames the</p>	<p>Accepted. Error corrected and amendment made.</p> <p>Accepted and paragraph 5.2.5 (formerly 5.2.3) deleted.</p> <p>Noted. It is considered that this guideline together with WTF12 (formerly WTF11) in materials is sufficient to achieve the careful balance of the original and modern interpretation required to create a setting that enhances the appreciation of the historic environment. The priority is the reinforcement of a sense of place. Innovation and contrast is just as much a part of conservation as a faithful re-creation of an original.</p>

	<p>historic area with materials that already exist within the WT.</p> <p>5.3.2 We disagree with this comment. Some of the most successful public spaces of today are those which have retained their historic grandeur and have the same functionality of a contemporary public space. The success of a public space is not dependant on being contemporary or historic but how the space works within its context. In the case of Burnley and the WT is a place of significant heritage value.</p> <p>5.53 We disagree with this statement.</p> <p><i>Suggestion, furniture should be selected that are appropriate to character and appearance of the area. Street furniture within the WT must work collectively as a suite if furniture; it must work comfortably with the existing built fabric, and it must ideally be low maintenance.</i></p> <p>5.5 and WTF21 We question the lighting principles in regard to dark sky issues in that the chimney's should not be up-lighted</p>	<p>Noted. Agree with the comments that you are making however Paragraph 5.32 should be read in the context of the Weavers' Triangle. Public space is not characteristic of the Weavers' Triangle. The design cue for the creation of new public space within the Weavers' Triangle should be the reinforcement of a sense of place and distinctiveness and for this reason it would be entirely inappropriate to create a public space reminiscent of the Victorian era in this location</p> <p>Accepted. Changes made to Paragraph 5.58 (formerly 5.53) to reflect the comments being made as follows:</p> <p><i>"Furniture should be selected that are appropriate to the character and appearance of the area. New street furniture within the Weavers' Triangle must be sufficiently robust; user friendly and enticing; it must work collectively as a suite of furniture; work comfortably with the existing built fabric; and it must ideally be low maintenance"</i></p> <p>Noted. It is anticipated that further testing and consultation will be required to help inform the details as progress is made towards implementation. In particular detailed investigations will be required into issues such as wildlife friendly lighting and dark sky issues.</p>
--	--	---

	<p>6.8 check the image is facing North</p> <p>6.11 We question to locality of the bridge connection from Mount Pleasant Street to the car park and suggest a more pleasant pedestrian connection to Mount Pleasant Street across Hammerton Street over the stream and onto Yorke Street should be considered. This should route would also reduce the climb approaching the canal by 2 metres.</p> <p>6.12 SL15 Cavalry Way Roundabout</p> <p>Any intervention to this roundabout must be carefully considered as to whether it would create any real value to its location</p> <p>6.37 We question the design proposal of the junction along Queens Way connecting Cow Lane, Holden Street and Hammerton Street. The configuration and identity of the space does not sit correctly. More consideration into the function of the space and what is the relevance of creating a shared surface in this location. What would be the function of the proposed building located adjacent to Cow Lane. The buildings attempt to enclose the area which has no specific</p>	<p>The image is facing North</p> <p>Noted. It is suggested that the proposal has not been fully understood and neither has the route proposed. The pedestrian route is not a connection between Mount Pleasant street and the car park. It is proposed is to aid connectivity between Trafalgar Street (south bank of the canal) and the Town Centre via Mount Pleasant Street (north bank of the canal) and Queens Lancashire Way and the proposed Hammerton Square. The footbridge creates a new access point to the canal towpath and is not proposed in isolation. The car park at Burnley Wharf is proposed as a new public space and as such would become a pleasant pedestrian connection to the footbridge and canal towpath.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. As explained in the accompanying text, this location is the central transition point between the Weavers' Triangle and the town centre it was therefore considered a critical point in reconnecting the Weavers Triangle to the town centre. In consultation with the Highways Authority Queens Lancashire Way was identified as a location where speeds could be reduced and pedestrian activity could be encouraged. The design intention is to spatially unite the north and south sides of Queen's Lancashire Way into a coherent and valuable piece of urban public realm by creating a public square through which the road will pass. The shared surface is critical to ensuring that vehicular movement is not unreasonably compromised and the use of the pedestrian materials palette across the whole space will heighten drivers perception of pedestrian priority and facilitate safer crossing. The trees are positioned to emphasise and further encourage the two pedestrian</p>
--	--	--

