

Draft

Halton Borough Council

Runcorn Town Centre

Draft Supplementary Planning Document

Statement of Consultation

P. Watts
Operational Director – Environmental Health and Regulatory Services
Environmental Directorate
Halton Borough Council
Rutland House
Halton Lea
Runcorn
Cheshire
WA7 2GW

February 2009

1 Introduction

- 1.1 Under the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 it is a requirement to prepare and publish a Consultation Statement for a range of planning policy documents, including Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs). This is a reflection of Government's desire to "strengthen community and stakeholder involvement in the development of local communities".
- 1.2 This Consultation Statement is being made available during the formal period of public consultation, alongside the draft SPD and the Sustainability Appraisal Report, in accordance with Regulation 17 (1) of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004.

2 Stakeholder Consultation

- 2.1 Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report consultation
Waterman Environmental were appointed by Halton Borough Council to undertake a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and Sustainability Appraisal (SA) of the Mersey Gateway Regeneration Strategy. As Runcorn Town Centre was recognised as one of the key focal points for regeneration and development within the Regeneration Strategy, it was considered that the SA Framework developed for the Regeneration Strategy remained applicable to the SA of the Runcorn Town Centre SPD.
- 2.2 Key issues and SA objectives for Runcorn Town Centre that emerged from both the existing context and the proposals of the Mersey Gateway Regeneration Strategy were consulted upon in December 2008/January 2009. English Heritage, Natural England, the Environment Agency and the Merseyside Environmental Advisory Service were invited to confirm that they were in agreement with the findings of the initial stages, and to provide an opportunity to suggest changes to the assessment. The comments and responses can be found in Appendix D of the Runcorn Town Centre SA.
- 2.3 Stakeholder consultation
The stakeholder consultation took place between 17th December 2008 and 12th January 2009. During this time key stakeholders in the purpose of the Runcorn Town Centre SPD were asked to comment on the appropriateness of the document's content prior to the formal consultation process. A summary list of consultees can be found at the end of this report.
- 2.5 Comments received and the resulting responses and the amendments to the draft SPD are contained in the following table:

Draft

Consultee	Date of response	Reference	Comments	Response
Cllr Hodgkinson Deputy Leader Liberal Democrat Group	07/01/09	Fig 1	This should include Riverside College and Homebase.	Included Riverside College plan - not the Bridge Retail Park as this is not subject to future development opportunity.
Cllr Hodgkinson Deputy Leader Liberal Democrat Group	07/01/09	Para 2.2	Should be 'latter half of 19th century'.	Accepted - text amended.
Cllr Hodgkinson Deputy Leader Liberal Democrat Group	07/01/09	Para 2.4	The original population proposed for the Runcorn New Town, including older area was 70,000. This was later increased to about 90,000.	Accepted - text amended.
Cllr Hodgkinson Deputy Leader Liberal Democrat Group	07/01/09	Para 2.5 3rd bullet point	The Spur Road, which was opened shortly after the SJB, bypassed the Town Centre. The Bridgewater Expressway follows the line of the Bridgewater Canal and did not cut off any roads but reinforced the canal barrier. (see also para 2.23 3rd bullet point).	Accepted - text amended.
Cllr Hodgkinson Deputy Leader Liberal Democrat Group	07/01/09	Para 2.8	The improved vehicular access is via Leira Way.	Accepted - text added.
Cllr Hodgkinson Deputy Leader Liberal Democrat Group	07/01/09	Para 2.11	The term 'shatter' zones is emotive, especially as the speed limit of the main roads shown on fig 2.7 is 40mph. What term should be used to describe the central expressway route which has a 60mph limit will carry more traffic and is likely to retain the existing 60mph speed limit?.	Accepted - text amended.
Cllr Hodgkinson Deputy Leader Liberal Democrat Group	07/01/09	Para 2.23 5th bullet point.	The railway arches do not significantly impede movement. The pedestrian routes under the expressway are primarily shared with vehicles and preferable to subways. An improvement to pedestrian routes would be welcome but at grade crossings of major roads have their dangers.	Text amended to address initial point. Point regarding at grade crossings is an opinion and not a recommendation.

