Report of the Corporate Director

On-Street Parking Regulations – Residential schemes

1 Purpose of Report

1.1 To enable the Committee to further consider variations to on-street parking regulations in Wellingborough in relation to Residential Permit Schemes

2 Executive Summary

2.1 This report further considers the proposed residential permit scheme parking areas around the Station and to the north of the Town Centre and sets out in the appendix further details of residential permit scheme policies and details of the issuing of permits.

3 Proposed Action

The Committee is invited to:

3.1 resolve that consultation is carried out with the affected residents in the areas around the station in relation to a resident parking permit scheme in association with the proposed short stay parking restrictions and subject to over half the properties supporting the proposals approve the implementation of the scheme subject to finance being available.

3.2 resolve that consultation is carried out with the affected residents in Alma Street, Cannon Street, Great Park Street, Park Road and Heriotts Lane in relation to a resident permit parking scheme and subject to over half the properties supporting the proposals approve the implementation of the scheme subject to finance being available.

3.3 recommend to the Resources Committee that an estimate of £53,500 is included in the 2009/10 capital programme to enable the proposals to be implemented.

3.4 Recommend that a residential permit charge of £25 be set for the first year with a review carried out on an annual basis based on the actual cost of enforcement, maintenance, management & administration

4 Background

4.1 In August 2007 Northamptonshire County Council reintroduced the enforcement of on-street parking regulations using parking wardens.

4.2 The on-street parking enforcement operation is overseen by the
Northamptonshire Parking Partnership comprising Members and Officers from Northamptonshire County Council and the Borough and District Councils. Councillor Malcolm Ward is Wellingborough’s representative.

4.3 At the June 2008 Development Committee consideration was given to variations to the on-street parking regulations in Wellingborough including two proposals for residential parking schemes in the Town Centre and Station areas of Wellingborough.

4.4 At the October meeting of the Committee a decision on the residential parking schemes was deferred for twelve months but was referred back to this Committee at Full Council.

5 Discussion

5.1 For some time prior to the introduction of the new parking enforcement measures, there has been concern in the area around the station about the number of commuters parking in the residential streets to avoid paying the station car park charges. This has, naturally, caused inconvenience and problems for residents who live in the area.

5.2 Residents from a number of streets within the vicinity of the station have complained about the issue of commuter parking and have requested consideration of residents parking schemes. In addition during the summer and autumn of 2008 there has been correspondence in the local press on the subject.

5.3 Now that parking enforcement measures are in place it is proposed that residents in the streets affected are consulted on the introduction of time limited parking areas in the residential streets with the residents being given the option to purchase resident parking permits allowing parking throughout the period of the restrictions.

5.4 The restrictions, two hours only between 7.00am and 2.00pm Mondays to Saturdays, would prevent parking by rail users during the day but would allow short stay visitor parking during the morning and longer term visitor parking in the afternoons and overnight.

5.5 As the proposal has been made necessary as a result of avoidance of car parking charges at the railway station, a meeting has been held with East Midlands Trains at which the issues were discussed and they were requested to contribute to the scheme, particularly as they will gain financially if the displaced vehicles now park in the station car parks. East Midlands Trains considered the matter and have initially offered to contribute £1,500 towards the consultation (50% of the estimated cost).

5.6 In late November East Midlands Trains announced that the Season ticket charge at Wellingborough Station would rise £130 to £850. This is an increase of approx 18% and concerns are already being expressed by Local Residents about the effect this may have on parking in the adjacent streets. In the press article East
Midlands Trains defended the rise saying that it represented good value for money and was considerably less than other places, quoting the Leicester charge of £1,232.

5.7 In addition the daily parking charge is rising from £6-50 to £7-50, a rise of 15%, although this rise is offset by the introduction of a new off-peak parking rate of £4 applicable on weekdays after 10.00am and all day Saturdays, Sundays and Bank Holidays.

5.8 In 2002 Wellingborough Borough Council with the approval of Northamptonshire County Council proposed to vary the existing limited waiting restriction in Alma Street to allow residents to purchase permits which would allow them to unrestricted parking in the restricted areas but would still allow shoppers and visitors to park in the street for limited periods.

5.9 While the approval for the scheme was given by the County Council they would not approve implementation of the proposal until the new enforcement measures had been put into place. Now that these measures are in place it is proposed not only to implement the resident permit facility in Alma Street but to allow the facility in other residential streets in the vicinity which have similar limited waiting restrictions.

5.10 It is suggested that as the original consultation on the introduction of a permit scheme in Alma Street was carried out seven years ago a further consultation is carried out in Alma Street and additionally now in Cannon Street, Great Park Street, Park Road and Heriots Lane to gain the views of the affected residents on the proposed permit scheme.

5.11 Following the previous reports into this proposal there has been a request that the limited parking bays in Cannon Street should be included in the proposal.

5.12 The attached appendix 1 sets out the above proposals in more detail.

5.13 Should the Council wish to proceed with either of the proposals all the properties within the proposed parking and residential permit areas area will need to be consulted. Draft consultation documents and reply slips are attached as appendix 4. Covering letters would be sent out with both documents.

5.14 The costs for the proposals amount to £53,500 and are detailed in 7.1 below and are made on the assumption that all the proposals are carried out as separate schemes. By carrying out both of the proposals together, the overall cost could be reduced by £2,700.

5.15 It is anticipated that the proposals could all be in place by the end of August 2009 providing no significant objections were received and on the assumption that over 50% of the residents were in favour of the residents permit schemes.

5.16 When carrying out the consultations, particularly where larger areas are involved, responses may vary and it may be necessary to reappraise the areas involved and to recon urgent on a revised area for residential parking.
5.17 The proposed programme to achieve this is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approval in Principle by Development Committee</td>
<td>7th January 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding approval by Resources Committee</td>
<td>10th February 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Council</td>
<td>3rd March 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td>April/May 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final approval by Development Committee</td>
<td>24th June 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Regulation Order in place</td>
<td>31st August 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>October 2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6 Legal Powers

6.1 Highways Act, 1980:
Road Traffic Act, 1991:

7 Financial and value for money implications

7.1 The cost of implementing the on-street parking measures would be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station Area – Commuter parking in residential areas</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td>£3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Order for 2-hour waiting limit</td>
<td>£2,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal order for residents permits</td>
<td>£2,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow Lining</td>
<td>£8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signing/posts</td>
<td>£16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowance for extending the area</td>
<td>£15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL ESTIMATED COST</td>
<td>£31,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residents Permits – Alma Street, Park Road etc</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consultation (if necessary)</td>
<td>£1,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Order for residents permits</td>
<td>£2,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Plates on posts</td>
<td>£1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowance for extending the area</td>
<td>£5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL ESTIMATED COST</td>
<td>£5,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.2 The cost of implementing the statutory orders for both proposals as separate schemes would be, £8,250. If both proposals were implemented at the same time, only two orders, a traffic regulation order and a resident’s permit order would be needed at a cost of £5,500.

7.3 There is no allowance in the Capital Programme at present and a bid for an allocation within the Capital programme of £53.5K needs to be made for the next (2009/10) financial year.

8 Risk analysis and Implications
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of risk</th>
<th>Consequences if realised</th>
<th>Likelihood of occurrence</th>
<th>Control measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unworkability of resident permit scheme in station area.</td>
<td>High number of public complaints</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Introduction of scheme only after majority approval of residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement of restrictions on residents cars in areas north of town centre</td>
<td>Complaints from the residents about lack of parking in vicinity of their houses</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Availability of permits for residents to park in the restricted areas all day</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.1 **Implications for Resources**
As the administration and enforcement would be carried out by the County Council there are no direct implications arising from this report.

8.2 **Implications for Stronger and Safer Communities**
The proposals will control the on-street parking in the residential areas and improve the overall environment.

8.3 **Implications for Equalities**
No direct implications.

9 **Author and Contact Officer**
Paul Thompson – Sustainable Infrastructure Manager

10 **Consultees**
Property Working Group
Dave Leveridge – Senior Financial Accountant
Andy Leighton – Parking Engineer, Northamptonshire County Council

11 **Background Papers**
Information from Northamptonshire County Council – 9th April 2008

PDT/HY/7/2 December 2008
Wellingborough On-street Parking
Proposed Revisions to Traffic Regulation Orders
Limited Waiting with Residential permits

1. Station Area – Commuter parking in residential areas

1.1 There is considerable demand from the residents in the streets surrounding the station for some kind of residents parking scheme because of the problems caused by rail users parking in the residential areas.