	<p>function. We also question the positioning of the trees.</p> <p>Type Errors</p> <p>5.3.5 materials should for the basis</p> <p>5.7.8 view along the linea route</p> <p>6.38 alter the elationship</p> <p>6.41 directly in front of the ourt</p>	<p>desire lines. It is to be noted that this part of the SPD is illustrative only. It is anticipated that further testing and consultation will be required to help inform the preparation of design briefs for detailed design commissions</p> <p>Accepted. Typing errors corrected.</p>
Network Rail	<p>This appears to align with the proposed station development at Burnley Manchester Road, we hope that the Council have kept this in mind in relation to the Weavers' Triangle development.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>
Natural England	<p>While we welcome this opportunity to comment, the specific topic(s) of the SPD does not significantly relate to our interests. Therefore on this occasion we do not wish to give detailed comments. All LA's have a Duty to have regard to the conservation of biodiversity in exercising their functions. The duty aims to raise the profile and visibility of biodiversity, to clarify existing commitments with regard to biodiversity and to make it a natural and integral part of policy and decision making.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Accepted. The SPD has been amended to include a new objective and guideline which place greater emphasis on the protection and enhancement of the canal and its immediate environments as a corridor of biodiversity which brings wildlife into and provides a habitat for plants and animals at the heart of the urban area. See comments to Lancashire County Council, Marcus Hudson above.</p>

<p>British Waterways</p> <p>Martyn Coy, Planner</p>	<p>We support the main principles of the draft SPD but wish to comment on the following:</p> <p>P4. On the character areas map the BW site at Finsey Gate is shown as being part of the straight mile area. Although it is at the end of the straight mile, it has a different character and is separated by the Finsley gate Road Bridge. We feel that it should be part of the Finsley Gate area or a separate area.</p> <p>The introduction states that the Canal is the link through the WT, however we feel that the canal is the key component of the area and this should be highlighted.</p>	<p>Support welcomed.</p> <p>Noted. This is not intended to provide a detailed appraisal of the character and appearance of the Weavers' Triangle rather the character areas were identified by Camlin Lonsdale for the purposes of understanding the townscape qualities of the Weavers' Triangle largely from a public realm perspective. The character areas have been included to provide an overview of the area that can be understood when read in conjunction with the Public Realm Strategy and Design Baseline and Implementation prepared by Camlin Lonsdale. A detailed assessment of the development of the Conservation Area and appraisal of the historical and architectural assets is provided in the Canalside Conservation Area Appraisal.</p> <p>To aid clarification the text in paragraph (former paragraph 4.3) has been amended to read: <i>The Camlin Lonsdale study identified five character areas within the Weavers' Triangle for the purposes of understanding the townscape qualities of the area from a public realm perspective. For a detailed assessment of the development of the Conservation Area and appraisal of the historical and architectural assets please refer to the Canalside Conservation Area Appraisal.</i></p> <p>The title of Character Area 5 has been changed to Straight Mile and Finsley Wharf to reflect the two distinct areas within.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
---	--	---

	<p>4.3 There appears to be a number of historical plans missing from this section</p> <p>P16 and 17. Character Areas. We feel the descriptions of each area is very brief and could do with more detail.</p> <p>There appears to be a contradiction with CA4 Finsley Gate contains a photograph of the BW site at Finlsey Gate, whilst the character area map on page 4 shows the site as being in the Straight Mile area.</p> <p>P19, 4.4 This seems to concentrate more on access to the WT rather than circulation and access through the WT</p> <p>P19, 4.30 This identifies the Leeds and Liverpool Canal as a restriction to movement. We assume that the SPD refers to a lack of crossing of the canal as the restriction as the canal and towpath are the only unbroken route through the WT</p> <p>P19, 4.35 The straight mile is an embankment not a viaduct</p>	<p>Accepted. Drafting error corrected by inserting correct plans for 1841 and 1890.</p> <p>Noted. In order to ensure that the SPD was not an overly lengthy document it was felt that, when read in conjunction with the Canalside Conservation Area Appraisal, the inclusion of character analysis material should be kept to a minimum. However the character descriptions have been expanded with some additional detail and by including the Significant Buildings within each relevant character area description to give a more comprehensive overview..</p> <p>Accepted. Error corrected by removing the photograph of the BW site at Finsley Gate in CA4</p> <p>Accepted. The section has been amended to include a summary of circulation and access through the Weavers' Triangle. This has also been articulated on a plan.</p> <p>It is considered that, although the canal towpath provides for east-west movement through the Weavers Triangle, albeit with limited access onto the canal towpath, its limited number of crossing points provides a restriction to north-south movement between the town centre and the residential area to the south as discussed in paragraph 4.28</p> <p>Accepted. Error corrected, reference to viaduct deleted.</p>
--	--	--

