

IT'S OUR CITY TURN CENTROS DOWN!

THE CENTROS MILLER PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR THE CANAL CORRIDOR NORTH SITE HAVE NOW BEEN SUBMITTED.

IT IS EXTREMELY IMPORTANT THAT AS MANY PEOPLE AS POSSIBLE OBJECT IN WRITING TO THESE APPLICATIONS IN ORDER TO STOP THIS DEVELOPMENT.

STOPPING THIS DEVELOPMENT DEPENDS ON YOU!

You can also find more information on our website:

www.itsourcity.org.uk

HOW TO OBJECT:

You have 2 options :

- 1. You can object to a specific planning application quoting the application reference number and giving details of your objections - (examples are given in this leaflet)**
- 2. You can object to ALL of the planning applications as a group (in detail or in general) in which case you must make this clear and quote all the application reference numbers. General reasons can include, increase in traffic and pollution, lack of consultation, threat to the existing city centre, and demolition of historic buildings in a conservation area. This leaflet gives more details.**

Details of the planning applications can be found on our website www.itsourcity.org.uk in the 'planning section' or on the City Council's website at www.lancaster.gov.uk.

To object:

Write to Mark Cassidy, Planning Department, Palatine Hall, Lancaster, LA1 1PW

OR

Email: dconsultation@lancaster.gov.uk

Please make sure you keep a copy of your objection with the date that it was submitted.

**PLEASE MAKE SURE THAT YOU SUBMIT YOUR OBJECTIONS BY 11TH JUNE 2007
AS THIS IS THE END OF THE STATUTORY CONSULTATION PERIOD FOR THESE PLANNING
APPLICATIONS.**

Here are some suggested grounds on which you might object to Centros Miller's proposals but please note that this not an exhaustive list. There are many more possible grounds for objection. If you would like assistance with your letter of objection please don't hesitate to contact us via our website or email admin@itsourcity.org.uk. Alternatively you are welcome to drop in and see us at the Gregson Centre, Moorgate on Tuesday June 5th from 7.30pm onwards.

- LACK OF PROPER CONSULTATION

The Government's own policy on what constitutes proper consultation is summed up in 'Planning Policy Statement 1 Delivering Sustainable Development' which states in paragraph 41 that *Community involvement in planning should not be a reactive, tick-box, process. It should enable the local community to say what sort of place they want to live in at a stage when this can make a difference. Effective community involvement requires an approach which: tells communities about emerging policies and proposals in good time; enables communities to put forward ideas and suggestions and participate in developing proposals and options. It is not sufficient to invite them to simply comment once these have been worked-up...* What has happened with the Centros Miller proposals is the opposite of what is required by PPS1.

Centros Millers proposals should also comply with the City Council's own 'Development Brief' for the Canal Corridor site or it could be rejected by the Planning Committee. The Development Brief states that: (Section 2.4) *“the regeneration of the area must be carried out in close consultation with local people and address their needs and aspirations”* and that there should be (Section 2.7) *“extensive public involvement in the development of the proposals”* and further still that (Section 4.14) *“The Council intends to progress the development of the area in such a way which maximises the involvement of local people and which reflects local concerns as much as possible. This could means involving local residents in the nature and detailed design of the proposed improvements and hopefully engendering a sense of ownership in the outcome”*.

In addition to the above there have been no alternative plans put forward by the Council so that the community could choose the one it wanted. The Centros Miller plans for the site have been presented as the only choice available all along. These plans have not been altered in line with what local people have asked for in Centros Millers own surveys.

For the above reasons you have not been properly consulted about this proposed development and can ask for the development to be rejected on these grounds.

- IMPACT OF THE DEVELOPMENT ON TRAFFIC AND AIR POLLUTION

The proposed development will add thousands of extra cars each day on to our main roads. This contravenes LDLP (Lancaster District Local Plan) Policy T17 which states, *Where the developer is unwilling to meet reasonable targets for minimising the proportion of journeys made to this site by car, development will not be permitted.* The 800 space multi-storey car park contravenes LDLP (Lancaster District Local Plan) Policy T13 which states, *Proposals for additional shopper/ visitor car parking will only be allowed where this is accompanied by an equivalent reduction in the all day commuter parking.* The long-stay car parking currently accessed from Alfred St. and Edward St. is not to be reduced accordingly, but merely displaced to the Bulk St. and Nelson St. car parks, adding to the peak-time volumes on the one-way system. Because the rat-runs of Alfred St./Edward St. will be closed off, the development will lead to an increase in traffic on Derwent Rd., Ullswater Rd. and Moor Lane. Centros Miller claims that new traffic signals for vehicles travelling from Kingsway across to Bulk Rd. will encourage drivers to stay with the one-way system. What does your common-sense say? Indeed Centros

Miller's traffic consultants are so out of touch that they make many wrong assessments: for example, they state that there are five trains an hour between Lancaster and Manchester; and that the no. 10 bus service frequency to the Ridge is one every two hours. But most extraordinary is their conclusion. *The results [of the traffic modelling exercise] show that there are no material adverse impacts from the proposed development. Compared with the Base + Committed development, the Proposed development has shown a broad improvement to local traffic conditions. (Paragraph 7.7)*

Any of these issues can be raised in any objection you make to the Planning Committee. In addition: PPS1 (Government Planning Policy Statement 1) states that (Key Principles (13:ii) *Regional planning bodies and local planning authorities should ensure that development plans contribute to global sustainability by addressing the causes and potential impacts of climate change through policies which reduce energy use, reduce emissions (for example, by encouraging patterns of development which reduce the need to travel by private car, or reduce the impact of moving freight)*”.