Draft

Consultee	Date of response	Reference	Comments	Response
Cllr Hodgkinson Deputy Leader Liberal Democrat Group	07/01/09	Para 2.26	Existing roads are described as redundant without any evidence being provided to support this view. A traffic model is available to test different scenarios and should be used. This would give guidance on distances and journey times which will highlight any congestion hotspots. Motorists are rarely mentioned in these documents but there is regular reference to easy access for cyclists. An increase in cycling would certainly be beneficial to health and reduce traffic congestion but unless the cycle lanes are linked to a wider network, their impact would be limited. In any case, cars and buses will remain the main mode of transport for most journeys over half a mile and the proposals and these proposals must reflect this reality.	The proposals described in this Supplementary Planning Document are based on the preferred de-linking option as expressed in the Mersey Gateway Regeneration Strategy agreed by the Council's Executive Board on 19 th June 2008. The preferred option for road, pedestrian, cycle and bus access to the Silver Jubilee Bridge as a result of the preferred de-linking proposals is now described in more detail in Section 3: The Mersey Gateway Project, Paragraphs 3.9-3.18 and illustrated in Figure 3.1.
Cllr Hodgkinson Deputy Leader Liberal Democrat Group	07/01/09	Para's 2.31 and 2.32	It is the A533 flyover Comments above apply. The demolition of the Runcorn loops would remove the direct link between the SJB and the Weston Expressway which leads to Runcorn Docks and the major industrial area in West Runcorn. This demolition would also divert significant volumes of traffic along a longer route via the Mersey Gateway. Traffic would then follow either the Bridgewater Expressway through an at-grade junction (which would also serve as the gateway to both the Town Centre and Runcorn Railway Station) or the Central Expressway, which is a long diversion for traffic from West Widnes. The retention of the loops would retain the direct link between the SJB and the Weston Expressway and permit a direct link to be provided from the SJB approach via a signal-controlled junction to the Railway Station. The loop crosses the proposed extension of the Bridgewater Canal but this is not an insurmountable barrier.	Text amended to address initial point. The proposals described in this Supplementary Planning Document are based on the preferred de-linking option as expressed in the Mersey Gateway Regeneration Strategy agreed by the Council's Executive Board on 19 th June 2008. The preferred option for road, pedestrian, cycle and bus access to the Silver Jubilee Bridge as a result of the preferred de-linking proposals is now described in more detail in Section 3: The Mersey Gateway Project, Paragraphs 3.9-3.18 and illustrated in Figure 3.1.

Draft

Consultee	Date of response	Reference	Comments	Response
Cllr Hodgkinson Deputy Leader Liberal Democrat Group	07/01/09	Para 4.4	The loops are primarily at ground level and follow the line of the railway. Where they cross Picow Farm Road, they are at the same level as the railway. It could be argued that the original access to the SJB is more intrusive as it is wholly on viaduct, is closer to the Town Centre and crosses an area which could be developed more effectively.	The proposals described in this Supplementary Planning Document are based on the preferred de-linking option as expressed in the Mersey Gateway Regeneration Strategy agreed by the Council's Executive Board on 19 th June 2008. The preferred option for road, pedestrian, cycle and bus access to the Silver Jubilee Bridge as a result of the preferred de-linking proposals is now described in more detail in Section 3: The Mersey Gateway Project, Paragraphs 3.9-3.18 and illustrated in Figure 3.1.
Cllr Hodgkinson Deputy Leader Liberal Democrat Group	07/01/09	Para's 4.8 and 4.10	The congestion in the Town Centre car parks between 9am and 3pm is recognised. The introduction of parking management measures and restrictions near the shops, which only effect long term parking, will benefit the shopping area. This is emphasised in Strategic Policy SP10.	Text amended from '10am' to '9am'
Cllr Hodgkinson Deputy Leader Liberal Democrat Group	07/01/09	Para 4.16 Objective 5.	This suggests the Council builds on the achievements at the Deck in the Canal Quarter. The flats in the Deck have proved difficult to let and sell and we are doubtful whether a similar development in the Canal quarter will be successful in the current economic climate.	Text amended
Cllr Hodgkinson Deputy Leader Liberal Democrat Group	07/01/09	Para 5.5 Strategic Policy SP5.	The number of takeaways needs to be reduced. Some are not viable and, as the Police will confirm, are simply fronts for crime.	Noted - the type of food establishments acceptable within the town centre will need to be justified as part of any planning application submission.

