

Comments for Planning Application 22/03924/P

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/03924/P

Address: Broadwalk Shopping Centre Broad Walk Bristol BS4 2QU

Proposal: Application for Outline Planning Permission with some matters reserved - Demolition of existing buildings and erection of a mixed use scheme comprising residential units (Class C3), commercial floorspace (Class E), community use (flexible Class E/Class F2), library floorspace (Class F1), cinema/ theatre floorspace (Class sui generis), vehicle parking spaces, cycle parking, and associated landscaping, public realm, access and servicing arrangements, and circulation space. All matters reserved except for access. (Major)

Case Officer: Peter Westbury

Customer Details

Name: Not Available

Address: Not Available

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Amenity - Residents Group

Stance: Customer made comments neither objecting to or supporting the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment:

FRIENDS OF REDCATCH PARK (FORP)

OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION COMMENTS

FORP accept that this is an Outline Planning application and subject to an extant approval in terms of height and massing, although we note this was for significantly less residential units.

Our comments are made purely from the perspective of the park and Redcatch Community Garden and its users. We are not commenting on the broader aspects of the proposed development as we are confident that Knowle Neighbourhood Planning Group (KNPG) have the requisite experience for all other comments.

We are broadly in support of the outline planning application in principle, subject to the following provisions for further detailed review, consideration and consultation.

After conducting a Park Use Survey during September 2022, we have a clear list of the main concerns about Redcatch Quarter (RQ) in relation to the Park and its users. Users are 90% in favour of the development and so there is a clear opportunity for the success of this application if there is positive engagement with these results. We are using the top 10 concerns below from the park summary to inform our comments.

1. 77% Loss of trees
2. 71% Impact of tall buildings in relation to the park
3. 66% The building process itself and how that will impact on the park
4. 64% How the boundary between park and RQ will look and function
5. 64% Effect of 2000+ people using the park
6. 62% Impact on the Community Garden
7. 48% Increase in anti-social behaviour
8. 43% Not enough additional play and communal space
9. 36% Security of the park
10. 33% Losing the car park

1. Loss of Trees

A separate tree survey has been requested from Bristol City Council (BCC) tree expert John Atkinson for the trees currently within the buffer zone. We are also looking at the ecological significance and contribution of this area to the park. While we accept a certain level of attrition due to the boundary treatment and because some trees are already near the end of their natural life, we still want to reassure park users by gaining assurance from BCC and developers that as few trees as possible will be removed from the boundary and therefore request that those of significance and contribution to aesthetics, wildlife and ecology are incorporated within the landscaping and boundary treatment and that any that are removed are replaced in accordance with the Bristol Tree Replacement Standard.

2. Impact of tall buildings in relation to the park

From reviewing our own survey data and the current objections (91 @ 22nd Oct) on the BCC Planning Portal, this is the greatest concern across the board. We understand clearly that the original planning application was accepted at 12 storeys, but the extant plan was half the size of the new application with only 420 residential units and the community is aware this is not a like-for-like development in terms of the overall size and massing. We also appreciate there are many potential additional upsides to the new design that were absent from the original. We feel there will be continuous push back on the height and density and that a compromise should be sought which serves all parties. We understand there is a viability issue for the developer but assume there is some wiggle room. A reduction in height and ergo density will go a long way to reassuring the community that the developers are listening and responding.

Buffer Zone

Currently between the Broadwalk Car Park and the start of the green space in the park there is a buffer zone of 17.9 metres.

This comprises:

- a. Service Road 7.9m
- b. Stone park boundary wall (1.5m high on the car park side)
- c. Bed containing trees and shrubs 6.5m (this extends to x3 on the corner in front of the old library)
- d. Perimeter path 3.5m

This buffer zone ends with 5 equally spaced park benches (3 just renewed) facing into the park

While ugly, the car park itself does not intrude into the park or overpower it largely because of the buffer zone acting as a screen and there is no overlooking due to its function, the buffer zone and of course the lower height. However, the new development is currently visualised to extend up to the park wall and at 12 storeys, will consequently be exceedingly overbearing. This new village, proposes to have elevations with windows and balconies extending 12 storeys and will now become the boundary of the park, with no clear buffer zone and an inference that park space may actually be lost in the process (some visuals indicate the existing path position being moved significantly into the park green space). Two 12 storey buildings rising directly from the park with no significant green buffer zone will undoubtedly result in a huge amount of direct overlooking onto the open green space on that side of the park, intruding into the peace and solitude that this area currently offers to users. It is one of only two clear green spaces left in the park (and incidentally where the temporary EE 3G mast was proposed to be positioned, which is why, to a great extent there was such support for the Residents Against The Mast campaign).

