

## Appendix 2: Draft Masterplan Consultation – Summary of responses received

| Draft Lichfield City Centre Masterplan Consultation |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| Project   | Comment   | Suggested Masterplan Change  |
| <b>The Masterplan Approach</b>                      |   |  |
| <b>Overall Strategy</b>                             | <b>77%</b> of respondents answered 'yes' to Question 1 'Do you think that the overall strategy is correct?'   |  |
|   | There is strong support for the weight given towards sustaining and enhancing the significance of the historic environment and heritage assets. The majority of respondents agreed that the Masterplan approach is appropriate, although some concerns were raised in relation to specific development opportunities. |  |
|   | More focus on sustainability as a guiding principle for the Masterplan. Lichfield should be proactive in working towards carbon neutrality.   | Addressed in Draft Masterplan (Objective 6).   |
|   | The cumulative scale of future development proposals appears to be out of character with the realistic capacity of the historic environment; scale of development proposed has the potential to lead to over-intensive and inappropriate forms.   | Comment noted. The proposed mix of uses has been developed having regard to the complementary uses which would support a "Speciality" centre and in ensuring proposals in the masterplan are both achievable and deliverable.                      |
| <b>Quarters</b>                                     | <b>73%</b> of respondents answered 'yes' to Question 2 'Is it helpful to think about the city centre in terms of quarters?'   |  |
| <b>Development Opportunities</b>                    |   |  |
| <b>1. Birmingham Road Gateway</b>                   | <b>78%</b> of respondents answered 'yes' to Question 3 'Do you think the 'Birmingham Road Gateway' development opportunity will help to improve the city centre?'   |  |
|   | The respondents who provided additional commentary in response to this development opportunity were generally very positive about the proposed mix of uses and consider the proposal to be an improvement on the former Friarsgate scheme.  |  |
|   | There is a need for affordable housing in Lichfield.  | Addressed in Draft Masterplan:<br>'focus on providing affordable homes to meet identified local need' (Paragraph 3.5).   |
|   | Pressure on local GPs due to increased residential properties.  | Comment noted.   |
|   | The provision for car parking is inadequate to accommodate existing demand and proposed new activities (e.g. cinema).   | Analysis of existing parking data informed the city-wide strategy for parking provision and is considered appropriate for the City Centre's needs, whilst seeking to also promote more sustainable forms of travel and less reliance on car usage. |
|   | Questioned whether car parking could be reduced / relocated to the periphery of the City, instead of a new MSCP?  |  |
|   | Suggestion that the new multi-storey car park should offer 10-minutes free parking, to allow for pick-up/drop-off at the Bus Station and Train Station.   | Suggested additional text under 'Parking and servicing';<br><a href="#">Future car park pricing strategy and associated management to be considered by LDC.</a>  |