1.2 Currently the daily cost of parking in the station car park is £6.50, which is the prime reason for commuters parking their cars in the residential streets. This daily cost is reduced to the equivalent of approx £2.50/day if an annual season ticket is purchased at £650. While the north and south car parks have been approaching capacity recently, East Midlands Trains opened the new car park in Midland Road in March, on the old site of Higgins yard, increasing the capacity and availability of car parking spaces at the Station.

1.3 It is proposed that limited waiting areas should be introduced in the residential streets affected by commuter parking. The restrictions would be in place between 7am and 2pm and restrict parking to 2 hours max within this period and would be applicable Monday to Saturday.

1.4 It is also proposed that a residents parking scheme is also introduced within those streets allowing residents to purchase a parking permit which would exempt them from the restrictions providing the permit was displayed in the vehicle.

1.5 It is anticipated that the initial orders would include the following streets:- Colwell Road, Chace Road, Chester Road, Palk Road (part), Knox Road (part), Winstanley Road (part), Newcomen Road (part), Cromwell Court, Vivian Road, Melton Road, Whitworth Road, Compton Road, Salisbury Road, Dryden Road, Talbot Road. It may also include for the three hour limit only for current unrestricted areas on Midland Road and Senwick Road.

1.6 Before any orders were introduced it would be necessary to consult with the residents on all the streets upon which it is proposed to introduce the orders and a positive response from the majority of the properties is required to introduce both the restriction and the permit scheme regardless of the number of responses received.

1.7 Should there be a positive response from parts of the area but a negative response from other areas then the scope of the scheme could be revised and a further consultation carried out.
1.8 Within the consultation documents residents will be made aware of the fact that their street may not be affected to any great extent at present but that if the proposal is introduced in other nearby streets then the problem may be displaced to their street, hence the reason for the proposed scheme.

1.9 The approximate cost for the proposal would be £31,500 as follows:

- Legal order for 3-hour waiting limit: £2,750
- Legal order for residents permits: £2,750
- Approximate cost of yellow lines: £8,000
- Approximate cost of signing/posts: £16,000
- Consultation: £3,000

1.10 It should be noted that the proposed initial area is not conclusive or exhaustive and some areas may be needed to be added to or removed as a result of consultation. It is also unknown at this stage to what extent the introduction of the restrictions will displace the on-street parking by commuters to other streets. It is advised therefore that a further £15,000 is set aside to progress the proposals to further streets if it becomes necessary.

1.11 It is proposed that a charge of £25 is made for the purchase of a residents permit as part of the scheme to cover the cost of management, administration and enforcement for the first year with a review taking place on annual basis to take into account the actual cost of management, administration and enforcement.

1.12 Within the area proposed for the restrictions there are approximately 884 properties that do not have off-street parking facilities and approximately a further 280 that have some form of off-street parking. On the assumption that each property without off-street parking purchases a residential permit at £25. This would amount to £22,100. This does not take into account households with more than one car or those households that do not have a car.

2. Existing limited waiting areas in residential streets immediately to the north of the Town Centre – Alma Street, Park Road, etc.

2.1 In 2002, following representations from residents and a subsequent consultation with residents in Alma Street, Wellingborough Borough Council gained approval for a permit scheme in Alma Street whereby the existing 2-hour restrictions would remain but residents would be able to purchase residents permits if they desired to enable them to park all day. There would be no additional cost to enforcement as the parking officers would be able to ignore those vehicles following inspection of the permit.

2.2 The existing on-street restrictions were put in place to prevent all day parking by local workers and to provide additional on-street parking for shoppers etc.
2.3 While approval was given by the County Council for the proposal they wished to delay implementation until the new enforcement measures had been put into place.

2.4 It is proposed that a further consultation with the affected residents of Alma Street is carried out, extended to cover the affected residents in Great Park Street, Park Road and Heriots Lane. Providing that over 50% of the residents approve the scheme it is proposed that the resident permit scheme for Alma Street is implemented and extended to include the limited waiting restrictions in Great Park Street, Park Road and Heriots Lane.

2.5 Following the initial reports into the proposal for the Town Centre residential area there has been a request for the limited waiting bays in Cannon Street to be included in the proposal.

2.6 The approximate cost of the proposal would be £5,000 as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legal order to allow for residents permits</td>
<td>£2,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional plates on existing posts</td>
<td>£1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td>£1,250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.7 By combining the order with Station area resident permit order the cost of introducing the residents permit scheme in these areas would be reduced to £2,250.

2.8 As with the Station area it is proposed that a charge of £25 is made for the purchase of a residents permit as part of the scheme to cover the cost of management, administration and enforcement for the first year with a review taking place on annual basis to take into account the actual cost of management, administration and enforcement.

3. Programme:

5.1 The anticipated programme for the proposals is detailed below which includes a consultation period for the station area residents permit scheme.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approval in Principle by Development Committee</td>
<td>7th January 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding approval by Resources Committee</td>
<td>10th February 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Council</td>
<td>3rd March 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td>April/May 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final approval by Development Committee</td>
<td>24th June 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Regulation Order in place</td>
<td>31st August 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>October 2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3 The above programme assumes that there are no significant objections within the consultation period or the statutory notice period.

4. Financial Implications:
6.1 A summary of the financial implications is contained in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station Area – Commuter parking in residential areas</th>
<th>Consultation</th>
<th>£3,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Legal Order for 2-hour waiting limit</td>
<td>£2,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Legal order for residents permits</td>
<td>£2,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yellow Lining</td>
<td>£8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Signing/posts</td>
<td>£16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Allowance for extending the area</td>
<td>£15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Estimated Cost</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>£31,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Station Area – Commuter parking in residential areas</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residents Permits – Alma Street, Park Road etc</th>
<th>Consultation</th>
<th>£1,250</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Legal Order for residents permits</td>
<td>£2,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Additional Plates on posts</td>
<td>£1,000 £5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff Costs</strong></td>
<td>Implementation exc. Consultation</td>
<td>£2,000 £2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Estimated Cost</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>£53,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.2 Northamptonshire County Council have indicated that a charge of £25 as a charge for a permit is acceptable for the first year with the facility for a review on the charge in relation to the cost of enforcement, management & administration on an annual basis.
Appendix 3

Residential Parking Schemes

A. Northamptonshire County Council – Residents Parking Schemes Policy

Northamptonshire County Council have a Residents Parking Schemes Policy, relevant extracts of which are detailed below:

From the Northamptonshire County Council Residents’ Parking Schemes Policy Notes – December 2006.

1 Introduction

1.1 There are a number of residential areas in the County which are regularly subjected to some intrusion by parked vehicles not belonging to residents. This parking is generally generated by shoppers or commuters or visitors to a specific parking location such as a sports ground/stadium. In some of the areas the parking might prevent residents who have no off-street facility (forecourt, drive, garage etc) finding a parking space reasonably close to their home.

1.2 Traditional Traffic Regulation Orders (TRO’s) are used to alleviate any access, road safety or environmental problems associated with high levels of parking but these offer no priority to the residents affected – both residents and non-residents are equally affected by any such restrictions.

1.3 It is however, possible to give priority to residents by introducing Residents Permit Holders Only parking schemes and defining various parts of the highway where parking may be permitted only if a valid permit issued by the Highway Authority is displayed in the vehicle. Permits are normally only issued to residents living in a street within the zone and are under the control of, and issued at the discretion of the Highway Authority.

2 Criteria for Introducing Residents Parking Schemes

2.1 The following set of criteria should be met prior to the consideration of a Residents Parking Scheme:-

   a) Not less than 85% of the available kerb side space is occupied for more than six hours between 8am and 6pm on five or more days a week from Monday to Saturday inclusive, and a bona fide need of residents is established.

   b) Not more than 50% of the car owning residents have, or could have parking available within the curtilage of their own property, or within 200 metres walking distance by way of garages or other private off-street space.
c) The peak or normal working day demand for residents’ spaces should be able to be met.

d) The introduction of a scheme should not cause unacceptable problems in adjacent roads.

e) The Council is satisfied that a reasonable level of enforcement of the proposals can be maintained by Parking Attendants.

f) Permits for non-residential premises will be limited in their use to essential operational use only.

g) In areas where parking space is severely limited, the introduction of reserved parking does not seriously affect the commercial viability of the area.

h) After a full consultation process a minimum of 50% of the residents of the zone directly affected are in favour of the proposals.