	<p>5.2 Leeds And Liverpool Canal</p> <p>P25, 5.2 WTF8 We feel the words <i>“whilst retaining the intrinsic nature of the canal”</i> should be added at the end.</p> <p>P25, 5.20 We presume the reference to large gritstone blocks are the towpath coping stones. Can this be clarified?</p> <p>P25, 5.21 Remove the word <i>“very”</i> from the first line</p> <p>P25, 5.24 We would suggest insertion of <i>“in the built environment”</i> after the word <i>footways</i> in the first line as sandstone flags are not a traditional material on towpaths. It is not clear what the <i>“key points”</i> are. It is important that the materials used in the key points integrates with the towpath materials.</p> <p>P26, 5.25 Any proposals should be considered in light of potential impact on the ecology of the canal corridor.</p> <p>P26, 5.26 The last line states that this is BW’s preferred detail for towpath edge. Would you be able to clarify who at British Waterways agreed this?</p>	<p>Accepted. Error corrected and amendment made</p> <p>Accepted. Amendment made as suggested.</p> <p>Accepted. Amendment made to add clarity as follows: <i>large coping stone blocks</i></p> <p>Accepted. Amendment made as suggested.</p> <p>Disagree. Sandstone flags are found in the Weavers’ Triangle typically under historic canal bridges and at former loading/mooring points on the towpath such as Burnley Wharf. Clarity given by amending the text In Paragraph 5.25 (formerly 5.24) as follows: <i>“Large Sandstone flags are a traditional material for footways and are occasionally found on the towpath in urban locations, typically under historic canal bridges and at former loading/mooring points on the towpath such as Burnley Wharf”.</i></p> <p>Accepted. Amendment made to Paragraph 5.28 (formerly 5.25) as follows: <i>“Proposals to remove significant areas of grass verge should be considered in light of the potential impact on the ecology of the canal corridor”</i></p> <p>Accepted. Clarification unable to be given so text has been deleted.</p>
--	---	--

	<p>P27, 5.29 We don't want to encourage the erection of aerials and other obstructions along the towpath as this adds to visual clutter and can harm amenity.</p> <p>P27, WTF9 The straight mile embankment is a BW operational structure and any proposals must involve full consultation with BW. Any proposals should consider the impact on stability of the structure and the future maintenance of any proposed landscape scheme.</p> <p>P29, 5.40 It is not clear if access points are seen as Gateway Sites. Any proposed signage along the towpath should be carefully considered to avoid restricting access/movement and avoiding clutter.</p> <p>P29, 5.48 We encourage the provision of art work along the canal; where appropriate and as long as it doesn't restrict access and movement of users</p>	<p>Accepted. Text deleted to reflect the concerns.</p> <p>Accepted. A new Paragraph (5.34) has been included as follows: <i>"The straight mile embankment is a British Waterways operational structure and any proposals must involve full consultation with British Waterways. Any proposals should consider the impact on stability of the structure and the future maintenance of any proposed landscape scheme."</i></p> <p>Noted. This guideline relates specifically to the streetscape although it is accepted that access points to the Canal could be considered gateway sites where they are considered key points of entry.</p> <p>Accepted. Paragraph 5.53 (formerly 5.48) has been amended as follows: <i>"The large facades of the mill buildings that overlook the canal provide a canvas for projections or the hanging artworks for viewing from the towpath. Equally, where the towpath widens, the pockets of extra space, could house individual pieces of artwork. Care needs to be taken in locating public art so as not to obscure features of architectural interest or to interfere with the workings of the canal or towpath or restrict access and movement of users. Advice on the most appropriate location for art installations should be sought from the Council's Conservation Officer in relation to Listed Buildings and</i></p>
--	--	--

