

Bournemouth Public Realm Strategy

Guiding Principles SPD

Consultation Statement

April 2013



Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	The consultation	2
3	Consultation responses	3
4	List of organisations contacted as part of the public consultation	21

1 Introduction

This consultation statement provides information following the public consultation on the Bournemouth Public Realm Strategy: Guiding Principles SPD. This document explains how the consultation was carried out, summarises the results and sets out how the draft strategy was amended in the light of the responses received.

The Bournemouth Public Realm Strategy: Guiding Principles SPD is a strategy to guide changes to, and investment in, the borough's streets and spaces. The borough wide strategy will guide changes so that our streets and public spaces function well, have a consistent appearance, are distinctive to Bournemouth, are in keeping with local character, and provide quality and value for money.

The Public Realm Strategy sets out guiding principles for the design of the public realm and seeks to:

- Nurture character and local distinctiveness to create a public realm that is memorable, attractive, enjoyable and promotes activity,
- Guide public realm schemes to create high quality streets and spaces that are safe and inclusive,
- Improve the function of the public realm network to promote walking and cycling, balance the needs of different types of transport and aid navigation.

The Public Realm Strategy addresses themes that are relevant to a number of Council departments including Planning, Transport, Property Services, Highways Maintenance, Economic Regeneration, Parks, Seafront and Town Centre Management, and has been produced in consultation with them.

It is intended that the Council, its partners and developers will refer to the Public Realm Strategy when planning changes to our streets and public spaces or when designing developments that affect the public realm.

As a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) the Public Realm Strategy has been produced in accordance with adopted local policy and national policy and legislation including the Bournemouth Local Plan: Core Strategy and the Local Transport Plan 3 (LTP3) 2011. The role of the SPD is to provide more detail about how the policies of the Bournemouth Local Plan should be put into practice. It also sets the context for future more detailed work specifically relating to individual areas of the borough, for example the Town Centre.

2 The consultation

Public consultation on the Bournemouth Public Realm Strategy: Guiding Principles SPD took place between 19th November 2012 and 7th January 2013. A period of 7 weeks consultation was allowed to ensure all stakeholders had an opportunity to comment.

Comments were invited in writing, by post to the Council Offices or by email to urbandesign@bournemouth.gov.uk.

The draft SPD and supporting documentation was made available for inspection at:

- Bournemouth Borough Council Customer Service Centre
- All the Bournemouth libraries
- On the Council's website at www.bournemouth.gov.uk/PublicRealm

A letter or e-mail was sent to identified consultees and other key stakeholders, including consultation bodies and local organisations, notifying them of the publication of the draft SPD. The list of organisations contacted can be seen on pages 21 to 23.

A press release was also made which led to an article in the Bournemouth Daily Echo on Monday 17th December 2012, please see below.



Article in the Bournemouth Daily Echo, Monday 17th December 2012

3 Consultation responses

Responses to the public consultation were received from 18 stakeholders and members of the public including Bournemouth Civic Society, DOTS Disability, Cooper Dean Estate, East Dorset Friends of the Earth, English Heritage, Environment Agency, Natural England, NHS Public Health, and RSPB. Three internal officer responses were also received.

The main points raised in the consultation are as follows:

- Support for the document from the majority of respondents
- Concern that changes to the public realm in the town centre could discourage people from driving to the town centre to shop
- Wishes from some respondents for a more cyclist and pedestrian friendly approach
- Suggestions to reduce the impact on the environment, promote sustainable drainage, and enhance biodiversity

Where practical, and where suggestions were in line with local and national policy, they have been included in the Public Realm Strategy.

The Equality Impact Needs Assessment for the draft document identified that changes to the public realm may, depending on their design, have a negative impact on disabled people. We welcomed a detailed consultation response from DOTS Disability, which was broadly supportive of the document and also suggested some changes. The suggestions have been incorporated into the document where they have been directly relevant.

The following table summarises the consultation responses and resulting changes to the Public Realm Strategy.

In addition to the following outlined changes, the document was changed after the public consultation to remove section 1.4 which explained how people could respond to the public consultation, and the section was replaced by information about the adopted status of the document.