2.2 The above criteria should be used as a guide and be treated as reasonable requirements for a scheme. Special circumstances need to be taken into consideration and it is therefore important to consider each scheme on its own merits.

4 Permit Types and Criteria for Issue

Residents Permits

4.1 Residents permits will only be issued to residents owning or keeping vehicles that live within the Residents Parking Scheme. A resident is defined as a person living in a property which has a frontage or vehicle access to a street named in the traffic regulation order for the Residents Parking Scheme. Flats are treated as separate addresses if they are separate for Council Tax rating, but houses in multiple occupancy are treated as one address. Proof of residency and proof of vehicle ownership or vehicle responsibility will be required.

4.2 Residents permits will be valid for 12 months, expiring at month end.

4.3 Residents permits are not transferable. In the event of a change of vehicle, the old permit should be surrendered in exchange for a new permit for the new vehicle. An administration charge will apply.

4.4 There will be a restriction on the number of permits issued per household to two. Each permit must be for a vehicle registered to the owner at the given address. Residents who have use of a company car, lease/hire car or who operate a taxi will require a letter, or lease agreement to confirm this arrangement.

Business Permits
4.5 Businesses operating within a Residents’ Parking Scheme may be considered eligible for a permit. The business will be limited to one business permit per business address/vehicle responsibility. These permits are not transferable. In the event of a change of vehicle, the old permit would be surrendered in exchange for a new permit for the new vehicle. An administration charge will be payable.

Visitors Permits

4.6 Short term visits will be accommodated by limited waiting areas which will be provided in all residents’ parking schemes.

4.7 Long term visits will be accommodated by the use of a visitors permit. These permits will be in the form of daily scratch cards. Visitors permits will be restricted to 50 per property per year. An administration charge will be applicable.

4.8 Visitors permits are available to all properties within the scheme whether or not they are in receipt of a residents’ parking permit. Proof of residency will be required from all applicants.

Carers/Medical Permits

4.9 Short term visits will be accommodated by the limited waiting areas which will be provided in all residents’ parking schemes.

4.10 Longer term visits will be accommodated by the use of a Carers/Medical Permit. These permits will be issued after strict procedures are agreed with the relevant organisations. These permits will be “District” based unless exceptional circumstances apply then a Countywide Permit will be issued.

5 Dispensations

TRO Exemptions

5.1 Exemptions to the traffic regulation orders will be required by certain visitors identified within each traffic regulation order. These exemptions include statutory undertakers vehicles whilst loading/unloading and vehicles picking up or setting down passengers. Dispensation will be issued to match the requirements of the traffic regulation orders. An administration charge will apply.

Trades People Dispensations

5.2 Dispensation will be permitted for the many different “trades” to service the area. These range from general building to property maintenance contractors who demonstrate the need to have their vehicle in attendance. An administration charge will apply.
5.3 Trades people such as mobile hairdressers and estate agents can be accommodated within the limited waiting areas or by the resident issuing a daily scratch card visitor permit.

5.4 Dispensations will only be issued for each individual request.

B. Issuing of Residents Permits

- At present Parking Permits are issued by Northamptonshire County Council at the Parking Shop, Riverside Way, off Bedford Road, Northampton.
- Postal applications are accepted but currently web applications are not. The facility to apply for a permit over the web is currently being investigated.
- Permits are processed and issued using a specialised software package. Each permit has a unique reference number and is fraud protected with holograms etc.
- The wording of the permit has to comply with the Traffic Regulation Order and as it would be part of the County Council’s enforcement scheme would need to be in the name of Northamptonshire County Council.
- Northamptonshire County Council has the production facility as part of the NCP contract for parking enforcement. Initial indications are that the cost of purchase and setting up of a stand alone permit management system is in the region of £12K excluding the running cost which would include annual maintenance and necessary upgrading.
- The charges for a permit are made up as follows:
  - 50% - Enforcement
  - 30% - Maintenance of signs and lining
  - 20% - Printing and administration

C. Northamptonshire County Council – Current position with regard to Residential Permit Charges

- Currently the cost of a resident’s permit in Northamptonshire is £25
- As the cost currently does not cover the cost of enforcement, management and administration in Northampton, a review of the charge is currently being made and has been consulted upon within the current areas in Northampton that are subject to residential parking schemes.
- In order to cover the cost of enforcement, maintenance and management & administration the charge of permits in Northampton needs to rise to £60.
- Following consultation the County Council have resolved to keep the charge at £25 while investigating whether improvements to the schemes can be made as the consultation, while showing that there was a satisfaction with the schemes, highlighted a number of areas where improvements need to be made if there was to be an increase in the charge.
- It should be noted that these charges are based on residents parking schemes which are applicable throughout the day and are only applicable to the Northampton residential parking schemes.
At the July Parking Partnership it was stated that charges for residential parking permits would be subject to negotiation and agreement between the County Council and the appropriate Borough/District Councils.
Parking problems near the Station

What is the problem?
Although adequate parking facilities are available at the railway station for commuters and other users of the railway, the cost of parking means that many rail-users park their vehicles in the nearby residential streets on a daily basis.

Most of the nearby residential streets do not have off-street parking areas, driveways or garages and residents have to park their cars in the street. Many complaints have been received because of the difficulties local residents have in finding parking places near their homes, because of the widespread parking within the residential streets by rail-users.

What do we propose to do?
Following discussions with Northamptonshire County Council (the Highway Authority) a scheme to resolve this parking problem has been suggested.

It is proposed that all the residential streets within the proximity of the railway station should be subject to waiting restrictions between 7am and 2pm, limiting parking to 2 hours. A resident’s permit scheme would also be introduced to allow residents to be exempt from the parking restrictions.

Where will be affected?
Initially the streets involved include all those bounded by Mill Lane to the North, Ranelagh Road, Midland Road and Chester Road to the West and Swanspool Brook to the South and are listed at the end of this document. The red line on the map to the left denotes the extent of the roads involved.

It should be noted that the streets that are further away from the station such as Ranelagh Road, Winstanley Road, Newcomen Road etc have been included as while they may not have a significant problem at present, it is anticipated that if the scheme were only to be introduced on the streets near to the station, the parking problems would be displaced to these streets and they have therefore been included in the scheme.

In order for the restrictions and a resident permit scheme to be introduced in any particular street or area, agreement needs to be obtained from over 50% of the
properties within that street or area. (e.g., in a street of 100 properties, 51 would need to say yes even if only, say, 52 replied).

**What will it cost?**

It is a requirement of a residential permit scheme that the costs of the management, administration, enforcement and maintenance of signs and lines are generally covered by the cost of the permit and it is proposed therefore that a charge of £25 per annum would be introduced for a residents permit with the charge being reviewed on an annual basis taking into account the actual costs incurred. The current proposed rate takes into account that the proposed restrictions will only be in operation in the morning and therefore enforcement will not be required all day. Other all day residential parking schemes do cost more.

As the need for the restrictions to be introduced relate almost solely to all-day parking, the two-hour limit of the restriction will still allow short term visitor parking in the morning and unrestricted visitor parking in the afternoon, overnight and on Sundays.

**Points for consideration.**

Residents in all of the streets proposed for the restrictions and the residents permit scheme are requested to seriously consider the proposals and in particular the problems that may occur if your particular street did not have the restrictions that neighbouring streets may have. With the cost of season ticket parking rising at the station the incidence of commuters parking in nearby residential streets may rise rather than fall with the associated parking problems for local residents.

Possession of a residents parking permit exempts the owner from the 2 hour restriction within the resident’s parking scheme area but does not entitle the holder to a specific parking space. The area allocated is available to ALL eligible permit holders.

