04 February 2013

Dear Madam,

Eastern Gateway

I must apologise for this being a late submission. I was to some extent taken by surprise by the submissions from Arrowcroft. This is probably my own fault for not investigating their written submission before last Friday’s hearing.

I gather that they are the owners of the former Woolworths store. Their objection seems to be that the diagram at paragraph 5.13 appears to require a linkage (probably a pedestrian route) to be created through that store. They were no doubt concerned that the threat of this would affect the marketability of the store. It was only as I reflected on their submissions after the hearing that I appreciated what they were getting at. Accordingly what I said was probably not as well thought through as it might have been.

I continue to have doubts as to whether a major redevelopment in the Bromsgrove Street area would be viable, if retail-led, though the area is thoroughly suitable for some redevelopment. With the completion of Weavers Wharf, the retail core of the town has shifted somewhat to the west. This is apparent from the number of empty shops along Worcester Street. That is the only evidence that I can offer, apart from the analogy of Stourbridge, which I have alluded to in previous objections and submissions: there the provision of new shopping centres has led to primary retail (A1) uses retiring from the southern portion of the centre, though leaving that area to be occupied by other town centre uses, particularly A2-A5, and some shop-based sui generis uses.

I see no reason why the whole of the area between Worcester Street, Coventry Street and the Ring Road should not be subject to a single policy (possibly excluding the Coventry Street Frontage). This should:

- Require town centre uses (as defined) along the Worcester Street and Coventry Street ground floor frontages. I am not clear whether some of the frontage is Primary Shopping frontage – the colours used are rather too similar – but if the Worcester Street frontage of EG6 is Primary, it should remain so. Indeed, in producing a final version, I would ask that the Council should adopt colours providing a clearer contrast.

- Otherwise all (or any) of the uses listed in EG5 would be acceptable for the whole area. It could be useful to provide general directions as to the location of particular types of development, but I do not see that as necessary or even desirable. By amalgamating these
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areas, my objection will be removed that over-prescriptive boundaries might stifle the enterprise of developers in site-assembly.

- Each of policies EG5-EG7 is currently subject to conditions (each numbered i-vi). These will need to be amalgamated.

- Wider provisions as to car parking within the plan need to be engaged by the amalgamated policy. A particular concern is that the Plan should ensure that a quantity of long-term parking is made available for use by those visiting the town centre, for example all day on business, apart from daily commuters.

- Encourage the provision of a pedestrian route linking development in the Bromsgrove Street area with the Town Centre. This is likely to be at the expense of Arrowcroft’s premises, which will require them to be compensated from the development gain of landowners in the Bromsgrove Street area. However that is a matter of negotiation. Compensation will in any event presumably be based on their existing retail use.

I am not sure that this submission will make much difference to the outcome of the Examination, as I think I am generally assenting to the compromise that you asked the Council and Arrowcroft to work out between them.

Yours Faithfully,

P. W. King

Dr Peter King,
Chairman