	<p>BW is working with partners to achieve an appropriate and sustainable regeneration of the former Wharf Site. This may offer an opportunity for the inclusion of new moorings and boater facilities and could also potentially offer opportunities for access to the waterfront. However in order to secure the future of the wharf site, it is critical that policy retains flexibility about the provision of canal related facilities and public realm provision. This will enable any regeneration of the site to ensure that the benefits are fully optimized within the context of a sustainable, deliverable and viable scheme. Therefore we suggest the following amended text: <i>“Design Approach: Enhance existing towpath access and provide a gateway feature, through consultation with British Waterways to ensure structural integrity and operational suitability. Any regeneration of the former wharf site could provide an opportunity for new moorings and boater facilities relating to the canal, and could also generate a new access to the waterfront if appropriate. These possibilities should be explored as part of any proposals brought forward for the redevelopment of the site. New pedestrian crossing point on Finsley Gate Bridge indicates a Gateway to the</i></p>	<p>likely to be supported.</p>
--	--	--------------------------------

	<p><i>Triangle.”</i></p> <p>P39, SL14 British Waterways need to be fully consulted on any proposals for new bridges across the canal. P39, L16 British Waterways need to be fully consulted on any proposals for new bridges across the canal. Any design must allow for boats to pass below.</p> <p>General point – we notice that there are a number of new bridges proposed for crossing the canal. We feel that a co-ordinated approach is required to the number and location of these bridges. British Waterways needs to be consulted at an early stage on the design and potential operational impact of any new bridges.</p> <p>P47, 6.54 It is not clear the relevance of the access being overlooked from a car.</p> <p>P47, 6.57 Whilst BW can see the benefits of improving this access, we wonder if there is an opportunity to look at improving the access across Manchester Road. There would appear to be a pedestrian desire line from the Inn on the Wharf and the WT Visitor Centre to this access who need to cross</p>	<p>Noted. Paragraph 6.1 makes it clear that this part of the SPD is illustrative only. It is anticipated that further testing and consultation will be required to help inform detailed design work as progress is made towards implementation. For added clarity the following has been added to Paragraph 6.1:</p> <p><i>“and British Waterways will need to be consulted at an early stage on the design and potential operational impact of any modifications to existing bridges or proposals for new bridges”</i></p> <p>Accepted. Reference removed.</p> <p>Noted. The Public Realm Framework proposes two strategically important pedestrian crossings across Manchester in the vicinity of the canal access point. For clarity, an additional paragraph 7.49 has been added as follows:</p> <p><i>“This proposal is complemented by the two proposed strategically important pedestrian crossings on Manchester Road as shown on the Public Realm Map in 6.1”</i></p>
--	---	--

	<p>this busy road.</p> <p>P48, 6.59 British Waterways need to be consulted on any proposals for a cantilevered deck to ascertain any impact on the towpath and canal</p> <p>P50, 7.3 British Waterways would seek to have early liaison in the design and implementation process of any early gains projects affecting the canal or towpath</p> <p>P51, 7.5, PP1BW is working with partners to achieve an appropriate and sustainable regeneration of the former wharf site. This may offer an opportunity for the inclusion of a high quality public realm however this will have to be considered in light of restriction on future use.</p> <p>P51, PP9 Any proposals will need to be considered in light of any impact it may have on towpath design and any conflict between users it may create.</p>	<p>Noted. Paragraph 7.46 (formerly 6.59) amended to include: <i>“British Waterways need to be consulted to ascertain any impact on the towpath and canal in relation to these proposals”</i></p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
<p>Rossendale Council</p>	<p>There are no direct cross-border impacts on Rossendale. The strategy is welcomed. It will help create a clear framework for pre-app discussions and</p>	<p>Support welcomed.</p>

	planning decisions and hopefully will lead to an enhanced public realm.	
National Planning Casework Unit	There is no need to send LDF material to the National Planning Casework Unit.	Noted.
Theatres Trust	Due to the specific nature of the Trust's remit we are concerned with the protection and promotion of theatres and, although we have read the document, this consultation is not directly relevant to the Trust's work, therefore we have no comment to make but look forward to being consulted on further LDF documents especially the core strategy, development control policies, planning obligations and the Burnley Town Centre AAP.	Noted.
LCC, REMade	Due to the NWDA being abolished and the REMade Programme effectively coming to an end on 31 st March 2011 we are not now going to be involved in the Weavers' Triangle project in future.	Noted.