Reference	Name of respondent	Summary of comments	Council response
01	D Botterill, DKB Leasing Ltd	The measures proposed in the document will discourage people from travelling into Bournemouth centre to shop, and will encourage them to go to places where they can park easily and for free instead, which will negatively impact the economy of the Town Centre. Cars should take priority, a large out of town shopping centre should be built to enable easy access by car, no further cycle lanes should be provided as they create a danger to motorists, residents should be forced to park on their own driveways rather than on the road.	The transport and shopping centre related suggestions are contrary to national and local government policy and / or not possible to implement and enforce. The Town Centre AAP proposes to retain overall numbers of car parking, and if the town centre is more attractive to walk around once people are out of their cars, then this should serve as an attraction. However, the Constraints section (3.4.2) has been amended to include a reference to the issue of discouraging people from driving into the Town Centre.
		The character of housing in Bournemouth should be upheld, particularly in Boscombe.	The support for retaining the character of housing in the town is welcomed.
		A large water and light feature should be built in the gardens or at the end of the Pier.	Although implementing a water and light feature is outside of the scope of the Public Realm Strategy, the Strategy would be supportive of this in principle if it was proposed by another operator.
02	V Lee	Cycle paths should be continuous and not suddenly end to allow connected routes for less confident riders.	Guiding principle G supports direct, well connected routes for cyclists and pedestrians where possible.
		Parks staff should be consulted on the Public Realm Strategy.	Parks staff have been consulted throughout the process.
		Support for the Westover Road proposals.	The Westover Road proposals are separate to this Public Realm Strategy, however the support is welcomed.
		Café culture should be increased in the town centre and on the seafront.	The Public Realm Strategy supports café culture (Guiding Principle A).
		The town centre precinct is in need of a refresh.	Noted.
		Buses can cause problems for passing traffic by not pulling properly in to bus stops.	Noted. This is outside of the scope of the Public Realm Strategy.

Reference	Name of respondent	Summary of comments	Council response
03	K Mantock, Bournemouth Civic Society	The Bournemouth Civic Society supports the Public Realm Strategy, and particularly commend the three overarching aims and the ten guiding principles. The summary of strengths and weaknesses of the current public realm is honest and so well informs the actions required to take the strategy forward. A great document with many good ideas.	Comments noted and welcomed.
04	D Ogborne, Wessex Water	Existing public sewer systems are located within the streets and open spaces. Where redevelopment proposals are promoted, early consultation should be made with all statutory undertakers to review the impact upon the utility services. In particular where new tree planting affects existing sewers and new paving affects manhole covers and alters ground levels. Wessex Water will be able to confirm requirements where access for statutory undertakers is necessary as detailed in Guiding Principle J Page 49 and the reinstatement of paved surfaces in Appendix 3.	Comments noted.
05	C Routh, Natural England	We welcome the recognition of the role that the natural environment can play in delivering a high quality public realm, and in particular the role of street trees in delivering a wide range of public goods.	Comments noted and welcomed.
06	A Pooley, East Dorset Friends of the Earth	<p>East Dorset FoE generally support the content of the Public Realm Strategy and believe the recommendations to be in line with local and national guidance for sustainable development, it incorporates positive suggestions that if implemented will contribute to the Council's commitment to reducing the carbon footprint of the Town. We would ask that the following comments are taken into consideration:</p> <p>The proposed use of Sustainable Urban Drainage - This is becoming increasingly important with the erratic weather patterns now being experienced. We believe that non-permeable surfaces should be avoided wherever possible.</p>	<p>Comments noted and welcomed.</p> <p>Sustainable Urban Drainage: Policy CS4 of the adopted Bournemouth Local Plan: Core Strategy requires SuDS, including for the development of car parking and hard standing.</p> <p>Have added '... and where possible lessen existing surface water flooding problems' to the text on page 44.</p> <p>Have also added 'The maintenance of sustainable drainage options also needs to be planned for at the outset.' to page 49.</p>