Draft

Consultee	Date of response	Reference	Comments	Response
Cllr Hodgkinson Deputy Leader Liberal Democrat Group	07/01/09	Para 5.10	We support the reinstatement of the Bridgewater Canal, but the removal of current highway links that blocks the route must not result in unsatisfactory approach routes to the SJB. The alternative proposed in our comment on para 6.77 is a viable alternative.	The proposals described in this Supplementary Planning Document are based on the preferred de-linking option as expressed in the Mersey Gateway Regeneration Strategy agreed by the Council's Executive Board on 19 th June 2008. The preferred option for road, pedestrian, cycle and bus access to the Silver Jubilee Bridge as a result of the preferred de-linking proposals is now described in more detail in Section 3: The Mersey Gateway Project, Paragraphs 3.9-3.18 and illustrated in Figure 3.1.
Cllr Hodgkinson Deputy Leader Liberal Democrat Group	07/01/09	Para 5.14 Strategic policy SP8	Cycle routes in the Town Centre must link with other routes leading to the Town Centre to be effective. Our Group considers that the proposed cycle routes in the Town Centre are too extensive. Runcorn is not Holland.	Additional bullet point added.
Cllr Hodgkinson Deputy Leader Liberal Democrat Group	07/01/09	Fig 5.1	There are benefits in providing a new junction at the location shown on this plan. However, there are major dangers in routing so many routes through one at grade junction. Any accident at this point would result in serious congestion in this area. It is on the direct route between the proposed Ineos Incinerator and Randle Island and would provide the only vehicular access to the SJB.	The proposals described in this Supplementary Planning Document are based on the preferred de-linking option as expressed in the Mersey Gateway Regeneration Strategy agreed by the Council's Executive Board on 19 th June 2008. The preferred option for road, pedestrian, cycle and bus access to the Silver Jubilee Bridge as a result of the preferred de-linking proposals is now described in more detail in Section 3: The Mersey Gateway Project, Paragraphs 3.9-3.18 and illustrated in Figure 3.1.

Draft

Consultee	Date of response	Reference	Comments	Response
Cllr Hodgkinson Deputy Leader Liberal Democrat Group	07/01/09	Para's 5.30 & 5.31	Strategic Policy SP14 Increasing the quantity and quality of art needs to be justified financially and should not conflict with SP14.	No further action required.
Cllr Hodgkinson Deputy Leader Liberal Democrat Group	07/01/09	Para 6.58	The use of the 'old 'Town Viaduct as the only access the SJB has not been justified. Retaining the Loop may be significantly cheaper, is less dependant on one critical junction and provides the opportunity to construct a direct access to the Railway Station off the SJB.	The proposals described in this Supplementary Planning Document are based on the preferred de-linking option as expressed in the Mersey Gateway Regeneration Strategy agreed by the Council's Executive Board on 19 th June 2008. The preferred option for road, pedestrian, cycle and bus access to the Silver Jubilee Bridge as a result of the preferred de-linking proposals is now described in more detail in Section 3: The Mersey Gateway Project, Paragraphs 3.9-3.18 and illustrated in Figure 3.1.