Centros Miller's proposals are in clear contradiction to the above policy in that they will bring many more cars and lorries into the City.

- EFFECT ON THE EXISTING CITY CENTRE

Centros Millers proposals will double the amount of retail floor space in Lancaster. There are already many empty shop units in the City. Centros Miller have not ruled out the possibility that some of the existing national retail chains in the City will move onto the new development. The development would become an alternative City Centre which has the potential to sap the life out of the existing City Centre. It will have particularly grave implications for Lancaster's independent retailers and the indoor market as it will undoubtedly draw people away from the current Centre. Planning Policy Statement 6: Planning for Town Centres states that : (Paragraph 2.41) : *“The aim should be to locate the appropriate type and scale of development in the right type of centre, to ensure that it fits into that centre and that it complements its role and function”*.

Retailing in Morecambe and surrounding areas will be seriously affected. This is not mentioned in Centros Millers Retail Assessment until the end in table 9 which shows that Morecambe and other places will suffer a loss of trade by 2012 when the development is operating. PPS6 however states that (Paragraph 3.21) *“In assessing sites, local planning authorities should consider the impact of the proposal on the vitality and viability of existing centres within the catchment area of the proposed development, including the likely cumulative effect of recent permissions, developments under construction and completed developments.* Centros Miller's documents do not pay sufficient attention to Morecambe and the other surrounding Centres which will be affected adversely, and should be rejected.

Nor do Centros Miller's documents demonstrate a need for a retail development of this size next to Lancaster City Centre. In any event PPS6 states in relation to existing City Centres that : (Paragraph 3.31) *“The identification of need does not necessarily indicate that there will be no negative impact.”*

If the development goes ahead it will fundamentally alter the nature of the City and Lancaster would become just another cloned town with no intrinsic individuality. More national chains in the City will mean more and more money is leaked out of the local economy. PPS6 states that: (Paragraph 2.42) *“Given their characteristics, local centres will generally be inappropriate locations for large scale new development, even when a flexible approach is adopted”*.

The proposed retail development extends far beyond that envisaged in the City Council's own Canal Corridor Development Plan Brief Referring to land between Alfred St./Edward St. and the canal, the Brief

states that (Paragraph 7.8) *The Council would not wish to encourage retail, commercial, leisure, food and drink uses and other uses likely to attract a lot of people.*” Which is of course exactly what Centros Miller are proposing and is another reason their planning application should be refused.

- DEMOLITION OF HISTORIC AND POTENTIALLY USEFUL BUILDINGS

Under Centros Miller's plans the old brewery buildings will be demolished. An appeal regarding the listing of the Brewery Buildings has been submitted and the planning applications should not go any further until this appeal has been heard. In addition to the Brewery , buildings on Stonewell, including the local Post Office, will be demolished to make way for a footbridge from the development over the road (at a height of at least six metres) into the St Nicholas shopping arcade opposite. Stonewell is a designated Conservation Area.

The opening statement of the chapter entitled Historic Buildings and Areas in the Lancaster and District Local Plan declares that *the city council has a long standing commitment to the conservation of historic areas and buildings* and goes on to state that *within conservation areas, the council has a duty to preserve and enhance the character of the area..* The proposal within Centros Miller's plans to demolish the dance studio (the old Coach House) and the Musicians Co-op clearly do not comply with Policy E 37 in the Local Plan, which states that: *proposals to demolish any building within a conservation area will only be approved where detailed planning permission has been given for a scheme of redevelopment which would preserve and enhance the conservation area including effective guarantees of early completion.*

Centros Miller are currently applying for 'Outline' planning permission as opposed to 'Detailed' planning permission. This means in general that their ultimate plans for the site will remain hidden until after planning permission has been granted and it is too late to object. This clearly contravenes Policy E 37 above.

E37 also states that *(the total or substantial demolition of an unlisted building which makes a positive contribution to the conservation area will be permitted where the applicant can demonstrate conclusively that; rehabilitation is impractical and reasonable efforts have been made to sustain existing uses or find viable new uses for the building and these have failed.*

Centros Miller has not demonstrated that these buildings cannot be rehabilitated, nor have they made any effort to show that these buildings cannot sustain their existing usage or that there are no viable new uses for the buildings. For this reason the application should be turned down.

THE ABOVE POINTS ARE POSSIBLE OBJECTIONS THAT YOU COULD MAKE. BELOW IN BRIEF ARE SOME OTHER POINTS WHICH COULD BE BROUGHT INTO LETTERS OF OBJECTION:
--

The development is a threat to the continued existence of the MUSICIANS COOP, as fitting out any new premises provided to it within the development will be dependent on the securing of outside funding. Its rent and overheads will be likely to increase to a level way above what it current pays.

The development does not entail the provision of a new 'CULTURAL QUARTER' for the City. As everyone knows we already have a Cultural Quarter on the site which already exists without being overshadowed by a massive department store and a multi-storey car park. The dance studio on the site will likely be lost for good. The 'PUBLIC SPACE' included in the plans is minuscule compared to the size of the development. There are no NEW YOUTH OR COMMUNITY FACILITIES in the plans. The HOMELESS ACTION CENTRE will be lost.