Reference	Name of respondent	Summary of comments	Council response
		<p>Supporting Biodiversity - Whilst we believe this is a positive initiative we would like to suggest that consideration be given to the planting of fruit trees in public areas where suitable and appropriate. This would add to the biodiversity benefits and could encourage foraging by the community.</p> <p>Encouraging sustainable travel - This is crucial if Bournemouth is serious about meeting the targets that have been set by the Council to reduce energy use and carbon emissions.</p> <p>When planning cycle lanes wherever possible these should be on roads in preference to shared pavements as this will reduce the conflict between cyclists and pedestrians.</p> <p>Sustainability of materials - Fully supported, in particular the use of locally sourced materials.</p> <p>Lighting - We fully support the suggestions made and believe implementation of PIR controlled lighting should be a priority.</p> <p>Energy generation - Fully supported.</p>	<p>Supporting Biodiversity: a reference will be added to the Public Realm Strategy to support the planting of fruit trees in public areas where suitable and appropriate. However, it will not always be appropriate to encourage foraging by the community.</p> <p>Cycle lanes - the Public Realm Strategy allows flexibility for designers to use the most appropriate connections for cyclists rather than prescribing a certain kind.</p>
07	S Chapman	<p>Strategy is not radical enough to tackle climate change and resource scarcity. More should be done to promote carbon awareness and careful resource management. The document is too far in favour of the private car.</p> <p>Parts of this respondents response appeared to be about policies in the adopted Core Strategy.</p> <p>Please produce an updated document which takes into account the destabilisation of the earth's climate and the</p>	<p>The Public Realm Strategy has to accord with national and local government guidance, including the National Planning Policy Framework, the Bournemouth Local Plan: Core Strategy and the Local Transport Plan 3. It is considered that the Public Realm Strategy takes the available opportunities, within this framework, to reduce the impact of climate change, support biodiversity, encourage sustainable travel, promote sustainable energy generation, source materials sustainably, reduce carbon emissions and manage waste responsibly.</p>

Reference	Name of respondent	Summary of comments	Council response
		other limitations to civilisation.	
08	E Marx / E Katz	<p>Document needs to be stronger to tackle the causes of climate change, in particular to reduce vulnerabilities to extreme weather. Renewable energy sources should be prioritised and energy usage must be cut. Visual amenity should not be used as a reason to refuse applications for renewable energy generation.</p> <p>Parts of this respondents response also appeared to be about policies in the adopted Core Strategy.</p> <p>Trees should be protected more strongly.</p>	The Public Realm Strategy has to accord with national and local government guidance, including the National Planning Policy Framework, the Bournemouth Local Plan: Core Strategy and the Local Transport Plan 3. It is considered that the Public Realm Strategy takes the available opportunities, within this framework, to reduce the impact of climate change, support biodiversity, encourage sustainable travel, promote sustainable energy generation, source materials sustainably, reduce carbon emissions and manage waste responsibly.
09	M Ambler, Yellow Buses	Photo caption on page 20 that reads ‘Dominance of buses on Gervis Place’ depicts the public transport facility in a negative manner. However, there is scope to improve pedestrian facilities at this site which we would welcome.	Noted, the photo and caption have been changed. The caption now reads: “Difficult conditions for pedestrians on Gervis Place”
10	L Owen, Public Health, NHS Bournemouth and Poole	1.1 Could consider changing the section heading ‘Background’ to read ‘Vision’ ‘Aim or ‘Purpose’	This suggestion has been considered, however, the aims and purpose of the document are covered later, and this section does not set a vision. In contrast, this section sets the theoretical context and explains the key terms, and so Background is still considered to be a good name for it.
		Para. 1.1 - Lack of pedestrian and cyclist signage - adding more signs does not necessarily enhance the environment.	This is recognised, however, a co-ordinated system of pedestrian and cyclist signage would help to rationalise existing signage and would help people to find their way around more easily.
		Para. 1.2 A thriving economy does not have to involve more motorised traffic. Experiences are important.	Noted, the strategy supports this, in particular see Guiding Principles A and B.
		Paras 2.1 and 2.2 Road space should be re-allocated away from private cars and towards public transport, cycling and walking, to achieve healthier lifestyles.	Noted, the strategy supports this, working within the national and local policy and guidance framework.
		The box explaining the difference between roads and streets is helpful, as is the stated move away from the	Noted and welcomed.