The lower levels of the Later Living blocks do not appear to impose on the park to a significant degree and the corner area in front of the old library, if landscaped well, will mitigate for this. The lower concourse section at 8 storeys as visualised at the junction appears to blend better with the park due to the open plan treatment in that area.

We stress that a serious consideration of this issue should be made to include a buffer zone to help mitigate for this overbearing aspect.

3. The building process itself and how that will impact on the park

The outline plan is particularly woolly about certain aspects of responsibility for specific areas of the development that join the park. We need a clear and agreed plan between BCC, the

developers, Parks, FORP and RCG with regard to the building process and phases thereof. This plan must include details of who is responsible for what in terms of action, timing and funding, especially when it comes to the entire boundary treatment, mitigation, reinstatement and maintenance.

Park wall and buffer zone

Given the outline plan, the park boundary wall is clearly going to be removed during the early phase of development and we estimate that given contractor access requirements for the development, a large swathe of park along the boundary and old library area (the buffer zone) will need to be cordoned off to facilitate this and will inevitably result in considerable destruction of the park, disturbance to park users due to the necessary diversion of the existing perimeter path (this perimeter path is part of a measured $\frac{3}{4}$ mile run used by regular runners in the park) We need to have an agreement about how this will be achieved sensitively to minimise disruption to park users. We request that BCC make it a condition of planning and or the party wall agreement that the cost of this temporary path and the reinstatement of the whole area affected, be covered by the developers. If Section 106 monies are to be allocated for this, then these funds must be clearly ring fenced.

4. How the boundary between park and RQ will look and function

This is a major concern to users and to FORP, to maximise the opportunities for increased community engagement and safe, secure interaction with the park. In the photo renderings of the outline plan, there is no clear boundary at the junction of the development with the park. But there is an absolute requirement for a secure boundary to be achieved to ensure the safety of children (and dogs) from entering the development and onto Wells Road.

We request more detail about how this secure but permeable boundary can be achieved as well as the proposed treatment of the Broadwalk park entrance which must be accessible for prams and wheelchairs. There may be an opportunity to work with the park in regard to the wildlife corridor behind the tennis courts to incorporate this into the new plan.

We want to ensure that the park doesn't become split down the middle with the RQ side having new paths and entrances and the other side having to make do. This will not be perceived well by the community, especially those living on the opposite side of the park.

We request that an effort is made to bring the entire park's path network up to the same standard and that S106 is allocated to this. The chicane gate on Redcatch Park would need to be replaced to accommodate disabled access, especially given the later living block, for which it will be their nearest park access point.

Lighting and CCTV must also be considered, especially along the development side where

residents will be coming and going and during darker months when this will present a safety and security problem.

5. Effect of 2000+ extra people using the park

There is very reasonable concern about the effect of this new 'village' on the park. Absorbing 2000 people across the whole of the ward would not present an issue or burden on the green spaces (or other infrastructure) in the ward. But this is a concentrated amount of people virtually inside the park and inevitably, Redcatch Park will become their preferred local green space. The Park will continue to be visually represented and marketed as the garden of the development and that is exactly how it is and will be perceived, especially by the BTR purchasers. But the concerns of the community and the existing park users are very real and need to be acknowledged, honoured and addressed in order to gain support and acceptance.

Communal/Private space inside the development

We understand that every development has a requirement to adhere to the BCC guidelines for open space for residents' wellbeing (as detailed in BCC Urban Living SPD). We would like confirmation of the amount of this being provided within the development as it is unclear from the submission documents. We are concerned that the park may be expected to absorb a large proportion of this and that indeed the concourse junction between the development and the park may encroach into park space. If the park is to accept a proportion of the development's requirement for open space, then this should be mitigated with S106 which can contribute to additional facilities within the park.