|                                  |  |  |
|----------------------------------|--|--|
|                                  | Consideration should be given to creating a public open space at the junction of St John Street and Birmingham Road to enhance the approach from Lichfield City Railway Station and the setting and appreciation of the Listed Hospital of St John and the District Council House.   | Comment noted. However, the provision of an area of open space adjacent to the junction of St John Street and Birmingham Road is not considered to provide an appropriate or attractive location for residents/ visitors to use. Areas of public open space are provided for elsewhere across the city.  |
|                                  | The inter-relationship between any new restaurants and the Transport Hub will need to be carefully designed to provide an attractive outlook.  | Suggested additional text under 'Key Design & Development Considerations';<br><u>Development will be designed to manage the interface between the proposed restaurant/cafe offer and the adjacent bus station.</u>   |
|                                  | Would like details on size of any proposed hotel.  | The detailed design of any such new hotel would be driven by operator demand and be subject to a planning application.   |
|                                  | Support limiting St John street development to 2 storey. Elsewhere the proposed 4 storey development is considered too high. Issues with vehicular access to site need addressing. A new MSCP is welcomed but need to time it correctly to prevent a shortfall in car parking. Proposed pedestrian route should be closer to the Garrick.        | The Delivery Strategy proposes an indicative phasing approach, to bring forward replacement car parking spaces in advance of any car parking being displaced from development opportunity sites.   |
|                                  |  |  |
| <b>2. District Council House</b> | <b>72%</b> of respondents answered 'yes' to Question 4 'Do you think the 'District Council House' development opportunity will help to improve the city centre?'<br>The respondents who provided additional commentary in response to this development opportunity considered that this would help utilise the Council offices more efficiently. |  |
|                                  | Concerns about offering a competing arts and wedding venue to The Guildhall and Lichfield Registry Office, having a potentially detrimental impact on these existing facilities.   | Suggested amendment;<br>'The Council Chamber and adjacent buildings could be converted subject to appropriate consents to provide a self-contained <del>wedding/occasion</del> venue <u>for hire</u> , with the attractive courtyard garden providing outdoor and breakout space' (paragraph 3.17)<br>Applicable to all references to 'wedding/occasion venue' |
|                                  | Also need parking for functions if converting the council chamber for events.<br>Parking should be available for public use outside office hours.  | Suggested amendment;<br>'In the evening and at weekends when the <del>wedding/occasion</del> venue is in use, <u>use of visitors could utilise</u> the District Council House car park <u>for visitors could be maintained, where practicable</u> . (Key Design & Development Considerations).   |

|                                 |   |   |
|---------------------------------|---|---|
|                                 | Separation of the former Headmaster's House from the third Grammar School building is highly undesirable and both should continue to be in the same ownership.  | Comment noted.  |
|                                 | If sections of the Council House are to be vacated by the District Council, office use, or similar, seem most appropriate. Express doubts as to whether the city requires more meeting or internal venue space.   | Comment noted.  |
|                                 |   |   |
| <b>3. Bird Street Courtyard</b> | <b>75%</b> of respondents answered 'yes' to Question 5 'Do you think the 'Bird Street Courtyard' development opportunity will help to improve the city centre?'   |   |
|                                 | The principle of development on Bird Street Courtyard is contentious. While some respondents opposed any development, others were open to development in principle, where the design of buildings was sensitive to heritage assets.   |   |
|                                 | Support the retention of some parking on the site but believe consideration should be given to those travelling from the north who need parking.<br>Support in principle the redevelopment of Bird St car park.   | Support noted.  |
|                                 | Consider that the Master Plan could be much more radical by redeveloping both the B&M site and the car park site.   | Comment noted – for discussion with LDC.<br>Suggested amendment to emphasise (a) environmental enhancements in the short-term; with (b) a longer-term opportunity for comprehensive development.  |
|                                 | Suggests that B&M store is demolished in order to open up the view from Market Street to Minster Pool and the Cathedral beyond, with a new public space provided.   |   |
|                                 | The Masterplan should mention National Cycle Network (NCN) Cycle Route 54, which is currently routed through Bird Street Car Park and dangerous for cyclists.   | Suggested additional text under 'development aspirations';<br><a href="#">Improvements to strategic cycle network through Bird Street Courtyard along the Sustrans route, to include new surface treatment to provide a clearer and safer route.</a>                    |
|                                 | Consider that Bird Street car park is ripe for some form of development.<br>Considers that the current proposal would not maintain views and feels uninspired.<br>Express concern about the proposed loss of some car parking spaces and request adequate parking is maintained for those visiting the Cathedral (not necessarily in Bird Street car park).<br>Consider that the removal of the majority of parking spaces will negatively impact the businesses in the centre. | Comment noted.<br>Displaced parking is re-provided elsewhere in the City Centre.<br>Comment noted, although the city centre benefits from being compact in form. The re-provision of parking spaces elsewhere in the city centre is considered an appropriate approach. |