Reference	Name of respondent	Summary of comments	Council response
		function of roads to streets.	
		The Wessex Way should be made safely usable by cyclists as it is a wide level road that directly connects Bournemouth and Poole.	Although improving direct links for cyclists is desirable, the Wessex Way has high vehicle flows. The costs and opportunities for such a change would have to be carefully assessed and this falls outside of the scope of this document.
		2.5 - Walking and cycling in Southampton has been much improved with EU investment. High quality, regular bus services which integrate with rail are a key element.	Noted. Text not changed because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Funding (EU or otherwise) is not covered in any of the examples in this section, so to include it for Southampton would not be consistent. - Although integrated bus and rail services are important, they are not specifically to do with the physical function and appearance of the public realm.
		The Council should seek to improve direct links for pedestrians and cyclists in culs-de-sac estates, including through buying properties on key routes.	Noted, improving links is supported by the Strategy but such direct action is outside its scope.
		4.1 The Overall Aims are wholly endorsed.	Noted and welcomed.
		Guiding Principle H - to be consistent with the aims, this point should commit to a reduction in parking provision, especially in the town centre and areas well-served by public transport.	A reduction in parking provision could disadvantage certain groups including disabled people, older people and those with young families. The Town Centre AAP commits to not reducing parking provision, and this strategy has to work within this framework.
		Guiding Principle A - the Pier Approach flyover in the town centre should be demolished.	Demolishing the flyover would be extremely costly and would cause problems for bus movements in the town centre.
		Guiding Principle A - the references to encouraging creativity are welcomed.	Noted and welcomed.
		Guiding Principle B - it is refreshing to see consideration of all the senses in this document, there is evidence to show that this approach is beneficial to mental health. The adoption of Permaculture principles should be considered.	Permaculture has been investigated and considered as a suggestion for the document. However, the principles are complex and would be difficult to deliver in an urban environment. Although it may be possible to incorporate some elements of the principles, adoption of the principles would be dependent on buy-in from all those

Reference	Name of respondent	Summary of comments	Council response
			involved in delivery. In any case, principles of sustainability covered in this document do begin to work towards a similar approach.
		Guiding Principle B advertisements on bus shelters should not block views of approaching buses for waiting passengers.	The design and location of bus shelters is too detailed for the public realm strategy, and advertising does pay for the bus shelters themselves, so without advertising fewer bus shelters would be in place. However this comment has been passed on to the Council's Public Transport Officer.
		p.33 - Safety / security grilles - Council should consider discouraging these by encouraging longer opening hours through mixed use traffic calming to increase pedestrian movement.	Noted. The document seeks to increase pedestrian movement and support local businesses. The Planning system also discourages / limits the use of security grilles.
		p.36-37 - Access - This is a very important section due to residents and visitors with disabilities and an aging population.	Noted and welcomed.
		p.38-39 - Signage - The Council should make use of electronic methods of wayfinding - e.g. smartphones rather than physical signs.	Reference added on page 38. At the same time it must be ensured that this does not exclude those without access to, or the skills to use, this technology, for example older people, people with disabilities, or people on lower incomes.
		p.41 - conflict between different classes of road users -the document does not propose solutions to this difficult issue - changes to the environment should be carefully considered to ensure that they do not adversely affect safety.	The document considers solutions, particularly in the 'Examples of current practice.' A one-size-fits-all approach will not be appropriate and so solutions will have to be carefully tailored to each individual place/route.
		p.42 - Residential streets, traffic speed - area-wide speed limits should be introduced.	Speed limits will be considered in the more detailed Public Realm strategies for individual areas and as part of detailed public realm schemes .
		p.43 - Car parking and car clubs - document should make reference to encouraging car clubs.	Noted. Car clubs are covered in the higher level Local Transport Plan (LTP3, para, 8.10 p.64).
		p.44 - Sustainability - the key points in this section are	Noted and welcomed.

