

Bury St Edmunds Draft Town Centre Masterplan

Bury Society and Churchgate Area Association Joint Response to Questionnaire

Note: This response to the Draft Town Centre Masterplan questionnaire represents the views of the public Open Meeting held on 26 July 2017 and now represents Bury Society and Churchgate Area Association policy (see summary at second paragraph of Q26).

Final: 15 August 2017



Town Centre Structure

1 Is the proposed structure of character areas clear and helpful ?

2 Do you have any additional comments ?

This is the joint response from the Open Meeting held by the Bury Society and the Churchgate Area Association on 26 July 2017 to consider the Draft Town Centre Masterplan. It has now been finalised and adopted as policy by the Executive Committees of both organisations and it represents the collective views of the 89 people who attended the Open Meeting (see summary at second paragraph of Q26).

The Chairmen of the two organisations request that this response should be counted as representing 89 people rather than as only one response for the Issues and Options Open Meeting.

Comments on character areas: The switch between the two map diagrams is confusing. Both are called character areas. The first map shows "Station Hill" but the second map doesn't.

Character Areas

3 Are the character areas helpful in explaining the proposed changes ?

4 If not, why not ?

The map diagrams do not show clearly enough where the main developments and other improvements would be geographically. Diagrammatic "blobs" would help.

5 Do you think the right character areas have been identified ?

6 If no, where else would you like to see identified ?

The Station Hill area should be included in the second map diagram (see note above)

7 Do you have any additional comments ?

The Bury Society and CAA Open Meeting on 26 July generally agreed the character areas that have been identified once people had talked them through. But several people commented that a fuller and clearer description of each individual character area is needed.

Character Area 1: Cornhill, Buttermarket and the Arc

8 Do the aspirations proposed address the issues ?

9 Do you have any additional comments ?

Car parking lost to suggested development should be replaced with multi-story parking on site or elsewhere. The scale of suggested shopping provision should be clarified and justified. More specific and clearly defined proposals are needed for the suggested development and the proposed pedestrianisation or part-pedestrianisation. Park and ride or similar facilities including shuttle buses are needed and should be explained more fully.

Character Area 2: The Northern Gateway

10 Do the aspirations proposed address the issues ?

Yes

11 Do you have any additional comments ?

More specific and clearly defined proposals for the suggested pedestrian and cycle links and suggested development are needed for this character area and also the railway station and the Station Hill character area. More car parking at the railway station and shuttle bus links to the town centre are needed. The current and separate road junction proposals by the County Council do not include the raised pedestrian crossing at Tayfen Road and Station Hill or the wider area enhancement suggested by the Draft Masterplan.

Character Area 3: St Andrews Quarter

12 Do the aspirations proposed address the issues ?

No

13 Do you have any additional comments ?

More specific and clearly defined proposals for the suggested redevelopment and car parking provision are needed for this character area. The Open Meeting thought the town centre needs a better bus station and had doubts about laybys on St Andrews Street North. A shuttle bus could link the town centre with car parks outside the town centre. See related comments for Parkway (Character Area 6).

Character Area 4: Churchgate

14 Do the aspirations proposed address the issues ?

Yes

15 Do you have any additional comments ?

The Open Meeting agreed that traffic should be limited in the Churchgate Area and the one-way system should be reviewed. Car parking for residents, businesses and visitors should also be reviewed. The problems of drop of and pick up of children at the three schools in the area remains an issue. The suggested raised pedestrian crossing between the bottom of Churchgate Street and the Cathedral was welcomed. But more "build outs", "chicanes" and "raised pedestrian crossings" are needed to slow traffic down and improve pedestrian safety within the medieval grid. Large lorries should be banned from some areas to reduce health and safety risks and damage to roads and pavements while smaller vans should bring deliveries in from depots outside the town centre. A car sharing scheme should be considered including pick up, drop off and depot facilities (more details are available).

Character Area 5: Ram Meadow

16 Do the aspirations proposed address the issues ?

17 Do you have any additional comments ?

More specific and clearly defined proposals are needed for the suggested mixed use development and associated road access and car parking provision. The scale of existing car parking provision should be retained and increased to meet the needs of suggested development on the allocated housing site and potentially on the football ground. Better pedestrian links with the town centre are clearly needed and a shuttle bus should also be considered. The river environment should be protected (see also Character Area 8).