LCC Strategic Planning and Transport , Phil Megson	Support welcomed and comments noted.
LCC support and the idea and key principles behind the PRS but it should be noted and accepted that any designs or bespoke treatments such as surfacing and street furniture requires the full agreement from LCC where these materials or changes form part of the highway infrastructure/network. The highway authority will take	

<p>particular note (and will require satisfying, where appropriate) on the following criteria: safety, design, standards, movement, fitness for purpose, implementation, future costs relating to maintenance, repair, replacement, and the future availability of items/materials.</p>	
<p>It should be noted that they key funding sources will be through development via s278 and s106 agreements) or other funding opportunities. It is envisaged that S106 requests will be made by the LA and not LCC. In all cases s278 requirements should take precedence over S106 financial contributions.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>2.1 Objectives</p> <p>No reference is made of the potential to promote the actual canal as a leisure destination and facility for boaters and canal users</p>	<p>Accepted. Objective included as recommended.</p>
<p>4.30 Ambiguity as the wording indicates that originally the WT was well connected, however the construction of the canal provided a level of restriction to the free movement if people and goods across it. The paragraph includes a number of other barriers, but it is noted that Queens Lancashire Way has been excluded yet it is included as a barrier to pedestrian movement within the document.</p>	<p>Accepted. Paragraph 4.27 (formerly 4.30) has been amended to address these comments as follows:</p> <p><i>“Originally there were strong connections between the residential area to the south and the Weavers’ Triangle and the town centre to the north-west. However, today, movement patterns are restricted by the Leeds and Liverpool canal, Queens Lancashire Way, Centenary Way, the M65, the railway line and residential developments. This creates a lack of connectivity and limited legibility within the public realm”</i></p>
<p>5.1 The concept of downgrading Trafalgar Street is worthy of further consideration, however it would only work if further changes could be provided/delivered at other locations such as those which influence movement at the roundabout allowing additional vehicles on Burnham gate opportunities to exit. It is also anticipated that flows on the Westgate arm will impede on other movements onto the roundabout.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

<p>5.3 Consideration to be given to direct (wherever possible) desire lines to and through the area</p>	<p>Noted. Desire Lines have been given consideration in the preparation of the Public Realm Map in 6.1</p>
<p>5.6 Concerned that a change in surface (texture/colour) at pedestrian crossing locations on well trafficked routes may encourage pedestrians to think that they have priority.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>WTF4 A shared surface should be synonymous with the prioritization of pedestrian needs over those of the driver.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>5.7 All motorized vehicles should be subservient to pedestrians. Private vehicles travelling through these areas should not be proposed as significant issues including safety; user conflict etc would need to be overcome to the satisfaction of LCC</p>	<p>Noted and additional text added to paragraph 5.8 as follows: <i>“Streets with Shared Surfaces should be designed in consultation with and to the satisfaction of the Highways Authority.”</i></p>
<p>WTF5 The introduction of tighter radii and junction tables need to be carefully balanced against the needs for delivery/service or other vehicles. Design standards, highway safety and needs of all users including vulnerable road users and the visually impaired will need to be satisfied.</p> <p>Note: examples have shown that some drivers/vehicle types when not confronted by a kerb face or other measure (bollards) treat the footway as an extension of the carriageway (user safety cannot be compromised).</p> <p>5.11 Tight radii and narrow carriageway widths will increase the incidence of larger vehicles overrunning the footways at junctions</p>	<p>Accepted. Paragraph 5.12 (formerly 5.11) amended to include the suggested text.</p> <p><i>The introduction of tighter radii and junction tables need to be carefully balanced against the needs for delivery/service or other vehicles. Design standards, highway safety and needs of all users including vulnerable road users and the visually impaired will need to be satisfied through full consultation with the Highways Authority.</i></p>