Reference	Name of respondent	Summary of comments	Council response
		strongly endorsed, because they will benefit health. Overall this is an excellent document.	Noted and welcomed.
11	M Holm, Environment Agency	Climate change - The Environment Agency supports the drive towards sustainable drainage solutions, in terms of both flood risk and water quality perspectives. The Council may wish to use enhanced public spaces to improve the existing surface water problems in your authority area - see the surface water flooding maps your authority have produced, which highlight the areas at risk. Note that sustainable drainage options may require more maintenance so this should be factored in to the maintenance and reinstatement section. Supporting biodiversity - we support the paragraph relating to wildlife corridors. However it should be strengthened to require enhancements and maintenance of existing green spaces / wildlife corridors. There should be a drive to increase and improve your urban biodiversity networks as they form part of the South East Dorset Green Infrastructure Strategy.	Noted and welcomed. Have added '... and where possible lessen existing surface water flooding problems' to the text on page 44. Have also added 'The maintenance of sustainable drainage options also needs to be planned for at the outset.' to page 49.
12	P Woodford, Cooper-Dean Estate	The Trustees support the good management of the public realm and the general aims of the draft strategy.	Noted and welcomed.
13	S Fitt, RSPB	RSPB is in agreement with the strategy for the public realm. The Council is required by the NERC Act 2006 and the NPPF to protect and enhance biodiversity, this will also help mitigate problems arising from severe weather events and be beneficial for the health and wellbeing of residents as well as wildlife. Would like to draw your attention to Exeter City Council's Residential Design Guide SPD and the Town and Country Planning Association & Wildlife Trust's 'Planning for a healthy environment: good practice for	Noted and welcomed. The recommended documents have been considered. The recommendations and content of the documents have generally either: - already been included in this Public Realm Strategy (whether in Guiding Principle I or in other guiding principles), - discuss residential, or other development, which is not the topic of the Public Realm Strategy, - go into more detail than can feasibly be covered in

Reference	Name of respondent	Summary of comments	Council response
		green infrastructure and biodiversity' as examples of best practice. The RSPB will also be publishing an in-depth guide on SuDS, which will be available shortly.	the Public Realm Strategy.
14	T Marden, Bournemouth Development Company	<p>The key principles are all very sensible.</p> <p>Although the Grand Garden Walk is town centre specific, it could be mentioned in this document as an example of a strategic approach to the public realm.</p> <p>Specifically missing is the importance of analysing at the outset of a project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What role the space is to have. For example some public realm encourages people to move quickly from A to B, whilst other needs to encourage dwell time. - Who is to use the space. - Where is it - town centre, beach, residential areas etc. <p>This all drives design, choice of material and can then be a benchmark to value the success or otherwise of the project. Could there be a small section inserted at say 4.2 to address this?</p>	<p>Noted and welcomed.</p> <p>Although the Grand Garden Walk would be a good example, the Strategy has purposefully tried to not cover specific examples within the borough, so as to not become too detailed or to be inconsistent by highlighting some examples but not others.</p> <p>A small paragraph has been added at 4.2.2 to cover these points.</p>
15	D Stuart, English Heritage	<p>Welcome the production of the public realm strategy, pleased to see referencing to Bournemouth's historic character.</p> <p>Para. 2.2 - Consider whether CS40 historic environment should also be referred to in the list of relevant policies.</p> <p>Section 3 - Understanding Bournemouth - consider giving equal weight to the role of the historic built environment and the urban public realm, alongside the natural environment.</p>	<p>Noted and welcomed.</p> <p>Having given this consideration, CS39 Designated Heritage Assets and CS40 would both be relevant, and so have been added to the list in para 2.2.</p> <p>This has been considered. It is felt appropriate to retain the emphasis on the town's natural environment - the sea, beach, pines, open spaces - as it is this that led to the founding of Bournemouth and has kept visitors coming to the town. However, text has been added at paragraph 3.1.7 to acknowledge the role of the historic</p>