|  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
|  | <p>Three storeys are too high for the area overlooking Minster Pool and to the Cathedral.</p>   | <p>Suggested additional text under 'Issues and Obstacles' (page 65);</p> <p><u>It should be noted that the viability appraisals were undertaken assuming a three-storey development to allow 2 floors of residential above ground level. It is appreciated that achieving 3 storeys on this site may be challenging due to the sensitivity of the setting. A cross check viability assessment reducing the development to 2 storeys indicates that a reduced height scheme on the same footprint would be marginally unviable. If 3 storeys are deemed unacceptable, reviewing the design or including further landownerships may therefore be necessary to improve the viability position.</u></p> |
|  | <p>The Bird street car park is the most useful car park in Lichfield as it is close to the shops. The car park provides easy access to the Cathedral. The views of the Minster Pool and Cathedral are a stunning welcome to visitors. Building beside the Minster will ruin the enjoyment of this stunning walkway.</p> | <p>Comment noted – see above</p>  |
|  | <p>Reduced parking at the Bird Street car park gives considerably less parking for North Lichfield residents and for visitors to the cathedral.</p>   | <p>Comment noted.</p>   |
|  | <p>It is likely that by having a maximum of 3 storeys in height, that this might set a precedent for all new development in this area, which could have a negative impact on the diversity of the skyline.</p>  | <p>Suggested amendment under 'storey heights';</p> <p>Proposals should have regard to the prevailing height of development in the locality with particular regard to vistas to and from the Grade I listed Cathedral. <u>Heights to be established through detailed design work, whilst maintaining vistas of the Cathedral spires. Up to three-storey development is considered appropriate, subject to vistas of the Cathedral spires being maintained.</u></p>   |
|  | <p>Parking here should be for Blue Badge Holders – this could remove the need for any Blue Badge holders' cars to access any of Market Street, Bore Street etc.</p>   | <p>Suggested amendment;</p> <p>'Up to 55 retained car parking spaces, <u>the majority of which will be prioritised for Blue Badge holders;</u>' (paragraph 3.26)</p>  |
|  | <p>Consult with Historic England and Staffordshire County Council's Historic Environment Team.</p>  | <p>Suggested amendment;</p> <p><u>Historic England and Staffordshire County Council's Historic Environment Team</u> (new bullet point to paragraph 3.27)</p>  |

|                                    |   |  |
|------------------------------------|---|--|
|                                    | Adjacent land within LDC and SCC control should be identified on the plan.  | Suggested amendment to plan to reflect comments.   |
|                                    | Bird Street Car Park Development Brief (2010) should be referenced.   | Suggested cross-reference to be made to the 2010 Development Brief.  |
|                                    | The Masterplan should make reference to the historic character and morphology of the site. An attempt should be made to reflect historic property boundaries. New development shouldn't abut Minster Pool Walk.   | The Analysis, Issues and Options Report provides a high-level analysis of the historic character and morphology of Lichfield. Any development proposal would be subject to a planning application which would include a historic environment assessment. |
|                                    | Pedestrian access improvements should be high priority. There should be increased public realm space adjoining Minster Pool Walk.   | Comments noted.  |
|                                    | The desire to use this space for development has been on the District Council's hit list for many years for financial gain, showing little regard for the wishes of residents. Car park loss will directly impact on residents of Beacon Street.  | Comments noted. This development opportunity seeks to provide a balanced response to the wide-ranging views on the future use of this site.  |
|                                    |   |  |
| <b>4. University West Car Park</b> | <b>67%</b> of respondents answered ' <b>yes</b> ' to Question 6 ' <i>Do you think the 'University West Car Park' development opportunity will help to improve the city centre?</i> '<br>The proposed area of coach parking is generally considered important by the majority of respondents. However, some respondents consider that either the existing car park should be retained, or it should revert back to open space.                               |  |
|                                    | Does not support this proposal as a former area of open space.  | Comment noted.   |
|                                    | Do not consider that the definition of this area as the Business & Learning Quarter is appropriate as it is primarily residential.<br>Two or three storey development on the car park would block line-of-sight visibility to the Conduit Clock tower on the Bowling Green roundabout from the Bishops Lodge apartments.<br>Loss of significant capacity in the car park would cause difficulties to visitors of residents at the Bishops Lodge apartments. | Comment noted.<br>Some parking will be retained. Displaced spaces will be re-provided a short walk away.   |
|                                    | Questioned whether this development opportunity could provide additional educational space, to allow the Cathedral School to expand within Lichfield.   | Suggested amendment under 'potential development capacity' to provide flexibility towards either educational uses or commercial business space (complementary to the Business & Learning Quarter).   |