Character Area 6: Parkway

18 Do the aspirations proposed address the issues ?

19 Do you have any additional comments ?

The scale of suggested shopping provision should be clarified and justified in this and other character areas. More specific and clearly defined proposals are needed for the suggested pedestrian and cycle links particularly across Parkway and car parking provision in this and adjoining areas (see also Character Area 3). Exchange of existing leisure and car parking uses on either side of Parkway should be considered. Car parking and/or social housing should be considered on the disused Lloyds Bank site on Risbygate.

Character Area 7: King's Road and Robert Boby Way

20 Do the aspirations proposed address the issues ?

21 Do you have any additional comments ?

The scale of suggested shopping provision should be clarified and justified in this and other character areas. More specific and clearly defined proposals are needed for the suggested pedestrian and cycle links particularly across Parkway between King's Road North and King's Road South. Public realm enhancement is urgently needed in this character area. Car parking provision must be replaced and extended in multi-storey car parks in this and/or adjoining areas if Waitrose is redeveloped on a larger scale. Better signage for pedestrians and vehicles is needed in this and other areas.

Character Area 8: Lark and Linnet Riverside

22 Do the aspirations proposed address the issues ?

23 Do you have any additional comments ?

The Open Meeting was pleased to see that previous suggestions for an “Arc of Opportunity” in this character area have been dropped because of alarm that a new road through Ram Meadow might be reinstated. But more specific and clearly defined proposals are needed for the suggested pedestrian and cycle links in this character area as well as the on-going work of the Abbey of St Edmund Heritage Partnership, the River Lark Catchment Partnership and the Bury Water Meadows Group. The Open Meeting supported the previous plans to relocate the tennis courts and to extend the Abbey Gardens into the former Eastgate Nursery. There is continuing concern about wildlife and water quality management.

Character Area 9: Across the Town Centre

24 Do the aspirations proposed address the issues ?

25 Do you have any additional comments ?

The Open Meeting supported the suggestions for public realm improvements and the provision of pedestrian and cycle links across the town centre. But it was concerned that the potential growth of shopping, tourism and associated traffic volumes and car parking needs should be balanced with the need to conserve the special heritage value of many parts of the town centre. Again, more specific and clearly defined proposals are needed.

Anything else ?

26 Is there anything else that should be considered as part of the Masterplan ?

The Street Market is the heart and soul of the town centre. The recent relocation of the town centre Post Office into the WH Smith building is lamented by many people. Improvements to signage across the town centre are needed but should avoid cluttering the street scene so perhaps smart phone and other high technology alternatives should be considered.

The Open Meeting on 26 July concluded that the Town Centre Masterplan is generally moving in the right direction but concerns remain about traffic and car parking. Most people think the need for growth and development should be carefully balanced with the need to value people and conserve our historic environment. People now want to see some more specific and clearly defined proposals for the town centre.

About you

Note: this section represents the totals and the percentages from the profile forms that were completed by the 89 people who attended the Open Meeting on 26 July

27 **Gender**

Male 47 (53%)

Female 38 (43%)

Total: 89

Figures do not sum to total because there was not a full response (85)

28 **Age**

Under 24 1 (1%)

25 to 64 23 (26%)

Over 65 65 (73%)

29A Residence

Bury St Edmunds 10 (11%)	Town Centre 62 (70%)	Other 10 (11%)
-----------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------

29B Employment

Bury St Edmunds 5 (6%)	Town Centre 8 (9%)	Other 38 (43%)
---------------------------	-----------------------	-------------------

30 *Frequency of Visits (not covered in the Open Meeting profile form)*

31 Town Centre Activities

Shopping 83 (93%)	Local services 74 (83%)	Cafés, pubs etc 80 (90%)
Leisure services 66 (74%)	Visiting market 70 (79%)	Hotel, B&B etc 21 (24%)

32 Disability

Only one person out of 89 ticked this box – they mentioned “hearing” as a disability

33 *Ethnic Groups (not covered in the Open Meeting profile form)*

34 *Religion (not covered in the Open Meeting profile form)*

35 *Sexual Orientation (not covered in the Open Meeting profile form)*

Contact Us

For enquiries about the Joint Response to this Questionnaire please contact ...

Richard Summers
Phone: 01284-750554 Mobile: 07713-739746
E-mail: richardsummers@spatialstedmunds.co.uk

The Bury Society

Website: <http://www.burysociety.com>
Chairman: Martyn Taylor
Phone : 01284-703495
E-mail: martyn_taylor@tiscali.co.uk

The Churchgate Area Association

Website: <http://www.churchgateassoc.org.uk>
Chairman: Vivien Gainsborough Foot
Phone: 01284-750887 Mobile: 07769-756429
E-mail: ygf.masongill@gmail.com