**List of roads to be considered for parking restrictions and resident’s parking scheme**

- Britannia Gardens
- Chace Road
- Chester Road
- Colwell Road
- Compton Road
- Cromwell Court
- Dryden Road
- Knox Road (between Ranelagh Road and Talbot Road)
- Leyland View
- Melton Road
- Midland Road (where there is currently unrestricted parking between Ranelagh Road and the station)
- Mill Road (between Ranelagh Road and Talbot Road)
- Newcomen Road (between Ranelagh Road and Vivian Road)
- Palk Road (between Ranelagh Road and Knox Road)
- Ranelagh Road
- Salisbury Road
- Senwick Drive
- Senwick Road
- St Mary’s Paddock
- Talbot Road
- Vivian Road
- Whitworth Road
- Winstanley Road (between Ranelagh Road and Vivian Road)

If you would like to discuss any of the points raised in this document please contact Paul Thompson, Sustainable Infrastructure Manager, at the Borough Council of Wellingborough on 01933 231730 or e-mail pthompson@wellingborough.gov.uk.
Parking problems in the Town Centre

What is the problem?
All day parking by local workers and shoppers displacing Town Centre residents parking.

What do we propose to do?
Following discussions with Northamptonshire County Council (the Highway Authority) it has been suggested that a residents parking permit scheme be set up.

Where will be affected?
It is proposed that a residents parking permit scheme be set up in Alma Street, Great Park Street, Park Road and Heriots Lane whereby the existing 2-hour restrictions would remain but residents would be able to purchase permits if they desired to enable them to park all day. There has been a request for the limited waiting bays in Cannon Street to be included in the proposal. The affected areas are highlighted in red in the map below.

In order for the restrictions and a resident permit scheme to be introduced in any particular street or area, agreement needs to be obtained from over 50% of the properties within that street or area. (e.g., in a street of 100 properties, 51 would need to say yes even if only, say, 52 replied).

What will it cost?
It is a requirement of a residential permit scheme that the costs of the management, administration, enforcement and maintenance of signs and lines are generally covered by the cost of the permit and it is proposed therefore that a charge of £25 per annum would be introduced for a residents permit with the charge being reviewed on an annual basis taking into account the actual costs incurred. The current proposed rate takes into account that enforcement is already being undertaken and the proposal does not require additional enforcement. Other all day residential parking schemes do cost more.
Points for consideration.
Possession of a residents parking permit exempts the owner from the 2 hour restriction within the resident’s parking scheme area but does not entitle the holder to a specific parking space. The area allocated is available to ALL eligible permit holders.

If you would like to discuss any of the points raised in this document please contact Paul Thompson, Sustainable Infrastructure Manager, at the Borough Council of Wellingborough on 01933 231730 or e-mail pthompson@wellingborough.gov.uk.
Proposed On-Street Short Stay Parking Proposals and Residents Permit Scheme

Station Area – Wellingborough

Name: ...........................................................................................................................................................................

Address: ...........................................................................................................................................................................
......................................................................................................................................................................................
......................................................................................................................................................................................

Number of vehicles owned by persons normally residing at the property requiring on-street parking:

........................................................................................................

Do you agree with the proposals to introduce a scheme of 2-hour limited waiting between 6.00am and 2.00pm, Monday to Saturday, within your street with the option of residents purchasing a residents permit at £25 for the first year with an annual review of the charge based on actual management, administration and enforcement costs?

☐ Yes, I agree with the proposals

☐ No, I do not agree with the proposals

If no, please indicate here the reasons that you disagree with proposals.
......................................................................................................................................................................................
......................................................................................................................................................................................
......................................................................................................................................................................................
......................................................................................................................................................................................

Please add any further comments here.
......................................................................................................................................................................................
......................................................................................................................................................................................
......................................................................................................................................................................................
......................................................................................................................................................................................

Please return completed form to Paul Thompson, Borough Council of Wellingborough, Swanspool House, Doddington Road, Wellingborough NN8 1BP
Proposed Residents Permit Scheme for Short Stay On-street parking areas

Town Centre, Wellingborough

Name: ………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

Address: ………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

Number of vehicles owned by persons normally residing at the property requiring on-street parking:

……………………

Do you agree with the proposals to introduce a scheme for residents in those street locations subject to limited waiting periods, the option of purchasing a residents permit at £25 for the first year with an annual review of the charge based on actual management, administration and enforcement costs?

☐ Yes, I agree with the proposals

☐ No, I do not agree with the proposals

If no, please indicate here the reasons that you disagree with proposals.

……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

Please add any further comments here.

……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

Please return completed form to Paul Thompson, Borough Council of Wellingborough, Swanspool House, Doddington Road, Wellingborough NN8 1BP
BOROUGH COUNCIL OF WELLINGBOROUGH

AGENDA ITEM 6

Development Committee

7th January 2009

Report of the Corporate Director

WELLINGBOROUGH TOWN CENTRE PUBLIC REALM STRATEGY SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT

1 Purpose of Report
1.1 This report introduces the draft Public Realm Strategy Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and invites Members to recommend that it be approved for public consultation and that delegated authority be given to approve the related Sustainability Appraisal. The guidance supports policies in the Town Centre Area Action Plan and the adopted Core Spatial Strategy and is intended to contribute towards the Council’s objectives of delivering high quality growth; reducing crime and anti-social behaviour; and enhancing the environment.

2 Executive Summary
2.1 The Public Realm Strategy will supplement policies in the Development Plan. It will provide robust planning and design guidance to ensure that decisions relating to planning applications, investment and development decisions that affect the town centre’s public realm over the coming years to 2021 can be made in a co-ordinated way. Members are invited to recommend that the Strategy and associated Sustainability Appraisal be subject to public consultation.

3 Proposed Action
   The Committee is invited to RECOMMEND that:
   3.1 The Draft Public Realm Strategy Supplementary Planning Document be approved for public consultation; and
   3.2 Delegated authority is granted to the Corporate Director in consultation with the Chairman to approve the Sustainability Appraisal of the Draft Public Realm Strategy for public consultation.

4 Background
4.1 ‘Public realm’ is taken to mean the parts of the town (whether publicly or privately owned) that are available, without charge, for everyone to see, use and enjoy, including streets, squares and parks. The Public Realm Strategy will supplement policies in the adopted North Northamptonshire Core Spatial Strategy (CSS) and the Wellingborough Town Centre Area Action Plan (AAP). Policy 13 (General Sustainable Development Principles) of the CSS seeks the achievement of a high standard of design, architecture and landscaping and the creation of a strong sense of place by strengthening the distinctive historic and cultural qualities and townscape of the Borough through design, landscaping and use of public art.

4.2 The principal AAP policy of relevance is Policy WTC15: Public Realm Quality. This indicates that a high quality, well connected public realm will be pursued in order to improve the appearance, attractiveness and accessibility of the town centre. This will include: a rolling programme of improvements to streets and...
spaces using high quality co-ordinated materials; improvements to the quality of existing public spaces and the provision of new landscaped spaces as part of major development proposals; improvements to the quality of the pedestrian environment, ensuring that routes are clear, safe, attractive and convenient; improvements to the environment of key roads and crossings; the creation of attractive ‘gateway improvements’ to mark and enhance the main approaches to the town centre; and environmental improvements and landscaping in association with new development. The text associated with the Policy commits the Borough Council to the preparation of a Public Realm Strategy.

5. **Discussion**

5.1 The draft Public Realm Strategy is appended to this report. Part B includes an analysis of: the historic centre; movement into and around the area; relaxing in the town centre; and maintenance. Part C sets out a strategy consisting of a vision; design principles; a public realm framework; design guidelines; and an analysis of key focus areas. The vision is to create a place where people feel safe to play, relax and socialise. Sustainable modes of transport will be encouraged whilst improvements will encourage best quality, sustainable public spaces that celebrate Wellingborough’s heritage. This vision will be achieved through the implementation of a consistent materials palette, enhancement of the existing public realm and the creation of new landscaped spaces that reinforce the existing green infrastructure. The vision will be delivered through a complementary approach between public realm enhancement and delivery of new development.

5.2 The delivery of the vision will be achieved through the adoption of 5 key public realm principles. These include a place for people; a focus on walkability; celebrating heritage; encouraging best quality public spaces; and green links and ecology.

5.3 The document then identifies strategies that will not only help to improve the public realm, but that will also help create vitality. These strategies include improvements to the pedestrian environment and play spaces; making cycling more appealing and easier; public art, heritage, lighting, signage and wayfinding strategies; and measures to make the town safer and more accessible. More detailed guidance is also provided to indicate the application of the various strategies to key open spaces and streets within the town centre.