<p>resulting in significant safety concerns or impacting on efficiency, delay and safety on the mainline for vehicles, however sensitive design could include the narrowing (where appropriate) along links may be beneficial to vehicle speed reduction and the pedestrian movement. The street design must not rely on the ability of larger vehicles to overrun the kerb in the design process. It is a fundamental requirement that the carriageway design should be such that vehicle movements are constrained within the carriageway area.</p> <p>5.13: Spelling Metres</p>	<p>Accepted. Error corrected.</p>
<p>WTF6 Palette of materials agreed by the Council <i>in consultation with the highway authority where the materials are proposed for use within the public highway.</i></p>	<p>Accepted. WTF6 amended as suggested</p>
<p>WTF8(a) LCC guidelines for cycling provision recommends a shared cycle/pedestrian route should be a minimum of 3 metres (6 metres if you include equestrians). The diagram shown suggests a width of 2.5m with 2x500mm edging treatments. The cobbled area would be hazardous for cyclists riding on it. Also mooring iron work would be a trip hazard. It is important that all changes in the vicinity of the canal satisfy all relevant authorities such as British Waterways.</p> <p>5.25 Same comments as WTF8(a) regarding the use of the cobbled strip</p> <p>5.28 Path should be a minimum of 3.0m wide</p>	<p>Noted. British Waterways did not take issue with the suggested dimensions however the need to satisfy all relevant authorities in any future proposals is noted and the text in paragraph 5.21 (formerly 5.19) has been amended as follows:</p> <p><i>These proposals have been developed with the intention of facilitating increased use of the towpath by pedestrians, cyclists and boaters. It should be noted that any future proposals affecting the towpath will need to be developed in full consultation with Lancashire County Council and British Waterways</i></p> <p>Noted. British Waterways did not take issue with the suggested dimensions. The dimensions are referred to as the 'ideal' and as such</p>

	it is considered to be acceptable. Reference to the need to consult with LCC and BW has been added to Paragraph 5.21 and as such would be a matter to be discussed on a case by case basis.
5.29 In ground sleeves and associated accessories would pose an obstruction to pedestrians and cyclists and would be a hazard to the visually impaired	Accepted. Reference to ground sleeves and associated accessories deleted to reflect the concerns of BW and LCC.
WTF14 The highway authority must be involved in the consultation process if the street furniture is proposed on the public highway.	Accepted. An additional paragraph has been added as follows <i>Any proposals for street furniture on the public highway will need to be developed in full consultation with the Highway Authority.</i>
WTF18 It is necessary to fully consider and satisfy all consequences of any planting on the function, construction and maintenance of the highway (including footway etc) also including safety to all users and their vehicles. Any planting within the highway boundary will require Highway Authority approval. Note: consideration to be given to the rate of growth, natural shape of shrubs/trees etc, species (that release no sap), root shape and its containment, maintenance of shrubs/trees etc (and the funding of), impacts of location ie. satisfying highway design criteria during and when fully grown including sight lines, highway/footway widths etc, impacts on visually impaired /vulnerable road users, visual intrusion on existing buildings etc (these comments are relevant to the whole SPD)	Accepted. An additional paragraph has been added to address the issues raised.
Management and Maintenance It is appreciated that the maintenance of publicly/privately owned areas accessible to the public require a high degree of maintenance to ensure that they are pleasant places in which to dwell or pass	Noted.

<p>through, nevertheless it is not the remit of the Highway Authority to enter into a management regime with a third party. Whilst every effort will be made to be seen as a committed partner, it should be remembered that as a publicly funded entity, long term financial commitments cannot be made and the degree of input that the County is able to input is dependant on resources.</p> <p>One way of limiting the County's liabilities in this respect is to formally stop up (close) any redundant highways under the appropriate legislation so that the land reverts back to private ownership.</p>	
<p>7.4 Management and Maintenance Charter I would suggest that LCC, whilst supporting the principles of the Management and Maintenance Charter cannot be bound by any agreements which would prioritise this area above any other. Resources are and will continue to be directed to areas where they are required, maximizing value for money with regard to movement, reliability, maintenance of assets etc.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>7.10 Should include provision for boaters and equestrians</p>	<p>Noted. Amended to include boaters and equestrians</p>
<p>6.43 SL11 Lower Sandygate Improvements at this location must incorporate suitable pedestrian facilities. Changes are subject to satisfying design criteria, safety and movement (all modes). In satisfying the movement needs at this location, other junction types should be considered. A shared surface arrangement could only be considered if the current levels of traffic using Queens Lancashire Way reduce significantly.</p>	<p>Noted. This part of the SPD is illustrative only. It is anticipated that further testing and consultation will be required to help inform detailed design work as progress is made towards implementation. In particular detailed investigations will be required for the proposals to assess their feasibility. During this process an alternative solution may be considered more appropriate</p>
<p>6.31 SL8 Hammerton Square Level and type of treatment within the highway boundary will rely on the traffic reductions being achieved</p>	<p>Noted. This part of the SPD is illustrative only. It is anticipated that further testing and consultation will be required to help inform detailed design work as progress is made towards implementation. In</p>