Some key questions for now and the next stage for which we request more detail:

- a. How much communal space will there be inside the development, what will this comprise and where will it be?
- b. How much private space will there be dedicated to residents e.g. later living and the BTR elements?
- c. Will there be a gym provided within the luxury BTR element and will this be accessible for a certain amount of general community membership, e.g. at off peak times?
- d. What is envisaged for the roof area?
- e. How is the Community Hub envisaged?
- f. Is there a café planned?
- g. If so, will this be run by the centre management, commercially tendered or could this be run by a community organisation such as RCG?
- h. Will there be hot desk/workspace provision?

- i. Will there be any independent childcare/creche provision considered in the centre?
- j. How much dedicated play space will there be?
- k. Will there be any public toilets?
- l. Will there be opportunity for RCG and community involvement in the roof top garden growing space, for example to be used as a Green Social Prescribing space?

All of the above, together with the retail/hospitality mix will impact on how many people will be using the park facilities at any given time and so having further intel about the above will help us communicate intelligently with current park users about the concerns of the park becoming overwhelmed.

Green Maintenance

This statement is taken from the Design & Access Statement PT3/ P4

"The general strategy will be for planting which is not dependent on complex maintenance or needs constant watering"

The above statement is unrealistic. There is much talk in the various RQ documents that the landscaping is crucial to the overall outcome of the development, yet it does not identify anywhere, how and who will be responsible for the lifetime maintenance post build. Having witnessed several photogenic green walls used in marketing new developments, then diminish into ugly brown scrub in just a few short years, the planned landscaping as a marketing asset is visually impressive but the reality requires a clear and agreed lifetime maintenance plan. We realise that some of this may fall within the centre and BTR management agreements, but we would like to see more acknowledgement and detail of this included in the reserved matters.

In addition, the increased use of the park by the new residents and visitors means that the general wear and tear on the park and its equipment, will increase and must be considered within the S106 as well as a separate annual membership contribution by the development to FORP, who will be subsidising additional maintenance work via their volunteer activities. As part of FORP's relaunch we are re-introducing a voluntary annual 'Friend Subscription' of £20 per household, to help raise funds for this type of work that is essential to the care of the park. This is planned for the launch of FORP 2.0, by end 2022

We cannot and do not expect Bristol Parks Department to pick up the slack of increased green, refuse and dog pooh maintenance within their existing budget (there are already 100+ dogs using the park regularly and the increase in pooh is already a problem). We know that BCC Parks budgets have already been cut and given the current financial crisis there will inevitably be further cuts. Volunteers are already having to step in and do much more in helping keep the park free of litter and carry out and arrange maintenance of some elements. Increasing the footfall within the park will put much more pressure on all the facilities.

Refuse Bins & Dog Pooh Bins

41% of park users requested more refuse and dog pooh bins right now.

With so many more people using the park there will be a certain need for even more of these.

Cycle Usage and Cycle Path

There was a plan to install a cycle path through the centre park which has now been scrapped but Matt Scammell of BCC Transport & Environmental Services, advises that they are looking at improving individual issues including 'CCTV and lighting on the main path around the children's play area to mitigate for anti social behaviour'. If this is the case, then this potential plan ties into our assertion that better lighting and CCTV will be needed with the advent of the development

In addition, with the lack of residential parking within RQ and the provision of 1185 cycle spaces noted in the plans (Residents 1100 | Centre Staff 33 | Visitors 52), there is a clear need to have a cohesive plan for a cycle path into/around the park to accommodate these users. We request that BCC planning include this within the reserved matters

6. Impact on Redcatch Community Garden (RCG)

- o 92% of users come to the park to visit RCG
- o 40% visit RCG every day
- o 91% use RCG to catch up with friends
- o 87% of users consider RCG extremely important to the park
- o 200,000 visits to RCG last year (based on café receipts, workshops and events)

RCG is the heart of the park and the importance of it to the park and its users cannot be overstated. It contributes to the community in many ways including general health and wellbeing and has become a facility that is relied on to deliver a space where all quarters of the community can come together. It is a precious resource to Knowle ward and must be protected during the process of the build and beyond.