5.4 Design guidance is provided in order to inform the selection of a new materials palette including surface materials and lighting as well as street furniture elements. This guidance is accompanied by indicative examples. The town centre is divided into three material palette zones indicating the level of priority and subsequent investment considered appropriate in different parts of the town. The platinum zone, centred on the town centre core and the key gateways, is identified as the priority area for investment.

5.5 The Strategy includes concept plans for 6 “focus areas” which capture the key principles and guidance of the Strategy and illustrate how they could potentially be applied to specific locations within the town centre. The concept plans provide a basis for indicative costs relating to proposed public realm improvements and
will inform where there may be potential budget shortfalls that could be supplemented by other funding streams. Concept schemes are provided for The Hind / Market Street, Gloucester Place, Croyland Gardens, the Cultural Quarter and the High Street Site. A development and management plan is incorporated into the Strategy which includes three phases. In phase 1 (the period to 2011) it is proposed to focus on a ‘cruciform’ arrangement of principal streets and footpaths stretching from the High St/Jacksons Lane junction to Castle Way/London Rd and from Croyland Gardens to Gloucester Place via Market St.

5.5 A Sustainability Appraisal of the social, environmental and economic effects of the Strategy must also be published. The process of writing up the Sustainability Appraisal is being finalized at the time of preparing this report and delegated authority is therefore sought to agree this prior to public consultation. It is proposed to undertake community involvement on the draft document together with the proposals for the extension of the Conservation Area, a draft Shop Front and Advertisement Design Guide SPD and a draft Church St/Market Square Development Brief SPD in March/April of 2009. Members will be asked to consider the latter two documents at the next meeting of the Development Committee on February 11th.

6 **Legal Powers**

6.1 Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004

7. **Financial and value for money implications**

7.1 The proposals within the draft Public Realm Strategy have not been costed. Delivery will require funding to be secured from a variety of sources, both in terms of capital and revenue, including co-ordination of: Council funding streams; bus priority measures funded by the County Council; Growth Area Funding; potential Heritage Lottery Funding; and developer contributions.

8. **Risk analysis and Implications**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of risk</th>
<th>Consequences if realised</th>
<th>Likelihood of occurrence</th>
<th>Control measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>That a high quality, well connected public realm will not be achieved.</td>
<td>Failure to upgrade the appearance, attractiveness and accessibility of the town centre will impact adversely on its vitality and viability and fail to achieve the renaissance that is sought through the Town Centre AAP.</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Proceed with consultation and subsequent adoption and implementation of the Public Realm Strategy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Implications for Resources**

8.1 The Borough Council owns land and property within the area addressed by the
Public Realm Strategy. It is also envisaged that there will be the need for additional resources associated with the implementation and management of proposals.

Implications for Stronger and Safer Communities

8.2 The Strategy includes measures to assist in the development of stronger and safer communities. For example, one of its objectives is to ensure that spaces are safe and appealing.

Implications for Equalities

8.3 The Strategy is intended to enhance access and inclusion so that potential users, regardless of disability, age or gender can use the town centre safely and easily.

9. **Author and Contact Officers**
   Mike Hay Byrne - Planning Policy Manager

10. **Consultees**
    Steven Wood – Head of Built Environment.
    Paul Thompson – Sustainable Infrastructure Manager
    John Casserley – Head of Environmental Services
    Robert Vaughan – Property Services Manager
    Mike Kilpin – Development Control Manager
    Alex Benoy – Open Spaces Development Manager
    Alex Stevenson – Conservation Officer
    Felicity Webber – Landscape Officer
    Liz Flores – Cultural Development Manager
    Paula Armstrong – Arts Development Officer

11. **Background Papers**
    None
BOROUGH COUNCIL OF WELLINGBOROUGH  
Development Committee  
AGENDA ITEM 7  
7th January 2009

Report of the Corporate Director

PROPOSED EXTENDED CONSERVATION AREA FOR WELLINGBOROUGH TOWN CENTRE

1. Purpose of Report
   1.1 To seek Members' authority to proceed with formal consultation upon the proposed designation of an enlarged conservation area and upon the Draft Wellingborough Town Centre Conservation Appraisal itself. The document and enlarged conservation area will contribute towards the Council’s objectives of delivering high quality growth and enhancing the environment.

2. Executive Summary
   2.1 A review of the Town Centre Conservation Area (TCCA) was envisaged when the original area was designated in April 2003, with a view to possibly expanding it. Members subsequently gave authority for investigative work to be carried out by officers in respect of an enlarged TCCA at the Committee meeting on 19 March 2008. Investigative work has now been completed and is set out in the attached Wellingborough Town Centre Conservation Appraisal.

   2.2 The Council has a duty to identify appropriate places to be designated as conservation areas and then to actively manage their preservation and physical improvement. Designation of a larger TCCA would allow tighter controls over the form and appearance of new development proposals in sub-central mixed use and residential areas, in the interests of reinforcing the positive aspects of the area’s existing (historic) character. Also, specifically, demolition of any building over 115 cubic metres in the designation area would require Conservation Area Consent.

3. Proposed Action
   3.1 The Committee is invited to RECOMMEND that consultation take place with interested parties upon the proposed designation of a conservation area as shown on the map included in the Wellingborough Town Centre Conservation Area Appraisal attached to this report, and upon the Draft Appraisal itself.

4. Background
   4.1 Section 69 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act, 1990 imposes a duty on local planning authorities to designate as conservation areas any “areas of special architectural or historic interest the character or appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance”. Furthermore, Government policy, as set out in the guidance note Planning and the Historic Environment (PPG15), indicates that all designated conservation areas require an associated formal character appraisal incorporating a management plan. An
authority’s justification for designation, as reflected in a systematic assessment of an area’s special interest and its character and appearance, is a factor which the Secretary of State will take into account in considering appeals against refusals of conservation area consent for demolition, and appeals against refusals of planning permission. A detailed character appraisal will, by the same token, render the North Northamptonshire Core Spatial Strategy Policy 13 which is concerned with strengthening Wellingborough’s distinctive historic and cultural qualities and townscape, more capable of effective implementation.

5. **Discussion**
   5.1 Detailed preparatory work has now been carried out and the accompanying document comprises a Draft Wellingborough Town Centre Conservation Area Appraisal. It is proposed that this draft appraisal be subject to consultation in March/April along with Supplementary Planning Documents that are being prepared in order to support the Town Centre AAP. Consultation would be undertaken with interested parties including the Ward Councillors, Chamber of Trade, Town Centre Partnership, English Heritage, County Council, Civic Society and local residents. A finalised appraisal, taking account of consultation responses, would then be brought to Committee for final ratification.

6. **Legal Powers**

7. **Financial and value for money implications**
   7.1 Budgetary provision will be required for implementation of the items in the draft management plan (section 8) contained within the Appraisal. A bid for funds from the Council’s capital programme would be required. This aspect has been acknowledged and noted by the Head of Financial Services. Officers are also investigating possible match funding opportunities through the Heritage Lottery Fund and English Heritage. Additional funding may also be available through the Growth Area Fund structure and developer contributions.

8. **Risk Analysis and Implications**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of risk</th>
<th>Consequences if realised</th>
<th>Likelihood of occurrence</th>
<th>Control measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>That new development within the town centre will not be sensitive to the existing historic fabric</td>
<td>Substandard development and inappropriate public realm improvements</td>
<td>Medium/high</td>
<td>Proceed with designation process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.1 **Implications for Resources**
The management and implementation of a number of the tasks identified in the Town Centre Conservation Appraisal will place additional demands on the Council and particularly on the Conservation Officer. The Council also owns land and property within the existing and extended conservation area which will be subject to the opportunities and restrictions which apply to buildings within a conservation area.
8.2 **Implications for Stronger Communities**  
Positive. Studies have shown that attractively designed and managed urban environments are more valued by people and engender a greater perception of safety than those which suffer from poor layout, design, maintenance and management.

8.3 **Implications for Equalities**  
None arising from this report.