|  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| <b>Other Development Opportunities</b> | Consider that the proposed development at Angel Croft would support and strengthen the Cathedral Quarter.   | Comments noted. The proposed development at Angel Croft falls within the 'transition area' of City Centre West, as set out in the masterplan. |
|  | The area between Dam Street and Cross Keys (centred on Quonians Lane), although within a Conservation Area, could be considered.  | Comment noted.  |
|  | A multi-purpose covered outside space to encourage market traders of customers of all ages.   | Comment noted.  |
|  | Potential commercial development on Stowe Road, adjacent Bromford office. Possible residential development on Swan Road/Friary and Sandford Street car parks.   | Comment noted.  |
| <b>Public Realm Priorities</b>         |   |   |
| <b>A. Birmingham Road Corridor</b>     | <b>88%</b> of respondents answered 'yes' to Question 8 'Do you think the 'Birmingham Road Corridor' interventions will improve pedestrian accessibility to the city centre from Lichfield City train station?'.<br>Improvements to the public realm, especially the provision of safer access routes from Lichfield City Station, are strongly supported by the vast majority of respondents. |   |
|  | This is supported as a very high priority, and needs early delivery in conjunction with the first phases of the Birmingham Road Gateway.  | Support noted.  |
|  | Suggest an underpass/overpass to facilitate pedestrian access that does not depend on stopping car traffic.   | Comment noted.  |
|  | Widening the road to accommodate a central filter lane for right-turning traffic should be considered to reduce the amount of queuing traffic.  | Comment noted.  |
|  | Synchronisation of traffic lights at the new junction with those at the junction of Birmingham Road and St John Street would improve traffic flows. Further synchronisation of the lights with those at the Greenhill/Rotten Row junction and the pedestrian crossing at the exit from the Three Spires Shopping Centre would also help improve flows.  | Comment noted.  |
|  | The Birmingham Road/St John St junction needs to be made safer. Another traffic light junction will make transiting Birmingham Road from either direction unacceptable.   | Potential new pedestrian crossing points are proposed as part of this junction.   |

|                                      |  |   |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|
| <b>B. Lichfield Transport Hub</b>    | <p><b>83%</b> of respondents answered '<b>yes</b>' to Question 9 '<i>Do you think the 'Lichfield Transport Hub' will enhance the arrival experience to the city by bus, coach, train and taxi?</i>'.</p> <p>The vast majority of respondents strongly support provision of a new bus station, as it would provide a more welcoming gateway to the City Centre.</p>                                   |   |
|                                      | <p>There should be an enclosed waiting area within the bus station to enhance the arrival experience for bus passengers.</p>   | <p>Comment noted – this is subject to the detailed design.</p>  |
|                                      | <p>The bus station should be of an adequate size to accommodate future expansion including for coach parking if necessary.</p>   | <p>Comment noted. The size of the bus station has been informed by discussions with the County Council and bus operators. Coach drop off/ pick-up bays are provided for as part of the Lichfield Transport Hub.</p> |
|                                      | <p>Note that some bus operators do not favour station layouts that require buses to reverse.</p>   | <p>Comment noted.</p>   |
| <b>C. Bird Street Walk</b>           | <p><b>80%</b> of respondents answered '<b>yes</b>' to Question 10 '<i>Do you think the 'Bird Street Walk' interventions will make this route safer and more welcoming?</i>'.</p> <p>Although the majority of respondents provide support for this public realm priority, the existing width of Bird Street Walk is considered too restrictive to permit the potential for any real improvements.</p> |   |
|                                      | <p>Consider that the B&amp;M store should be demolished to improve what is currently a very dingy alley.</p>   | <p>Comment noted – see above</p>  |
| <b>D. Circular Minster Pool Walk</b> | <p><b>81%</b> of respondents answered '<b>yes</b>' to Question 11 '<i>Do you think a 'Circular Minster Pool Walk' will encourage more people to use the Minster Pool area?</i>'.</p> <p>There is some opposition to this proposal, with several respondents concerned about the potential impact on Minster Pool, biodiversity, trees and the tranquillity of the Remembrance Garden.</p>            |   |
|                                      | <p>Supports the proposal but is mindful of potential difficulties in achieving it, not least in relation to land ownership. Careful planning will be required in regard to seating and signage.</p>  | <p>Support noted.</p>   |
|                                      | <p>The proposal is supported and will offer improved circulation opportunities. It is not considered that this proposed northern section requires to provide a cycleway facility.</p>  | <p>Support noted.</p>   |