Draft

Consultee	Date of response	Reference	Comments	Response
Cllr Hodgkinson Deputy Leader Liberal Democrat Group	07/01/09	Para's 6.64 -6.70	<p>Existing major roads near the SJB inevitably focus on the SJB and are barriers. The arguments in these paragraphs can be applied even more strongly to the upgraded Central Expressway. Some delinking of the SJB approaches should be beneficial but the description of the A557 approach to the SJB as redundant infrastructure needs to be demonstrated. The de-linking proposals for both the Runcorn and Widnes approaches to SJB will not provide sufficient capacity for even 2 lanes on the SJB to be fully utilised if the Mersey Gateway had to be closed due to an accident or major roadwork's. There is currently little congestion on the SJB outside peak periods and in the future people will be paying tolls at all times simply to remove peak hour delays. If the SJB will be unable to take a significant diversion of traffic when there are major problems on the Mersey Gateway, the advantage of having two bridges will be lost. A traffic model is available to test different scenarios and should be used. This would give guidance on distances and journey times which will highlight any congestion hotspots.</p> <p>We are concerned that benefits to through traffic seem to be at the expense of local people wishing to travel between West Runcorn and the A562 to Liverpool, for example. The traffic model needs to provide information on journey times which may alleviate these concerns. Alternatively the information provided from the traffic model may suggest different options for de-linking the SJB. The model also needs to test the impact of proposals to build 4,000 dwellings in the Runcorn Dock area, for example.</p>	<p>The proposals described in this Supplementary Planning Document are based on the preferred de-linking option as expressed in the Mersey Gateway Regeneration Strategy agreed by the Council's Executive Board on 19th June 2008. The preferred option for road, pedestrian, cycle and bus access to the Silver Jubilee Bridge as a result of the preferred de-linking proposals is now described in more detail in Section 3: The Mersey Gateway Project, Paragraphs 3.9-3.18 and illustrated in Figure 3.1.</p>
Cllr Hodgkinson Deputy Leader Liberal Democrat Group	07/01/09	Para 6.73	<p>The downgrading of the Queensway Expressway to a residential road will prevent it acting as a local route between Widnes and West Runcorn and worsen their connectivity.</p>	<p>The document does not refer to Queensway Expressway as a residential road.</p>

Draft

Consultee	Date of response	Reference	Comments	Response
Cllr Hodgkinson Deputy Leader Liberal Democrat Group	07/01/09	Para 6.77	The current highway approach to the SJB blocks the extension of the Bridgwater Canal, but it could pass under the loop if it was raised by about 1 metre. The link from the Weston Expressway provides a bigger problem to the extension of the Bridgwater Canal where it passes under the arch, but the Loop junction with the Bridgewater Expressway could be altered to accommodate a right turn from the west for SJB bound traffic.	The proposals described in this Supplementary Planning Document are based on the preferred de-linking option as expressed in the Mersey Gateway Regeneration Strategy agreed by the Council's Executive Board on 19 th June 2008. The preferred option for road, pedestrian, cycle and bus access to the Silver Jubilee Bridge as a result of the preferred de-linking proposals is now described in more detail in Section 3: The Mersey Gateway Project, Paragraphs 3.9-3.18 and illustrated in Figure 3.1.
Cheshire County Council	09/01/2009	Pg 6 Para 2.2	This paragraph states that the Manchester Ship Canal was constructed in the latter half of the 17 th Century. The Manchester Ship Canal was actually constructed relatively late, opening in 1894. However there was a precursor to the Manchester Ship Canal, the Runcorn to Latchford Canal, which was part of the Mersey and Irwell Navigation and is dated to the early 19 th century.	Accepted - text amended.
Cheshire County Council	09/01/2009	History & Context Section (Pg 6)	The section on the history of Runcorn could be more detailed and we suggest that the Runcorn and Halton Archaeological Assessment in the Cheshire Historic Towns Survey is used as an information source and referenced in the document. This document provides a detailed history of Runcorn and the surrounding area, and can be found on Cheshire County Council's website at: http://www.cheshire.gov.uk/Planning/Regenerationresources/Historic/NHE_Historic_Halton.htm	Adding additional historical context would not necessarily add anything further to this document, in its role as a Supplementary Planning Document for planning purposes.