9. **Author and Contact Officers**  
Alex Stevenson – Design and Conservation Officer

10. **Consultees**  
Steven Wood – Head of Built Environment.  
Mike Haybyrne – Planning Policy Manager  
Rob Wilton – Head of Financial Services  
Robert Vaughan – Property Services Manager  
Mike Kilpin – Development Control Manager

11. **Background Papers**  
None
Purpose of Report

(a) To keep members appraised of the latest progress on the project programme for the Town Centre redevelopment and specific issues which may require understanding and guidance from members on specific projects.

(b) To allow members of the Development Committee to request further information on specific issues and to take any necessary action as appropriate.

This proposed action helps to achieve the Council's corporate objective of Promoting High Quality Growth and Enhancing the Environment.

Executive Summary

This report gives an overview of the present position of implementation against the Town Centre Project Programme.

Proposed Action

Members NOTE the ‘RAG’ report attached at appendix I and provide any comment to officers as appropriate.

Background

Following the approval of the Town Centre Healthcheck and Implementation Plan at Development Committee in November 2008 it was agreed that a progress report in the form of a RAG (Red-Amber-Green) report would be regularly submitted to the Development Committee. This will provide members with information on all Town Centre projects and a summary of action which can help inform members and allow them to guide officer in the implementation of the town centre redevelopment.

Discussion

The town centre healthcheck process developed a series of systems, governance arrangements and reporting mechanism that would allow the Council through the Development Committee to effectively monitor and manager the town centre redevelopment programme.

The report attached as Appendix I is a monthly RAG (Red-Amber-Green) report which covers the following:
• Major milestones from all projects
• Achievements within the reporting period
• Current issues and changes to the programme or risk profile
• Scheduled tasks for the next period
• Financial cost planning
• Link to further documents

5.3 Members are requested to note the report and provide any appropriate comments to officers.

6 Legal Powers
6.1 Local Government Act 1972
6.2 Local Government Act 2000
6.3 Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004

7 Financial and value for money implications
7.1 Significant funds will be needed to achieve the project outcomes and the financial cost planning section of the report will help members to understand the funding resources that will be required to deliver these projects. Any funding requirements not already within existing budgets will be highlighted and if approved relevant reports will be developed to bid for these additional resources.

8 Risk analysis and Implications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of risk</th>
<th>Consequences if realised</th>
<th>Likelihood of occurrence</th>
<th>Control measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Town Centre regeneration programme does not progress as desired</td>
<td>What would happen if this thing did occur?</td>
<td>How likely is this to occur?</td>
<td>What can we do to mitigate the risk?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The investment and redevelopment of town centre sites does not occur leaving the town vulnerable to further economic decline and stagnation.</td>
<td>Medium to High</td>
<td>Implement the recommendations from the Town Centre Health check and Implementation Plan and review the risk implications and project progress through the monthly RAG reports at Development Committee.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8.1 **Implications for Resources**
(a) Significant internal and external resources needed throughout the plan delivery process. A better planned and costed delivery programme will enable greater potential to access and lever in additional external funding.

8.2 **Implications for Stronger and Safer Communities**
(a) Major contribution to community cohesion, and community safety matters and the objectives within the local area agreement

8.3 **Implications for Equalities**
(a) Major obligation within the design and evaluation of projects to assess the impact of proposals both in terms of project management and on different groups in Wellingborough

9 **Author and Contact Officer**
Steven Wood – Head of built Environment

10 **Consultees**
Town Centre Project Managers
James Wilson – Corporate Director
Joe Hubbard – Assistant Chief Executive

11 **Background Papers**
11.1 Copies of the weekly RAG reports, project level execution plans and associated documents such as the risk register can be made available to all members as required to provide detailed methodology for the day to day running of the project delivery teams and development support team.
Borough Council Of Wellingborough
Town Centre Regeneration
Monthly RAG Report

Project Name: Wellingborough Town Centre Regeneration
Month Ending Friday: 28/11/08
Programme Manager: Dominic Lees
Project Sponsor: James Wilson
Project Number: 24886
Status: Green - No issues. Amber – Project Board can handle any issues. Red – Project Board need input from Development committee or missing major milestone

Reason if status not Green:

Project Purpose: The regeneration of the town centre incorporating Tresham college, the High Street, Church Street, Market Square, Public Realm, Transportation Projects and Town Centre Development Sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Milestones (completed tasks older than 7 days have been deleted)</th>
<th>Original (rev 1)</th>
<th>Revised (Rev 4)</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>LSC Regional Approval in principle to Tresham College Redevelopment</td>
<td>18 12 08</td>
<td>22 10 08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Issue Project Execution Plans, update strategic prog’ &amp; project business case by team leaders</td>
<td>31 10 08</td>
<td>30 01 09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Receipt of AAP inspectors questions and team workshop to plan response</td>
<td>03 11 08</td>
<td>03 11 08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Commission outstanding strategies -Communication, Utilities, Transport &amp; Parking</td>
<td>12 08 08</td>
<td>12 11 08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Committee approval of programme management process &amp; cost planning resource as per Implementation plan and healthcheck recommendations</td>
<td>01 10 08</td>
<td>12 11 08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Receipt of GAF III funding bids &amp; allocation of funding streams</td>
<td>20 11 08</td>
<td>15 12 08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Start members consultation and workshops to Planning Support Documents in support of AAP</td>
<td>17 11 08</td>
<td>03 12 08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>LSC National AIP to Tresham funding bid in writing</td>
<td>03 12 08</td>
<td>17 12 08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Submit Public Realm Design for committee approval and commence planning consent</td>
<td>03 12 08</td>
<td>24 01 09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>AAP response proposals submitted to Inspector</td>
<td>20 01 09</td>
<td>17 12 08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Review of AAP respondents submissions</td>
<td>06 01 09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Commence AAP Public Inquiry</td>
<td>14 02 09</td>
<td>27 01 09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Commence full planning consent approval for Tresham College</td>
<td>25 01 09</td>
<td>09 02 09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Agree vacant possession for Tresham College and land assembly taxation rights</td>
<td>25 01 09</td>
<td>02 02 09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Agree strategy for delivery of supplementary development sites</td>
<td>10 02 09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Submit and obtain FC approval for Supplementary planning documents</td>
<td>01 03 09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Submit and obtain approval for developers design brief (High St)</td>
<td>10 03 09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Completion of developers design brief &amp; due diligence</td>
<td>30 04 09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>AAP Approval</td>
<td>30 06 09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Publish OJEU notice &amp; prepare shortlist of developers for High St</td>
<td>20 10 09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Achievements this Period (Milestones or Major Tasks Completed)

1. Ongoing AAP question and legal response process for Public Inquiry. Drivers Jonas and Roger Tyms support of process agreed.
2. Agreement of implementation plan by committee setting out the process for delivery of regeneration
3. Commencement of AAP Project Execution Plans with project team leaders
4. Commencement of Transport and Parking working group coordinated with NNDC and NCC. May Gurney WSP
5. Draft presentations of planning support documents to members and TCAG – Public Realm Scheme, Conservation Area Appraisal and Shop Front Design Guide. Committee dates agreed and consultation planned for March 2009
6. Draft proposal for communication strategy issued by Breeze in coordination with NNDC.
### Current Issues, Changes or Risks – refer to project risk register for detail Rev 4: 28/11/08

1. The accelerated timeline for consultation and member review for the planning support documents needs to be managed to ensure member buy in to the process. Members’ workshop completed 03 12 08 with successful feedback to team. Communication must be ongoing to meet members’ expectations.

2. The benefits of the PEP may be clearly seen within the AAP work, time must be allocated to each team leader to produce an updated PEP before the next development committee.

3. No strategic cost plan in place, Funding cycles are not linked to resourcing needs or timeline creating high risk of shortfall or under spend and inability to control programme delivery. Interim cost planning commission to be instructed to ensure BCW team accountable and auditable throughout development process.

4. The utility strategy work with the EA has highlighted the critical delivery of the Broadholme sewage treatment works extension. The updated Water Cycle study is due to be issued 16 12 08 updating impact of AAP.

5. The Tesco objection to the AAP is the major risk to the AAP inquiry, arguing for the change in policy that would allow an increase in their convenience shopping floor space.

6. Tresham land assembly and legal agreements must be concluded by close Jan 09 – in order to achieve this the vacant possession and interim lease agreements must be agreed.

7. The cost planning commission within the team requires procurement. Strategy for service commission to be agreed to support the regeneration team and promote fund management.