|  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
|  | <p>A cycle route to the north of Minster Pool linking to Beacon Park could really improve bicycle connectivity as part of a National Cycle Network route.</p> <p>The proposal would be an ideal solution, if the section on the north side of the pool were to be a shared cycle/pedestrian path with adequate 'Share with Care' notices to protect pedestrians.</p> <p>Constructing a path will disturb the biodiversity of the north side of the pool. Trees will have to be chopped down &amp; late-night revellers will cause a nuisance to residents.</p> <p>The route would need access through the Garden of Remembrance, which is a Grade II* listed structure and, and the gardens of a number of listed buildings, which should remain a quiet reflective space.</p>  | <p>Comment noted. Any new path would seek to avoid any adverse impacts upon existing biodiversity and landscaping. Any changes proposed would be subject to detailed design and assessment.</p> <p>Suggested amendments to 'Key Improvements';</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The route to the north of Minster Pool is proposed as a footpath-only route to retain the tranquillity of this area. Improvements to the existing strategic cycle network through Bird Street Courtyard are proposed, to include new surface treatment to provide a clearer and safer route.</li> </ul> |
|  |   |   |
| <p><b>E. Pedestrian Priority Streets</b></p> | <p><b>77%</b> of respondents answered 'yes' to Question 12 'Do you think the 'pedestrian priority streets' interventions will improve pedestrian safety?'.</p> <p>This public realm priority is welcomed by most respondents, in providing a positive impact on residents, visitors and the environment.</p> <p>Opening up Bore Street to direct traffic would be extremely undesirable and likely to encourage more unauthorised traffic from Tamworth Street to Bore Street. This is counterproductive to providing a safe pedestrian area. The bottom end of Bore Street junction should be re-designed.</p> <p>Re-opening of Lower Bore Street to vehicles, closing of Conduit/Market/Breadmarket Street requires careful and sensitive consideration due to impact on local businesses.</p> <p>Pedestrian priority streets need better enforcement.</p> <p>Pedestrian priority streets should not exclude cyclists.</p> <p>Need to consider light/noise pollution.</p> <p>The city centre should be pedestrianised, blue badge holders can be relocated into nearby car parks and servicing of premises could be subject to an hours restriction. Bollards could be installed on the entrance to the city centre on Tamworth Street.</p> | <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted. Any such change to the street network would be subject to future discussions between LDC/SCC and local residents and businesses, as appropriate.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The masterplan seeks to maintain and enhance access for all users, regardless of their mobility needs.</p>   |