Draft

Consultee	Date of response	Reference	Comments	Response
Cheshire County Council	09/01/2009	History & Context Section (Pg 6)	Some of the information included in the history and context section of the document, would be better suited under a separate heading. The 'context' that is being set out here is the context for the need for redevelopment of the town, and an outline of previous schemes which have the same objective, rather than setting an area within its wider locality and associated history. As this detail does not form part of the history of the area, it would be more appropriate under a different heading.	Section titles amended.
Cheshire County Council	09/01/2009	Characteristics of Runcorn Town Centre (Pg 11)	This section of the document does not define all elements of the character of Runcorn Town Centre. Much of the information included outlines schemes and development that have occurred in the vicinity; however this does not define the character of the town, only providing information on the current situation in the town. For example, information on the developer competition held in 2005 is important information, but does not define the character of the area and therefore is not relevant under this heading. The English Heritage document 'Guidance on Conservation Area Appraisals' (2006) provides guidance on how to define the character of an area and could be used as a template for this section.	Section titles amended.
Cheshire County Council	09/01/2009	Local Policy (Pg 21)	The policies in the Unitary Development Plan which relate to Listed Buildings and Archaeology have not been included in the local policy section of the document. As there are a number of Listed structures within Runcorn Town Centre which need to be protected and an Area of Archaeological Potential, it is important that the relevant policies are included.	Accepted - additional UDP policies added to appendix.
Cheshire County Council	09/01/2009	4. Vision & Objectives (4.2)	As the character of the town has not been fully established in section 2.10 ff , it is perhaps not appropriate to state that Runcorn has the 'character to develop as a market town'. Rather it has the 'potential' to develop as a market town specialising in local retailers and produce.	Accepted - text amended.

Draft

Consultee	Date of response	Reference	Comments	Response
Cheshire County Council	09/01/2009	Strategic Policies	Runcorn Town Centre is not felt to be of sufficient historical or architectural interest to warrant being designated as a Conservation Area, probably because of the alterations that occurred in the 1960/70s. However the area is still of historic interest and there are a number of listed structures in the vicinity. As such a policy should be included which states that the historic interest of the area will be considered in any development scheme, and where appropriate, preserved or enhanced. Also special regard should be paid to the desirability of preserving the setting of a Listed Building.	Addressed through inclusion of relevant UDP policies above. Any proposals within the SPD boundary will still be subject to the policy provisions of Halton UDP.
Cheshire County Council	09/01/2009	Strategic Policies (Cont...)	The Area of Archaeological Potential defined by the Cheshire Historic Towns Survey covers much of the Town Centre Area. This designation is based on the fact that the area includes sites that were occupied before the industrialisation of the area during the 19th century. In addition, the area contains a variety of industrial remains, evidence for which survives both above and below ground. Any such remains could be damaged or destroyed by new development and we note the requirement in Paragraph 6.31 of the Widnes Draft Supplementary Planning Document for the preparation of an archaeological assessment to accompany planning applications that affect areas of archaeological interest and the implementation of appropriate mitigation strategies, where required, prior to the start of development work.	Accepted - Added requirement for an archaeological assessment to accompany any planning application in section 8.
Cheshire County Council	09/01/2009	Strategic Policies (Cont...)	This represents an appropriate strategy which should also be included as a strategic policy in the Runcorn document. The completion of an archaeological assessment and, if appropriate, a programme of field evaluation prior to the determination of a planning application is important as it allows the need, if any, for further archaeological mitigation to be established at any early stage. Any further archaeological mitigation (excavation, watching brief, etc) may then be secured by an appropriately-worded condition. It is, of course, possible that pre-determination assessment and evaluation will demonstrate that further archaeological mitigation would not be appropriate, in which case this will have been established at an early stage in the development process and no further work will be required.	Expanded on above.