8. Member involvement and delegation requires mapping for each project within the Town Centre.

9. The team members within the programme board require agreement and communicating to the wider team. This should consider the members delegated and mandatory consultation role.

10. Review of procurement strategy going forward to be undertaken. English Partnership or East Midland framework proposed for review. Mace / BCW review timeline required - propose 1st April 09 to have procured project delivery teams.

11. The expansion of the conservation area within the draft appraisal document must be reviewed in light of proposed PPG15 land values reduced to nil within development agreements. The proposal currently highlights potential buildings listed for CPO and demolition within the AAP for a conservation status in direct contravention of AAP policy. Consultation period ongoing to Feb 09 when changes are to be incorporated before adoption of policy.

### Scheduled Tasks for Next Period Ending 23/12/08

1. Completion of the communications brief and review of shortlist specialist consultants (28/11)

2. Topographical survey of site J to complete EA report for AAP inquiry

3. Completion of AAP project execution plan – updating strategic programme and business case

4. Review and update of utilities risk review to include the delivery of Broadholme expansion

5. Review of AAP response by programme board to question A, B, C, D, E & F

6. Update and issue of ongoing Mace programme management commission

7. Issue of response document to AAP inspector on 17th Dec 08

8. Review of objectors responses within AAP inquiry and draft of Inquiry Plan to be agreed

9. Revision 4 strategic programme to be developed reviewing and highlighting resource allocation over the next 24 months

### Financial Planning and Fund Management

#### Key Issues

1. Appointment of cost planning team to enable development of project and programme level cost planning against cash flow forecasting and funding strategy / cycles

2. Project level cost plans unknown to programme management team, budget allocations unclear.

3. Funding management and active fund applications team to be commissioned to allow additional fund streams to be developed

4. No change control system in place at present- await agreement of project cost plan to create base line budget figures
## Borough Council Of Wellingborough
### Town Centre Regeneration
#### Monthly RAG Report

### Summary team / project budget allocations 2008 / 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delivery Team</th>
<th>Original allocation</th>
<th>Forecast allocation</th>
<th>Funding / Budget Deficit / contingency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. AAP adoption and inquiry (inc' planning support documents)</td>
<td>£100,000</td>
<td>Not commissioned</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Tresham redevelopment team</td>
<td>£2,450,000</td>
<td>£2,980,994</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. High Street Redevelopment team</td>
<td>£50,000</td>
<td>Not commissioned</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Church Street and Market Square redevelopment team</td>
<td>£275,000</td>
<td>Not commissioned</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Transportation Projects</td>
<td>nil</td>
<td>Not commissioned</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Public Realm Delivery projects</td>
<td>nil</td>
<td>Not commissioned</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Supplementary development sites</td>
<td>nil</td>
<td>Not commissioned</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Development Support Team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Support Team</th>
<th>Original allocation</th>
<th>Forecast allocation</th>
<th>Funding / Budget Deficit / contingency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Planning team – Public Realm Strategy</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>£88,000</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Planning team – Conservation Area Appraisal</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>£73,542</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Planning team – Shop front Design Guide</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>£60,000</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Planning team – Planning Support Document (Ch St/Mrkt Sq)</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>£78,000</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Finance team</td>
<td>nil</td>
<td>£75,000</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. CPO – Acquisition team</td>
<td>£1,120,000</td>
<td>£1,010,000</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Transportation</td>
<td>£7,075,000</td>
<td>Est £94,000</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Parking</td>
<td>£16,000</td>
<td>Est £56,000</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Utilities</td>
<td>nil</td>
<td>Est £30,000</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Housing &amp; employment growth strategy</td>
<td>nil</td>
<td>Est £25,000</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Communications Strategy</td>
<td>nil</td>
<td>Est £60,000</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Summary Cost Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The Budget</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The Estimated Final Cost</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The Current Commitment</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The Orders Not Placed (includes Contingencies)</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The Contingency</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The certified to date payment value</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Change Control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change Control</th>
<th>Change Order Value</th>
<th>Funding Stream</th>
<th>Date For Approval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Change order CRF 001/24886/03- 081208</td>
<td>£10,203.05</td>
<td>High Street</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendices;

1. Risk Register
   Please refer to attached file;

   C:\Documents and Settings\dole\My Doc

2. Strategic Milestone Programme
   Please refer to attached file;

   C:\Documents and Settings\dole\My Doc

3. Cost Plan – to be commissioned and included within February 2009 report

4. Weekly Programme Manager RAG Reports
   Please refer to attached file;

   C:\Documents and Settings\dole\My Doc
REPORT OF ACTION TAKEN UNDER URGENT DELEGATED POWERS.

REGIONAL FUNDING ADVICE (RFA2)

1  Purpose of Report
1.1  To report action agreed by the Chair under urgent delegated powers to respond to consultation upon the Regional Funding Advice (RFA2) consultation.

2  Executive Summary
2.1  This report provides retrospective advice to members of the Committee on the urgent action taken in agreement with the Chairman to respond to the RFA2 consultation.

3  Proposed Action
That Members note this report

4.  Background
4.1  The Government is seeking views from stakeholders on the Regional Funding Advice consultation. This provides a mechanism for the regions to advise government on the priorities for transport, housing, economic development and skills and looks at the next 3 years 2008/09 to 2010/11 with planning assumptions through until 2018/19.

5.  Discussion
5.1  The consultation response is attached as an appendix to this report.
5.2  Officers also attended a consultation event in Leicester on 20th November 2008 and fed in their views. Responses were required by 28th November.

6  Legal Powers
6.1  Local Government Act 2000

7.  Financial and value for money implications
7.1  Major funding allocation for transport, housing, economic development and skills are made on the basis of this advice to government and can have major implications for prioritising funding for this sub region.
8. Risk analysis and Implications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of risk</th>
<th>Consequences if realised</th>
<th>Likelihood of occurrence</th>
<th>Control measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Failure to respond could result in the specific interests of the Borough not being recognised.</td>
<td>The proposals put forward suggest prioritising projects which will be beneficial for the growth and infrastructure provision for Wellingborough.</td>
<td>High.</td>
<td>Ensure response is made within deadlines.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Implications for Resources
8.1 None arising directly from this report.

Implications for Stronger and Safer Communities
8.2 None arising directly from this report

Implications for Equalities
8.3 None arising directly from this report

9. Author and Contact Officers
James Wilson – Corporate Director

10. Consultees

11. Background Papers
None
Response to EMDA’s Regional Funding Advice: Issues Paper

Q1. How should the Region focus investment in order to strengthen its resilience and secure its long term future in the context of difficult economic circumstances?

Investment ought to be focussed on the delivery of agreed priorities for housing and employment growth, in areas which have been designated growth areas and provide the best opportunity to deliver national targets. Additional investment for transport infrastructure, education and skills development and employment needs to be aligned to facilitate the delivery of increased housing growth.

In difficult economic times investment needs to be made available to pump prime private sector investment to overcome cashflow difficulties for housebuilders and developers who will be struggling to make major schemes economically viable.

Q2. What are the implications for investment across transport, housing and regeneration, economic development and skills in relation to the challenge the Region faces in adapting to and contributing to mitigating climate change?

Investment across transport, housing and regeneration, economic development and skills should be taking account of carbon emission and the role that major infrastructure can make in seeking to reduce the region’s carbon footprint and meet our carbon reduction targets. Unfortunately, these targets have been very ambitious in times when the economy has been buoyant; achieving them during an economic downturn will be even more challenging. The assessment of climate change impacts and the minimisation of carbon emissions from major infrastructure projects should be an integral part of developing a business case for funding, however, there should also be a refocusing on where public agencies can make the biggest impact on carbon reductions and resources should be reallocated accordingly. For example better insulation and energy efficiency of the existing housing stock would make a bigger impact than increasing new build energy efficiency through the Code for Sustainable Homes. A more diversified localised energy strategy providing for a greater range of renewable energy for communities may also have greater effect.

Q3. What are the investment priorities for the region in terms of delivering sustainable plan-led housing and economic growth and regenerating urban areas and existing communities? Should the Regional Funding Allocations be top-sliced to create a Regional Infrastructure Fund?