|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
|  | Removing cars or more severely restricting vehicular access around Market Square would present a much better city centre environment.   | Comments noted.  |
| <b>F. Pedestrian Walkways &amp; Linkages</b> | <b>91%</b> of respondents answered ' <b>yes</b> ' to Question 13 ' <i>Do you think the improvements to 'pedestrian walkways and linkages' will enhance pedestrian access and safety?</i> '.<br>Most respondents agreed with this public realm priority, although many considered there should also be an emphasis on improving (and maintaining) existing infrastructure. |  |
|  | There is too much emphasis on walking and cycling for a city with high levels of retired and elderly people.  | Comment noted.   |
|  | Pedestrian pathways from the proposed Angel Croft scheme should be retained.  | Comment noted.   |
|  | Noise and light pollution must be considered.   | Suggested additional text under Objective 5;<br>'The masterplan identifies public realm improvements to enhance connectivity between the Birmingham Road Gateway and the city centre, both visually and physically. <a href="#">These improvements must be sensitive to existing residents with respect to noise and light pollution.</a> (Paragraph 2.46) |
|  | Proposed Angel Croft development will provide an excellent walkway from the Cathedral Quarter to Beacon Park.   | Comments noted.  |
| <b>G. Signage and Wayfinding</b>             | <b>93%</b> of respondents answered ' <b>yes</b> ' to Question 13 ' <i>Do you think the improvements to 'pedestrian walkways and linkages' will enhance pedestrian access and safety?</i> ' and is strongly supported.   |  |
|  | Large city maps with key attractions could be included, along with distances to such attractions.   | Comment noted.   |
|  | There could be reference to potential heritage improvements such as shop front improvements, heritage tourism signage, revival of heritage features in the public realm, walkways and cycleways that appropriately connect heritage assets and better reveal their significance.  | Comments noted. To be considered as part of future signage and wayfinding strategy (Public Realm Priority G).  |
|  | A review of all street furniture and installations should take place.   | The masterplan promotes a co-ordinated approach to signage and street furniture.   |
| <b>Other Public Realm Priorities</b>         | Park & Ride should be considered to keep cars out of the city centre.   | Comment noted. A Park and Ride is not considered appropriate to the scale and function of Lichfield.   |

|                                  |   |   |
|----------------------------------|---|---|
|                                  | <p>More 'radical' approach to encouraging more sustainable forms of transport should be considered. More consideration should be given to cyclists, including the potential for cycling to the city centre from the east or west, via Dam Street and a traffic-free Bird Street Courtyard.</p> <p>The Masterplan should mention National Cycle Network (NCN) Cycle Route 54, which is currently routed through Bird Street Car Park and dangerous for cyclists.</p> <p>Improve access to the city centre through segregated cycle paths or 'share with care'. Improved cycling facilities throughout the city centre to include priority boxes at junctions, and where possible, 3metre shared cycle and pedestrian routes. More cycle stands should be provided.</p> <p>There is no reference to heritage assets within the public realm improvements section as the potential impact on the Grade II* structure in the Garden of Remembrance and how it is unlikely to be compatible with a new cycleway.</p> | <p>Addressed in draft masterplan, under Design Principle Four (Designing for Health) and under 'moving around the city centre'.</p> <p>A new cycle hub is proposed at the station.</p> <p>Suggested amendments to text;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reference to Sustrans National Cycle Route 54 being integrated within Bird Street Courtyard with onward cycle connectivity provided as part of the Circular Minster Pool Walk.</li> <li>Reference to new cycle parking facilities across the city centre at key locations, including at Bird Street Courtyard.</li> </ul> <p>Suggested additional paragraph following paragraph 4.12;<br/><u>4.13 Regard must be had to the setting of the surrounding Listed buildings, including the Grade II* Listed War Memorial in the Garden of Remembrance.</u></p> |
| <b>Delivering the Masterplan</b> |   |   |
| <b>Delivery Strategy</b>         | <p><b>82%</b> of respondents answered 'yes' to Question 16 'Do you think the Delivery Strategy provides a sensible way forward for implementing the masterplan?'.</p> <p>The delivery strategy is generally supported by the majority of respondents, although a number of respondents consider that Birmingham Road Gateway should be a delivery priority.</p> <p>Birmingham Road Gateway, and specifically the proposed multi-storey car park and bus station, need to be prioritised.</p> <p>Development should be phased to ensure replacement car parking spaces are available.</p>  | <p>Correct errors on page 63;</p> <p>Under phasing for Birmingham Road Gateway;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Phase One:</b> Residential apartments and small-scale business units (western section of site).</li> <li><b>Phase Two:</b> Leisure scheme comprising hotel, cinema and restaurants, along with residential houses and apartments. (central section of site).</li> <li><b>Phase Three:</b> Re-provision of MSCP, along with some leisure and restaurant uses.</li> <li><b>Phase Four:</b> Re-provision of existing Bus Station</li> </ul>  |