Reference	Name of respondent	Summary of comments	Council response
			built environment and urban public realm.
		Guiding Principles are comprehensively set out.	Noted and welcomed.
		Guiding Principle A - suggest reference to uses in the list of features of influence, of the spaces themselves as well as the buildings that address them (e.g. upper Old Christchurch Road).	Uses added to the list on page 24.
		p.25 Designated and non-designated heritage assets -would encourage an holistic appreciation of area character, and the role of 'non-status' or everyday historic public realm in defining a sense of place.	This has been considered, the last paragraph of the main text on page 25 does discuss non status public realm, so it is considered that the text would not benefit significantly from adding the words suggested.
		Much will depend on the follow-up to this document, as covered in section 5.	Noted.
		Consider how to ensure buy-in from Council departments, statutory undertakers and partners such as English Heritage. Consider what the ongoing role of English Heritage might be.	Noted and welcomed, this needs consideration outside of the Public Realm Strategy.
16	M McManus, DOTS Disability	User engagement and involvement: ring fence a specific budget for user engagement and focus groups. Consider developing a specific 'disability reference group' - a consistent group of local disabled people as a focus group for consultation on public realm changes and other stages of the development process.	We welcome these suggestions. DOTS Disability is on the Council's standard consultee list for proposed public realm schemes, Traffic Regulation Order changes and planning policy proposals. More in-depth focus groups with local disabled people have taken place when public realm changes have been proposed, including for proposals for changes to the Triangle and Westover Road. Although this is outside of the scope of the Public Realm Strategy: Guiding Principles SPD consideration will be given to undertaking focus groups or other consultation with local disabled people for future public realm proposals.
		Understanding disability: There is no commitment to disability equality training in the strategy. Future documents arising from the Strategy should refer to Bournemouth Council's commitment to the social model of disability, and include a brief explanation of this principle in their glossaries, to increase understanding of the social	This would add strength to the direction Public Realm Strategy is seeking to take. Guiding Principle E and the glossary have been updated.

Reference	Name of respondent	Summary of comments	Council response
		model and the approach required.	
		Disability equality training: planning documentation resulting from the Strategy should state that all those involved in this work should attend Disability Equality training, including those undertaking the annual review of the projects in LTP3.	We welcome these comments, the Council is committed to Equality and Diversity and training for officers. Although outside the scope of the strategy the Council will nevertheless take this forward.
		Disability: The presence of the Disability section is welcome, however it is confusing as it also refers to groups of people not affected under the disability heading, for example, people with prams.	The section includes people who struggle with mobility for whatever reason, but it is accepted that some of these people are not affected under the disability heading. The order of the section has been changed to clarify that changes that help disabled people would also help other people who struggle with mobility.
		Further documents should have a section entitled Equality and Diversity that lays out the Council's approach to all of the protected characteristic groups, including disabled people. Issues pertaining to specific protected characteristic groups, including disability, should be included as a sub-section of the Equality and Diversity section to place disability in the right context.	Noted and welcomed, this will be considered for future documents.
		Examples of current practice: Concerned that the impact of changes on disabled people in these examples are not fully understood, and so cannot necessarily be considered to be improvements. The Council should review the example of Maidstone in Kent, which has received positive feedback for its approach to an accessible public realm. Future examples of good practice should include reference to feedback from disabled people.	It is not clear whether the respondent is referring to a specific scheme or policy document in Maidstone. Some initial research has found that there do not appear to be any relevant policy documents (although there is a good public realm policy document produced by Kent County Council), but Maidstone high street has recently undergone public realm improvements and an accessibility officer was appointed to ensure the changes took the needs of people with disabilities into account. Following Maidstone's example of appointing an Accessibility Officer, a sentence suggesting this for larger schemes will be added to the Strategy (page 35).
		Shared surfaces / Exhibition Road: the level of concern regarding the safety of this shared surface is considerable and not limited to concerns voiced by the visually impaired	Noted and welcomed.