Issues

RCG is a Charitable Community Benefit Society, it survives primarily on the revenue from the café. Revenue is also generated from the sale of goods grown in the Garden and plants etc bought in, rental from hire of facilities and the hosting of events. People come into the Garden because of its tranquillity. This revenue is used to fund community wellbeing, education and therapy sessions. Any disruption or fall off from this would seriously jeopardise the business model.

There is concern that footfall into RCG, as well as bookings will diminish because of the pursuant

noise and disruption of the demolition and building work over several years and this could negatively impact RCG to a point where it could become unsustainable. In the longer term any commercial cafés within RQ, greater than the number that exist now, could impact on the Garden's income. The viability of the Garden is very fragile, whilst it has grown year on year over the 5 years since inception, it has expanded the services it provides (often for free) to the community. It could not survive with any impact on its income. BCC must factor this into the decisions it makes on the design and within the conditions it places on any approval so that the Garden can be protected as far as possible from increased commercial competition on its doorstep.

Friday food pop ups during 2022 saw 200+ visitors at some events and bookings for children's parties, weddings and christenings in the Canopy saw an increase on the previous year, following the installation of the new marquee building 'The Canopy' which was paid for from crowdfunder donations and grants and built in part with volunteer labour. With this revenue the Garden has been able to increase significantly the wellbeing and therapy sessions it offers to adults and children which requires professional leadership by the specialist therapy team who are employed by the Garden, out of generated revenues.

It's hard to imagine that people will, as readily, want to book or attend this type of event, when there is demolition and building noise disturbing the calm of the park and Garden environment. There is also a very real issue about some of the workshops held in the Garden as many of these are for neuro-diverse children, adults with mental health challenges or people suffering with dementia. All of these groups find loud and constant noise very challenging, and this may mean these will become very difficult or even impossible to operate. Not only would these groups lose out (and this will no doubt impact negatively on the wider community infrastructure) it could mean that the Garden would have to lose its specialist staff.

Parking issues are also going to present a problem for visitors coming from further afield (we know people come from other parts of the city as the reputation of the Garden has spread throughout the wider Bristol area). Deliveries and pop-up food vans accessing the Garden will also present difficulties. We need to have an assurance and be advised of the method to ensure that during the development phase, no RQ contractor vehicles will use the car park.

Revenue Streams Staff

Café 55% 7.6 FTE

Events 18% 40+ Volunteers

Shop 11%

Funding 16%

As evidenced above, the café represents half of the revenue of the operation and is the mainstay of the business. This revenue not only supports the management of the organisation but supports a large proportion of the education, wellbeing and mental health events and workshops that the

Garden holds weekly.

Volunteers

The Garden's success is also reliant on its 220 weekly volunteer hours to deliver all of its activities. The concern about the development's impact on RCG also stretches to its ability to continue to attract volunteers during the building process. A huge part of the Garden's appeal to volunteers, is its vibrancy, communal and social ambience. So, if footfall diminishes and with it the Garden's ability to afford to hold events, buy produce etc, this could start a negative feedback loop as the breadth of volunteer opportunities for interaction also falls away.

We are aware that the advent of an additional influx of residents on the Garden's doorstep could also present great opportunities for additional revenue and volunteers however, sadly, the preceding years during the various building phases raise only concern about the Garden's viability during that time.

What does RCG need?

In our Park User Survey we ask what RCG needs

1. 65% Better undercover facilities
2. 44% Better café facilities
3. 59% Improved toilet facilities
4. 40% More produce on sales
5. 37% More food events
6. 26% More workshops
7. 18% More educational events

Plans

The Garden awaits an extension to its licence with BCC and is in the process of applying for a Community Asset Transfer (CAT) of the space to secure its long-term future and allow it to apply for a wider range of capital grants, which, it is hoped, will hugely assist in enabling RCG to build a permanent café facility and simultaneously upgrade other elements of the Garden's commercial operation.