|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
|  |   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Phase One:</b> Residential apartments and small-scale business units (western section of site).</li> <li>• <b>Phase Two:</b> Re-provision of MSCP, along with some leisure and restaurant uses.</li> <li>• <b>Phase Three:</b> Leisure scheme comprising hotel, cinema and restaurants, along with residential houses and apartments. (central section of site).</li> <li>• <b>Phase Four:</b> Re-provision of existing Bus Station</li> </ul> <p>Under phasing for District Council House;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Phase One:</b> Residential apartments and small-scale business units (western section of site).</li> <li>• <b>Phase Two:</b> Re-provision of MSCP, along with some leisure and restaurant uses.</li> <li>• <b>Phase Three:</b> Leisure scheme comprising hotel, cinema and restaurants, along with residential houses and apartments. (central section of site).</li> <li>• <b>Phase Four:</b> Re-provision of existing Bus Station</li> </ul> |
|  | The commercial 'profitable' elements should be progressed in parallel with the public realm improvements.   | Comment noted – this is the assumption set out under Timescales in Section 5 of the draft masterplan.  |
|  | More detailed delivery strategy for the public transport/southern gateway could be provided.  | Comment noted. However, it is considered premature at this stage to provide further detail than included.  |
|  | We have concerns with the tables produces from page 62 and both the description of development proposed and the limited reference to heritage.  | Comment noted – heritage is considered as part of the overall masterplan proposals.  |
|  | Negotiations will need to take place with Network Rail in relation to development adjacent to Lichfield City Railway Station.   | Suggested additional text;<br><u>Negotiations required with Network Rail, regarding any new development adjacent to Lichfield city Railway Station.</u>  |
|  | Concern that the Birmingham Road Gateway will be 5-7 years away, this site is the number one priority for the city.   | Comments noted. Delivery will be subject to the determination of the planning application and the selected delivery route.   |
|  | Deliverability only considered for commercial elements with a vague reference to delivery of public sector infrastructure; this (public funding) would seem highly unlikely and we would expect contributions from developers to be sought. | The Delivery Strategy identifies potential funding opportunities for both the Development Opportunities and the Public Realm Priorities.   |