Draft

Consultee	Date of response	Reference	Comments	Response
Cheshire County Council	09/01/2009	Strategic Policies (Cont...)	This advice is in line with that contained in <i>PPG16: archaeology and planning</i> (DoE 1990) and is also in accordance with Policies BE5 (sites of archaeological importance) and BE6 (archaeological evaluations) in the Borough's Unitary Development Plan.	No further action required.
Cheshire County Council	09/01/2009	Sub-area policies	The numbers of the sub-areas as shown on the maps do not correspond with the order in which the sub areas are approached in the document. It would be clearer if either the sub areas were renumbered to match the order of the document, or the document was reordered.	Agree - document re-arranged into a meaningful order.
Cheshire County Council	09/01/2009	Regent Street and Western Approaches (Pg 57 6.25)	6.25 states that new development could occur through selective demolition of vacant buildings. If these buildings are historic, then demolition should not be recommended and the document should state this.	Reference made in text
Cheshire County Council	09/01/2009	Bridge Street and Eastern Approaches (Pg 60)	Within the Bridge Street sub area there are a number of Listed Buildings: The Old Police Station, the Royal Hotel and Church of the Holy Trinity. These buildings should be identified as being part of the character of the area and it should be stated that their setting should be preserved or enhanced.	Text added to paragraph.
Cheshire County Council	09/01/2009	Bridge Street and Eastern Approaches (Pg 60)	This area also retains historic street patterns. Roads such as Thomas Street, Bold Street, Stanley Street and Parker Street are all visible on the 1st edition Ordnance Survey maps. These street forms should be identified and protected.	Accepted - additional text added.
Cheshire County Council	09/01/2009	Promenade & The Desk Sub-area, (Pg 69)	The description of the Promenade and the Deck sub-area does not identify the two listed buildings in the area: the Church of All Saints, Grade II* and a substation, formally the hearse house, which is grade II.	Accepted - reference added.

Draft

Consultee	Date of response	Reference	Comments	Response
Cheshire County Council	09/01/2009	Promenade & The Desk Sub-area, (Pg 69)	The Church is an important site and building within Runcorn, and is one of the strongest links back to Runcorn's early history and is known to have been in existence from at least the 12th century. The importance of the church and its site needs to be identified in the document as it could form the focal point for improvements to the area.	Accepted - additional text added.
Cheshire County Council	09/01/2009	General	<p>The opportunity should be taken during the regeneration of Runcorn Town Centre to ensure that the heritage of the area makes a significant contribution to future redevelopment.</p> <p>Runcorn Town Centre is not designated as a Conservation Area, however it is still of historic interest and character. This character needs to be more firmly identified and policies and aims included in the document in order to protect the historic elements of the area. It is evident from numerous other schemes that heritage-led regeneration can be very successful and the potential of some of the buildings in Runcorn Town Centre should not be underestimated.</p> <p>The archaeological potential of Runcorn Town Centre has been demonstrated by the Cheshire Historic Towns Survey and this potential should be taken into consideration at an early stage in the regeneration process.</p>	No further action is considered necessary as the existing policies of the Unitary Development Plan adequately deal with the protection and enhancement of the historic built environment.
Environment Agency	12/01/2009	Planning Policy Context	We welcome reference to PPS1: Delivering Sustainable Development and PPS 9: Biodiversity and Geological Conservation. However, due to the number of historic landfill sites (notably Old Quay Quarry, Victoria Road, Old Bridgewater Locks, Percival Lane, Dukesfield and the Runcorn and Weston Canal) and possible historic contaminative land-use of the SPD area, that reference be made to PPS23: Planning and Pollution Control. We would also suggest that reference is made to Policy PR14 Contaminated Land, of the Halton UDP.	Accepted - additional reference added to text.
Environment Agency	12/01/2009	Planning Policy Context	We welcome inclusion of reference to Halton's Biodiversity Action Plan and the requirement that development proposals will be required to have regards to these policy provisions.	No further action required.