Currently the café (Roots) is a trailer at the entrance to the site and generally has one person working in it due to the restricted space. This often leads to queues at busy times of day. There is also a limit to the products it can sell due to space and storage. Because of the lack of covered seating, during inclement weather, there is far less footfall to the café and therefore a reduction in sales for a significant proportion of the winter trading days.

Building a new café on site could potentially take care of the top four needs listed above and would certainly bring added financial support and security to the whole of the Garden's activities

There is a plan and feasibility study currently underway with the aim of creating a bespoke café facility which could include:

- o Larger counter/serving area
- o Retail produce sales area (garden produce, jar products, soft drinks, snacks etc)
- o A small kitchen/preparation/storage area
- o Indoor customer seating area
- o An Accessible toilet
- o Additional covered outdoor seating area

RCG are hoping to apply for some grant funding to assist with this new project. They need to secure a considerable amount of further funds to make this project viable. We suggest that S106 be allocated for this.

They are hoping that work can begin on this project by Spring 2023.

The Park Toilets

The public toilets came very high on the list of priorities for the park in general and especially for RCG. 62% of users said the park needed better toilet facilities and it was listed as the 3rd priority for RCG.

The toilet block was refurbished about 10 years ago and the toilets are very well used by park users and visitors to events at RCG. The building is in pretty bad repair and often the gents is closed due to drain issues. (There are some known drain issues which RCG and BCC are investigating with a full drain survey, to inform the plan for the new RCG Café). BCC Parks department maintain the toilets. We are very aware that the issue of public toilets in parks is tricky and that most have been closed completely. FORP want to avoid this at all costs and assert that with the advent of RQ with its additional influx of people into the park and children's area, makes them even more essential. There is a huge benefit to the RQ centre if there are additional public toilets in the park as this will prevent park users using the public toilet facilities in the centre. The long-term maintenance of toilets is understandably a great concern to BCC especially due to cuts in budget. But there are options in the market for public toilet buildings with pay on entry systems which could mitigate costs. <https://www.healthmatic.com/public-toilets/>

There is a good case for further investigation into how we can incorporate a toilet block into the overall plan for the park in relation to RCG and RQ as there is a demonstrable benefit to the development. S106 should be used to achieve this. We anticipate a significant public outcry if the toilets are not included in the plan.

The Pavilion

The park pavilion is a very rundown and underutilised resource in the park and its position next to the Garden presents an opportunity for this to become a part of the RCG facility. It is currently used for the BCC Parks staff to have their tea/lunch breaks and, on an ad hoc basis, by The Park Knowle Football Club. BCC has no plan or budget to make any renovations or improvements to the building.

Park Knowle FC is run by Mike Alden (also a FORP Committee member). Mike is a volunteering hero and very well regarded in the local community. He has been running the club for 10 years. The club is based at the Park Centre in Knowle West. His club provides a huge amount of opportunity for young people including girls and disabled players, to play football and interact positively with each other. There are currently 12 teams, including 2 girls' teams and 5 disabled teams. We estimate that 250+ young people have come through the club since its inception and Mike has recently been nominated for BBC Sports Personality of the Year Unsung Hero Award. The club use the Redcatch Park football pitches whenever they can, but this is very limited because of the lack of operational facilities in the Pavilion; the changing rooms are out of date and in very poor condition and there are no separate changing rooms for girls or officials and no disabled facilities at all. None of the showers or toilets work and therefore none of the teams have sufficient or appropriate facilities. Some of the teams cannot play at Redcatch Park at all, because of the lack of facilities which reduces the opportunities for the club to grow and continue to thrive. The few teams who do use the park to play have to go home muddy as there are no working showers.

RCG are collaborating with The Park FC to apply for a Community Asset Transfer (CAT) of the Pavilion on a shared use basis. This will enable them to apply for any relevant funding available to redevelop this building and enable the club to install the requisite facilities to facilitate all teams to play at Redcatch Park. RCG would be able to utilise the Pavilion for management office space, extra toilet and kitchen facilities and additional meeting and workshop space and in time, possibly a youth club

The priority for RCG is to concentrate their efforts on the CAT for the Garden first and then progress to the Pavilion CAT in the new year.

However, FORP feel that the Pavilion is a key element in the overall health and viability of two very important park assets; RCG and The Park FC.