|                       |   |  |
|-----------------------|---|--|
|                       | We can see no difference in the viability status of the Birmingham Road proposal over Friarsgate.   | The former Friarsgate scheme was a retail-led proposal which is not a financially viable proposition for a city centre in the current retail market. The Masterplan proposes a broad mix of uses appropriate to Lichfield and which is based on local market evidence of the uses which would be capable of delivery.  |
| <b>Other Comments</b> |   |  |
| <b>Other Comments</b> | Improvements to Lichfield City train station should be considered – café, toilets etc.  | New facilities proposed as part of new Transport Hub.  |
|                       | Connectivity between Lichfield City and Lichfield Trent Valley stations (including signage) needs to be addressed. Increased car parking at Lichfield Trent Valley station and shuttle bus service between Lichfield Trent Valley and Lichfield City to reduce the number of car trips.   | Comment noted.   |
|                       | There will be fewer parking spaces overall.   | Comment noted. Addressed in main section above.  |
|                       | There should be more reference to the Cathedral's contribution to the City. There is some contradiction in the emphasis on protecting views to the Cathedral, and then proposing a three-storey building on Bird Street Car Park. None of the proposed developments will bring Lichfield to national or international attention or encourage longer dwell times or overnight stays. | Comment noted.<br>Development height at Bird Street Courtyard addressed in main section above.<br>The proposed mix of uses is intended to encourage longer stays. The masterplan recommends that a wider Marketing Strategy should be developed to provide visitor information not only within Lichfield through new signage, but also in raising Lichfield's profile through marketing and social media to encourage people to visit. |
|                       | There should be more support of the tourism economy. The profile of the City needs to be raised, but there is no proposed development or use that will bring Lichfield into regional, national or international attention, or encourage longer dwell time or overnight stays.   | Addressed in draft masterplan as part of Public Realm Priority G (Signage and Wayfinding); in the suggested development of a wider marketing strategy for the city.  |
|                       | The re-provision of a leisure facility should be considered in the city centre.   | Comment noted. However, alternative suitable sites are being considered by LDC beyond the city centre (addressed at paragraph 2.9 of draft masterplan).  |
|                       | A separate car parking schedule would be beneficial. The use of VMS electronic car park signage should be investigated.   | Comment noted.   |

|  |   |
|--|---|
| Lichfield City Council should be added to the list of consultees on Birmingham Road Gateway.   | Suggested amendment to 'issues and obstacles' to include negotiations with Lichfield City Council and the trustees of St John's Hospital.   |
| The Trustees of St John's Hospital would welcome being included in any stakeholder discussions/events concerning the Birmingham Road Gateway and the Birmingham Road Corridor. |   |
| Where appropriate, Historic England would be keen to be a stakeholder at the appropriate time.   | Comment noted. Historic England will be a statutory consultee to any future planning application affecting heritage assets.   |
| Infill development and redevelopment on brownfield sites will not always be appropriate (paragraphs 2.81.2.83).  | Suggested amendment;<br>'Select infill and redevelopment opportunities on brownfield sites designed to overlook the park and establish an attractive edge <u>where this would not harm the significance of heritage assets</u> '. (paragraphs 2.81 and 2.82)  |
| Replace 'preserved' with 'protected' and do not reference listed buildings as separate to heritage assets (simply use heritage assets).  | Suggested amendment;<br>Replace ' <del>preserved</del> ' with ' <u>protected</u> ' in paragraphs 2.61 & 2.85.<br>Replace ' <del>listed buildings</del> ' with ' <u>heritage assets</u> ' in paragraphs 2.4, 2.31, 2.85 and 3.29 and on pages 63, 65 and 67.   |
| Reference the other spires of St Mary's and St Michael's churches in paragraph 2.5.  | Suggested amendment to reference the spires of St Mary's and St Michael's Churches.   |
| Biodiversity net gain and climate change should be referenced.   | Suggested amendment to reference biodiversity net gain under Objective 6 (The Green and Sustainable City).  |
| Include road names on Masterplan map.  | Suggested addition of road names on Masterplan Quarters plan.   |
| No funding is currently identified in the SCC capital programme for investment in the Birmingham Road corridor including improvements for sustainable transport.               | Suggested amendment;<br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transport funding from Staffordshire County Council - As Highway Authority, Staffordshire County Council <del>will</del> <u>could</u> play a key role via their involvement in the development of the Birmingham Road Corridor and Transport Hub in addition to their support for sustainable travel schemes including pedestrian and cycling initiatives; (paragraph 5.23)</li> </ul> |

|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
|  | A clear challenge is the issue of climate change.   | Comments noted. Masterplan Objective 6 (The Green & Sustainable City) seeks to promote climate change resilience.  |
|  | Need for EV Charging points, need for VMS signage, need for a shop signage policy and need for public art to be included in Masterplan. | Provision of EV charging points is to be considered as part of the planning application process, consistent with District and County Council policy requirements at that time.<br>The masterplan identifies the potential use of public art. |