North Northamptonshire has adopted its Core Spatial Strategy and could be regarded as having a plan-led approach to delivering sustainable
housing and economic growth. To achieve the delivery of the housing growth in this sub-region it is crucial for the Government to meet the funding requirements as set out in the Programme of Development (PoD). This demands rapid solutions and funding commitments to major obstacles to growth such as the A14 and provision of potable and foul water sewage facilities. The Inspector found that the Core Spatial Strategy for the sub-region was sound however an immediate review was necessary to understand how infrastructure could be provided to ensure that growth was sustainable. In Wellingborough key infrastructure projects such as the Isham Bypass and Isham to Wellingborough Improvement project (IWIMP) are critical to enable the release of further housing development in the form of the North West Wellingborough Sustainable Urban Extension. A similar solution for the A45, to that of the A14, is required especially a grade separated junction for Wilby Way to enable the Highways Agency to be confident that congestion levels created by the growth will be acceptable.

Further investment is also required to deliver an integrated transport interchange centred on Wellingborough Station which needs the Eastern Inner Relief Road to provide greater accessibility and facilitate the delivery of a new central business district for the town. The Council’s Town Centre Area Action Plan, recently submitted to the Secretary of State, provides for the plan-led regeneration of the town centre on the redevelopment of Tresham College and provision of a major addition of retail development which is sympathetic to the existing heritage and creating high quality public realm. Some of this regeneration will require public funding and support especially in this harder economic climate.

We do not think that the Regional Funding Allocation should be top-sliced to create a Regional Infrastructure Fund unless this is done at a sub-regional level such as for North Northamptonshire to be administered by the Local Delivery Vehicle to deliver against local priorities identified in the PoD. The provision of a sub-regional tariff which could be pooled with main government funding streams and the FRA through the forthcoming Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) legislation would be the best way to fund local infrastructure.

**Q4. In the context of the cost of initial transport scheme proposals from stakeholders far exceeding the funding allocation, how can the region develop a more outcome-focused (as opposed to scheme-led) approach to identifying and working up transport investment priorities in order to deliver on wider economic, housing and regeneration policies?**

Greater rigour should be applied in assessing the delivery of wider housing, economic and regeneration objectives than has previously been the case. In the context of major cost inflation which has been experienced by the very large capital schemes the relative impact and ability to deliver against Government priorities for housing, employment land and town centre regeneration must be demonstrated for scheme to be approved.
Q5. Should a regional fund be created, by top-slicing LTP integrated transport block, to invest in packages of small scale integrated transport measures concentrated in particular areas where they could have as a significant impact in solving transport problems and delivering wider policy priorities?

No – See answer above. A series of sub-regional fund could be established to allow smaller highways and transport schemes to come forward, however, major capital schemes still will need to be delivered and other funding streams such as Community Infrastructure Fund (CIF) and Transport Infrastructure Fund (TIF) should be used to promote more innovative transport solutions.

Q6. How can the Region achieve the right approach and balance in targeting investment with the aims of delivering significant plan led housing and employment growth, whilst regenerating and tackling deprivation in and problems of city flight from existing urban and former industrial areas, and tackling problems of affordability in rural areas?

The first thing to be said is that Region Funding investment should be targeted and focussed where there has been significant planning to deliver integrated outcomes e.g. around Programmes of Development. Therefore, where transport, economic development, housing or skills public investment can be demonstrated to be leveraging substantial private sector investment which is delivering against multiple objectives then these investments which will help to unlock this wider investment should be prioritised.

A prime example of this would be investment in road infrastructure which is deemed a priority to help deliver housing growth in North Northamptonshire. A solution to capacity issues on the A14 has been a barrier to the growth of the sub region and while this is considered to be a national priority for funding and not part of the RFA the ‘western Corridor’ which runs north to south for North Northamptonshire is fundamental to the delivery of the growth in this area. The Isham to Wellingborough Improvement (IWIMP) road which will extend the Isham Bypass is apart of this and will help to unlock a minimum of 3,000 dwellings.

Problems of city flight and issues of regenerating former industrial areas or accessibility/affordability in rural area should also have a plan led approach which can demonstrate the cost/benefit approach to public investment and how this can regenerate areas where there has been market failure and what the outcomes are likely to be from this investment.

Q7. What are the implications of current housing and property market conditions for public sector investment to deliver housing growth (including affordable housing) and physical regeneration?
The implications of the current housing and property market conditions are that the private sector is finding it increasingly difficult to move ahead with planned development of investment without support from the public sector. Uncertainty in the mortgage markets and increased risk profiles for developers mean that many are either not pursuing schemes and land banking or revisiting s106 agreements to make schemes more commercially viable.

Affordable housing is also being hit. Some RSLs are able to bring forward developments where they have grant allocation and cash to purchase sites at lower cost however schemes that where based on previously inflated land prices are now difficult to deliver.

In order to continue the delivery of housing growth and regeneration the use of forward funding and public investment to help de risk development schemes will be essential. It may also be appropriate to focus on employment development and jobs creation at this time to help ensure that growth is infrastructure and jobs led rather than being housing led.

Q8. How can investment be used to strengthen the adaptive capacity and resilience of the region’s economy, responding to the challenges, issues and opportunities posed by the structure of the region’s economy recognising the service sector has accounted for a large proportion of the economic growth in the last decade, the region has a significant manufacturing sector, and in the context of the RES priority sectors of food and drink, healthcare, construction and transport equipment?

According to Oxford Economics it seems more likely that areas of diversified employment such as in the East Midlands might be more resilient to the economic downturn rather than areas dependent on financial services or service industries in general. Having said this, the East Midlands in the longer term still needs to be protecting itself against over reliance on manufacturing sector and it long term decline. In respect of the RES priority sectors these still remain important during the economic recession especially food and drink and construction for Northamptonshire.

Off site housing construction manufacturing could be a major area of expansion which could generate large numbers of jobs given the significant allocation of housing for the East Midlands and the fact that it is the fastest growing UK region. Likewise an increase in the design, manufacture and installation of green technologies and waste processing could also generate significant employment opportunities while helping to achieve carbon emissions targets.

Q9. In the context of changing market conditions how can the Region support and stimulate demand for and investment in learning and skills development, innovation and enterprise from businesses?
The improvement of education and skills levels and increase in performance in the Region is fundamental in underpinning the physical, economic and social regeneration of areas. This will help attract new businesses, retain the most talented youngsters and provide greater ambition for businesses to succeed in the Region.

The support for investment in new HE/FE colleges is essential to offer quality teaching in state of the art facilities. Tresham Institute has recently been working with Wellingborough, Kettering and Corby to redevelop all of its campus’ within these towns and also to bid for university status thereby giving Northamptonshire two university accredited organisations whereas until recently there had been none which was a serious gap in provision for this part of the Region.

Further funding could be made available to help make these redevelopments viable. The Council has put significant resources of its own in to provide a site and underwrite future infrastructure costs which should be contributed to by development. Education uses have less ability to pay these and therefore the RFA or other grant funding should recognise this.

Greater emphasis needs to be placed on enterprise for young people still at school in order for them to identify business start up and self employment as a viable route for a future career/job. Wellingborough has encouraged its local schools to get involved in enterprise week and promoted entrepreneurship through Young Enterprise. There is much more that can be done and the provision of grants and low cost accommodation on easy terms are some initiatives that the Council has employed in the past. The Wellingborough Innovation Centre which is operated by Oxford Innovations has proved very successful and has become a focus for business start up and enterprise. Sadly this will close when the relocation of Tresham occurs in 2010/2011 and a replacement facility could be beneficial in fostering a greater level of business start up.

Q10. What are the implications for planning and delivery of learning and skills of the region’s wider economic development priorities, its plans for delivering population and housing growth and regeneration, and changing travel-to-learn pattern?

In North Northamptonshire there has been a deficit in the provision of Learning and Skills which is in the process of being addressed through the application for university status from Tresham. This deficit has caused a problem of retaining the sub region’s best talent as mentioned above and this will only be exacerbated by further housing growth and regeneration. While the model for degree level education may further change and be more deliverable on an individual and remote basis there will still be the need to provide a hub for learning within each town or locality. This will reduce the travel to learn catchment area and also help
to kick start the regeneration of town centres by providing a major investment in educational infrastructure.

The planning for learning and skills and curriculum development also needs to be focussed on the economic priorities for the region, therefore our Regional sector priorities should have a corresponding level of investment in training and provision of courses in these areas.