RCG has secured funding to make its current 1:1 / small group therapy space more appropriate (currently held in an extension of the marquee building (known as the Canopy) which does not afford the required privacy). The plan is to form a therapy room within a section of the marquee from materials which provide more sound insulation and a more intimate ambiance.

Further funding is being sought to provide a 'garden room' therapy space - a separate garden room close to the Canopy in which garden related therapy sessions can be held. Again, this will provide quiet space for 1:1 sessions to be held more privately.

The Garden exists with a lot of donations, support from the volunteer army, grants and mostly second hand kit. The catering equipment (ovens, fridges, freezers, chilled cabinets etc) are all second hand and frequently break down. Making food items to sell in the café is often a challenge. The Garden equipment is mostly donated and, until the recent purchase of another shipping container, was kept in timber sheds etc. A number of break-ins saw the loss of a number of electrical tools and equipment, which were largely replaced by kind donations following a public appeal.

The Garden would like to afford a better CCTV system to help deter break ins. Perhaps this could be considered as an extension to the CCTV system for RQ?

The dry summer of 2022 has left the main circulation grass areas bare, despite only being laid in 2021 (with the most resilient grass type affordable). Whilst the main area was laid by paid labour, some areas were laid by volunteers. The whole area not covered in buildings, requires new surfaces and the Garden needs professional support to design this area and advise on what could be used that is environmentally appropriate (the Garden is organic and very environmentally conscious) whilst being more resilient.

The Garden is very conscious that it does not have a rainwater harvesting system and this is very high on the agenda to address. Current feasibilities are looking at how rainwater from all the main buildings can be captured, contained and distributed around the garden to minimise the water usage. Once a plan is agreed, funds will need to be sought to implement.

It is hoped that there will be sufficient funds to provide solar panels and additional insulation / maximum energy conservation measures to the new café building to reduce the impact of the Garden on the environment.

It would be most welcomed if the RQ landscaping design team could support the Garden with advice on some of these elements.

The Garden has an under 5 play area, which is in much need of redevelopment, which we would like to be considered alongside the general Park and RQ development under play area provision.

7. Increase in Anti-Social Behaviour

This is a very real concern for the future of the park and we are in fact currently dealing with a

resurgence. Specifically young disaffected teenage boys using motor scooters, electric bikes and generally being obnoxious and abusive. This could present a greater problem with the development having an open concourse, cafes, community hub, restaurants, route from Wells Road etc. There is a great need for engagement with this group of people and we are aware that there is currently nowhere for them to hang out, let alone engage them. We have a good relationship with the local Police department and are asking them for their guidance and suggestions vis a vis the development especially regarding the permeable concourse boundary, security, lighting, entrances and walkways. We will also be meeting with some key youth workers from Knowle West to gain knowledge and intel about how we might be able to engage with this group. Mike Alden from The Park Knowle Football Club is going to assist with introductions.

We request assistance from BCC and any advice from experience the developers may have from other such developments regarding this issue, to agree a plan as part of the overall vision. This will be a concern for potential residents of RQ and is something we need to mitigate for and a proactive approach will be more affective.

8. Not enough additional play and communal space

We have already addressed the question of communal space in point 5 above but we wish to address the issue of children's play space in more detail.

According to the Child Yield Calculator and recommended guidelines of play space per child (BCC Urban Living SPD) the development as it stands, would need to provide play space per child as follows:

Age Anticipated children Recommended play space on site

0-4 years old 52.35 523.5 (m2)

5-11 years old 24.88 248.80 (m2)

12- 15 years old 8.01 80.1 (m2)

Total 85.23 852.4 (m2)

From the documents submitted it does not appear that these guidelines will be met and that therefore the assumption is that the existing play space and equipment in the park will absorb these additional children. The children's play area is already very well used and at busier times of day, after school and weekends, children are already having to wait to use equipment. Some of the equipment is already well worn and some is broken (the roundabout is on its last legs).

If it is the case that RQ cannot supply dedicated children's play space then a condition of planning should be in place to allocate S106 for updating, extending and providing additional equipment here. A separate area/equipment for teenagers should also be considered (this would also help

mitigate for some of the anti-social behaviour concerns).