Draft

Consultee	Date of response	Reference	Comments	Response
Environment Agency	12/01/2009	Flood Risk	We note that flood risk is briefly mentioned within paragraph 2.23, as a constraint in 7.10 and reference made to PPS 25 in paragraph 7.20. We would advise that flood risks associated with the Manchester Ship Canal (MSC) are currently unknown. We are currently undertaking investigations into the flood risk associated with the MSC. However, these finding will not be available until the later part of 2009 at the earliest. Any development adjacent to the MSC (and Mersey Estuary) may require a site specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA).	Accepted -Text added
Environment Agency	12/01/2009	Flood Risk	We recommend that paragraph 7.10 is expanded to explain that development proposals greater than 1 hectare within flood zone 1 will require a site specific FRA. Additionally it should be stated that surface water run-off rates from greenfield sites should be restricted to greenfield rates (including making allowances for climate change). Additionally, any development adjacent to canals may require a site specific FRA as the flood risks from these waterways is currently unknown.	Accepted - additional text added.
Environment Agency	12/01/2009	Strategic Policies	Providing that developments comply with PPS9 and PPS25, we welcome the Strategic Policies detailed within the SPD, specifically utilising waterside frontages and establishing better links between the Canal Quarter and the Deck / Promenade and enhancement of the Bridgewater Canal. Indeed, proposals to link and improve waterside locations provides an opportunity to enhance / provide green networks (as detailed in SP9).	No further action required.
Environment Agency	12/01/2009	Objectives	We welcome the inclusion of ' <i>...enhancing the cultural, built and natural environment...</i> '. We would recommend that greater emphasis to be placed on the natural environment as a greenspace and the ecological and recreational benefits that appropriate landscaping can achieve (such as the creation green networks and the expansion and improvement of existing green spaces).	Any proposals will be required to conform to the policies of the UDP. Inclusion of additional UDP policies will become close to re-iterating the UDP.

Draft

Consultee	Date of response	Reference	Comments	Response
Environment Agency	12/01/2009	Objectives	We would recommend that an objective to ' <i>... provide appropriate development that fully mitigates all environmental constraints including landscaping, contamination, noise, air quality, water quality, flooding, and visual impacts...</i> ' be considered for inclusion within the document.	This is covered by the policies of the UDP, and various other policies in the SPD. It is not considered necessary to include an additional policy covering these matters.

Draft

2.6 A summary list of those consulted as part of the stakeholder consultation for the draft Runcorn Town Centre SPD is given below.

Runcorn Town Centre SPD Consultees
Arriva North West & Wales
Bridgewater Canal
British Waterways
C/O St Modwens Developments Ltd
Cheshire Area Health Authority
Cheshire Police
Cheshire Wildlife Trust
Chester & Halton Community NHS Trust
DLA Piper
English Partnerships
English Partnerships Regional Office
Environment Agency
Fire Officer (Warrington)
Giffords
Government Office North West
Groundwork Mersey Valley
Halton & St Helens Primary Care Trust
Halton Borough Council Councillors
Halton Borough Transport
Halton Chamber of Commerce
Halton Community Transport
Halton General Hospital Trust
Halton Housing Trust
Halton LSP
Health & Safety Executive
Home Builders Federation
M Farrow - Conservation Officer (CCC)
M Leah - Archaeological Officer (CCC)
Merseytravel
Natural England
Network Rail
North West Water Ltd
Peel Holdings Ltd
Runcorn Locks Restoration Society
Runcorn Police Station
Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd
Taylor Young
The Brindley Arts Centre
The Inland Waterways Association
Urban Splash

2.7 In addition to the stakeholders listed above, relevant Halton Borough Council Officers were also consulted. These comments have been

Draft

taken into consideration in the drafting of the Runcorn Town Centre SPD. Officer's comments and responses are available upon request.