Reference	Name of respondent	Summary of comments	Council response
		and mobility impaired communities. Similar concerns have been raised by the disabled community about the implementation of shared surfaces in Bournemouth. We therefore welcome the commitment to consider carefully the implementation of shared space/surface in Bournemouth.	
		Access officers involved in the development of Exhibition Road should be consulted with.	Noted and welcomed, this will be considered where shared surface schemes are proposed.
		The Strategy should commit to extensive user involvement with local disabled people on any shared surface proposal, as part of a full EINA.	Noted and welcomed. The strategy discusses the importance of public consultation, and the Council is aware of the value of user involvement.
		Other smaller town centre approaches to making the public realm more accessible to disabled people and where there has been considerable involvement of disabled people, should be reviewed. For example Maidstone in Kent and the London Borough of Islington.	<p>The Maidstone example has been addressed above.</p> <p>It was not clear whether the recommended Islington example was a policy document or a case study public realm project. In terms of policy, Islington's Streetbook SPD (adopted October 2012) prioritises Fairness through inclusive design, and makes reference to designing for people with disabilities throughout the document. The key points discussed are already in the draft Bournemouth Public Realm Strategy, at the level of detail appropriate for the Strategy. Similarly, the Islington Inclusive Landscape Design SPD sets out detailed design requirements such as the gradient of ramps, height of handrails and design of gateways, which are too detailed for the Bournemouth Public Realm Strategy. The overall objectives set out in each section have been covered in the Bournemouth Public Realm Strategy. These documents will be kept in mind for future more detailed work.</p>
		Existing feedback on the barriers that face disabled people: the Access Dorset High Street / Town Centre Accessibility Survey Report should be reviewed by those taking this work forward, and included as key reference	Noted and welcomed. The recommended survey report is too detailed for the current Guiding Principles document, but is a useful reference for further work.

Reference	Name of respondent	Summary of comments	Council response
		material in subsequent planning documents and guidance. It should also be used as a reference for any EINA screening exercise resulting from this work.	
		Accessible parking: the strategy and approach should include a strong commitment to provide accessible parking in hub locations, as opposed to a consideration.	On further investigation saved Local Plan policies 8.39 and 8.40 make strong commitments to providing car parking facilities for disabled people and the NPPF supports this (para. 35). Therefore, this Strategy should be in line. The text has been changed to reflect this commitment, however specific reference has not been made to the Local Plan policies because the Local Plan is being superseded by updated policies, and so specific reference would run the risk of becoming out of date.
		Mobility scooter provision: the provision of parking for mobility scooters and charging points needs to be considered essential.	Although there is not the same explicit policy commitment at a higher level, it goes with the principles of improving access, and the text has been reinforced.
		Pedestrian circulation: The definition of pedestrian should be stated to include wheelchair and mobility scooter users, so that those working with this Strategy and taking it forward are reminded to give consideration to these groups.	This has been clarified - where pedestrians are first discussed in detail in the document on page 11, by an extra sentence on page 34, and by a new entry in the glossary on page 62.
		The document lacks reference to Shop Mobility, and the Town Centre needs a Shop Mobility facility for both residents and to attract potential tourist visitors who may be disabled, and their families. The document should include a commitment to the development of a Shop Mobility facility in Bournemouth town centre as a priority, and explore how Shop Mobility can be delivered in the minor town centre hubs.	The Town Centre Area Action Plan supports a Shop Mobility facility in the Town Centre (policy T9). This Strategy does not have access to resources to ensure the delivery of Shop Mobility, and Shop Mobility is not directly related to the treatment of our streets and spaces, and how they look and function, which is the purpose of this Strategy.
		People with sensory impairments rely on the presence of features such as kerbs and rails, textured paving at controlled and uncontrolled crossings, to make informed decisions. Any changes to public realm safety features, for example, the removal of street railings, should warrant a full EINA and substantial user involvement activities.	EINAs and public consultation are discussed on page 37. Some public realm changes could be minor and so committing to a full EINA in all circumstances may not be the best use of resources. Sentences have been added to the section on removing railings (p.31) and to the section on shared surfaces, (p.35) to say EINA screening and