9. Security of the park

The park currently has three lockable gates; two on Redcatch Road and two in the car park. Two chicane gates, one on Redcatch Road and the other on Broadwalk are not lockable and allow access to the park out of hours. The internal park gate in the car park is kept locked, either by Parks staff or RCG. The internal park barrier gate is kept locked to prevent unauthorised vehicle access directly to the park. The external car park gate is locked each evening by a BCC patrol team who also lock the toilets. All of the other gates are left open.

The nature of the RQ development means that security measures within the park become more crucial to help protect and reassure the residents. The boundary junction treatment is crucial to this, as it needs to present a method which will successfully act as a barrier and deterrent for anti-social behaviour as well as preventing children and dogs escaping into the centre and onto Wells Road. We think that if new gates are installed to replace the chicane gates, then a decision needs to be made whether these gates are locked after a certain time, along with the others. We are open to this discussion as we see that the needs of the residents and businesses in the development must be weighed.

The current security arrangement does not appear to be an issue as far as anti-social behaviour is concerned, but it may become so when there is direct access to residences from the park side of the development.

Walkways

The replacement path which will run along the side of RQ and connect it and the park to Broadwalk on one side and Redcatch Road on the other, will become the most used route in the park and so the entrances at either end must be accessible. At the moment they are both chicane gates and so these will need to be replaced. The cost of this must be factored in as part of the development and approvals should be conditional upon this.

Lighting & CCTV

Key lighting will play a large role in the security of the park and the development. We request that a lighting and CCTV plan be developed and discussed and a provision within S106 which will include the central path, connecting path from RCG to RQ, passing the development to both entrances on Redcatch Road and Broadwalk.

Security for RQ

We assume there will be general security for the centre and that there will be liaison between the park and the centre as necessary if/when events are held on the concourse/junction. It is important that we know the arrangements in place and points of contact.

10. Losing the integral car park.

The Park car park is used every day by people using the park, playing football, tennis, dog walkers and deliveries to RCG.

Parking is and will continue to be a hot topic of discontent in the community and so it is essential that all RQ contractors are informed not to use the Park car park during construction. We understand that the RQ developers will provide on site or off site parking for all their contractors. It is imperative that Redcatch Park does not lose any of its greenspace to accommodate parking or contracting space (other than that agreed for the boundary treatment during that phase of the build)

We understand that there will be a Residents Parking Zone (RPZ) and that the full range of this is to be agreed in due course. We also understand that the RPZ will not come into effect until the development is complete. This presents an issue during the development phases, as when the old Broadwalk car park is removed, the estimated 200+ commuters from outside the city, who arrive in the morning, use it as a free car park and then proceed to work in the city, will then start using the surrounding streets and inevitably the Park car park. In addition, there will be numerous building consultants, contractors and sub-contractors also potentially doing the same. Existing users and of course the Community Garden are concerned about this during the building phase and beyond and we would like to ask for a plan as to how this can be managed to minimise inconvenience.

We request that the solution for minimising the loss of resident and park / RCG visitor car parking space be a condition of the planning. Even without the contractor's vehicles, the 200 or so commuters who use Broadwalk as a free park and walk / ride facility at the moment must be deterred from parking in the streets around RQ development.

We would like to suggest that a possible solution could be a limited portion of the RPZ nearest the development, being introduced from the first phase of the development. This portion could cover the Park Car Park and would help alleviate the immediate issue caused by the park and ride commuters currently using the Broadwalk car park. (Deliveries to RCG could obtain a temporary pass from the Garden). This would really assist the Garden and local residents nearest the park/development, who will be the first to suffer in terms of reduced on street parking spaces.

.....

These comments were compiled by:

Sian Ellis-Thomas (Chair) & Lesley Powell (Vice Chair) of Friends of Redcatch Park (FORP) in close collaboration with Mike Cardwell (Dir) & Kate Swain (Dir) of Redcatch Community Garden

November 1st 2022

.....

NB: November 2nd: Today we had our third productive meeting with RQ Developers and have shared our comments above with them. We are comforted that they are keen and actively willing to engage with us collaboratively for solutions that are beneficial to the park as well as the development.