and maintained.	particular detailed investigations will be required for the proposals to assess their feasibility. During this process an alternative solution may be considered more appropriate.
SL7 Walkers Hey Square The provision of a suitable ramp (with supporting measures including safety (such as a hand rail) in an appropriate location would encourage more pedestrian and cycle movements.	Assumed that this comment is providing support for this concept design which includes a ramped towpath access.
SL5 Albion St/Burnham Gate Crossing The existing pedestrian demand is catered for, albeit in an unattractive manner. It is noted that the previous bridge was dismantled. Consideration must be given to the reasoning for its removal and any replacement must satisfy local needs and movement whilst linking it into the wider network.	Noted. The concept design has not been conceived in isolation, the key objective of this proposal is to deliver pedestrians to the north side of Burnham Gate and the connecting route to the Weavers' Triangle. The concept design proposes an extension to rather than removal of the bridge.
SL13 Manchester Rd Canal Access Replacement of the parapets will need structural approval.	Noted. Paragraph 6.1 makes it clear that this part of the SPD is illustrative only. It is anticipated that further testing and consultation will be required to help inform detailed design work as progress is made towards implementation. For added clarity the following has been added to Paragraph 6.1: <i>“and British Waterways will need to be consulted at an early stage on the design and potential operational impact of any modifications to existing bridges or proposals for new bridges”</i>
SL2 Trafalgar Street Junction A crossing facility would provide a pedestrian connection to the town centre. The location shown would only be feasible if an improved link to Dent Road is created otherwise pedestrians will continue to use Back Dent Road	Noted. The concept design has not been conceived in isolation. The crossing facility is proposed in conjunction with an improved pedestrian environment to Dent Road through a shared surface treatment see SL1 Manchester Road Railway Station.
SL3 Hammerton Street Junction Pedestrian crossing provision on Hammerton Street would provide a safe point to cross. A pedestrian crossing on Manchester Road would provide a safe crossing point,	Assumed that this comment is providing support for this concept design which includes crossing points on Hammerton Street and Manchester Road. This part of the SPD is illustrative only. It is

<p>its location would need to be investigated inline with junction operation and desire lines</p>	<p>anticipated that further testing and consultation will be required to help inform detailed design work as progress is made towards implementation. In particular detailed investigations will be required for the proposals to assess their feasibility. During this process the exact location of the crossings would be established.</p>
<p>SL4 Finsley Gate Bridge Environs Crossing location must consider design standards and safety (vertical alignment and viability issues). With this the suggested location would need to be reconsidered. It is noted that the St Modwen development has a requirement to provide a crossing further down Finsley Gate (nearer to the bowling). The development of the canal yard has access problems and it has been suggested that the mini-roundabout is replaced with a signalized junction that has pedestrian facilities</p>	<p>Advice noted. It is anticipated that further testing and consultation will be required to help inform detailed design work as progress is made towards implementation of this concept design. In particular detailed investigations will be required for the proposals to assess their feasibility. During this process it is expected that the exact location of the crossing would be established that takes into consideration any future redevelopment of the BW boat yard/wharf.</p>
<p>SL14 Burnley Wharf Footbridge A significant number of delivery and safety issues would need to be overcome with agreement with British Waterways</p>	<p>Noted. For added clarity the following has been added to Paragraph 6.1:</p> <p><i>“and British Waterways will need to be consulted at an early stage on the design and potential operational impact of any modifications to existing bridges or proposals for new bridges”</i></p>
<p>SL15 Cavalry Way Gateway Any proposal will need approval of LCC as the Highway Authority as safety and the likely distraction are major concerns. Also it is likely that any installation will be on adopted highway land.</p>	<p>Accepted. The constraints and considerations text has been amended to give clarity to this issue as follows:</p> <p><i>“Any proposal will need approval of LCC as the Highway Authority as safety and the likely distraction are major concerns. Also it is likely that any installation will be on adopted highway land”</i></p>