Reference	Name of respondent	Summary of comments	Council response
			public consultation, including of disabled groups, should be carried out.
		Although there is reference to hate crime there is no reference to disability hate crime. There is currently a low level of understanding of disability hate crime, which needs to be changed to maximise the safety and security of disabled people in the town centre. Bournemouth Council's intolerance of disability hate crime should be given a high profile, and this serious issue should be given due consideration within the Strategy and subsequent options.	Agree that all hate crime is a serious issue that should not be tolerated. Disability has been missed off the possible reasons for people to feel singled-out or vulnerable (so has age), and so the document has been amended. The purpose of this document is to set out Guiding Principles rather than to discuss the details of particular crimes, and so, aside from the above changes, the commitment to make places more secure and feel more secure for everyone, and the strategies set out to do this, are considered to cover the issue.
		Consideration during design of potential effects on the senses is welcomed, as is the acknowledgement of the potentially positive outcomes for those with a sensory impairment.	Noted and welcomed.
		The consideration that will be given to the use of white light appliances is also welcomed because the impact of light pooling can be disorientating for people with visual impairments. In addition, people who are Deaf, deafened and hard of hearing rely on good clear sight lines at night to feel secure.	Noted and welcomed.
		It should be ensured that those developing spaces with multi-sensory features are aware of the barriers that disabled people with sensory impairments face, so that design does not worsen those barriers.	The text on page 27 has been amended.
17	Town Centre BID Manager	<p>While it's quite right as we look to the future to take opportunities to improve the public realm for pedestrians and cycles, we must bear in mind the impact that will have on the town as a whole, not just specific areas.</p> <p>The town centre competes against out-of-town shopping destinations which are almost wholly accessed by car, such as Castlepoint. If measures to deter car use are</p>	The Public Realm Strategy has to accord with national and local government guidance, including the National Planning Policy Framework, the Core Strategy, the Local Transport Plan, and the Town Centre AAP. The AAP proposes to retain overall numbers of car parking, and if the town centre is more attractive to walk around once people are out of their cars, then this should serve as an attraction. However, the Constraints section (3.4) has

Reference	Name of respondent	Summary of comments	Council response
		<p>implemented in the town centre (with the desired effect of increasing pedestrian and cycle use, and improving the town centre) it should be recognised that the actual effect will include increasing the numbers who are incentivised to drive to Castlepoint, and other car-based shopping destinations. This will put further stress upon the town centre business which are already facing significant reductions in footfall year on year, and lead to an increase in car use, rather than a reduction.</p> <p>Therefore it would be prudent to ensure any changes are balanced so that any measures which have the effect of deterring cars from the town centre are matched by changes to equally deter cars from out of town shopping. This will also result in a much more effective incentive to adopt cycling/walking etc... across the whole town</p>	<p>been amended to include a reference to the issue of discouraging people from driving into, and therefore visiting the Town Centre.</p>
18	H Annicchiarico	<p>Bournemouth's topography puts people off riding bicycles, particularly in the town centre.</p>	<p>The town's topography is a problem that unfortunately cannot be changed, and so for some people cycling will not be a feasible option. However, the topography does not put existing cyclists off and so it is reasonable to try to make our streets safer and more welcoming for existing cyclists and to encourage others. The Borough of Bournemouth also has many choices of route from one place to another, so often it is possible to plan a route that is less hilly.</p>
		<p>Bus services should cover a wider range of routes and should be cheaper.</p>	<p>This is unfortunately outside of the scope of the Public Realm Strategy, however this comment has been passed on to the Council's Public Transport Officer.</p>
		<p>Police Community Support Officers are a good way of making people feel safer and they should be retained.</p>	<p>This is also unfortunately outside of the scope of the Public Realm Strategy.</p>
		<p>Changing street lighting is unlikely to make people feel safer.</p>	<p>The benefits of street lighting are well documented, and where appropriate, improvements to street lighting to reduce dark patches and improve the quality of lighting can reduce the fear of crime after dark.</p>

Reference	Name of respondent	Summary of comments	Council response
		Anti social behaviour is a problem that should be tackled by better policing.	This is also unfortunately outside of the scope of the Public Realm Strategy.
		Bournemouth's streets are not being maintained well enough and any future changes to the public realm would not be sustainable in terms of maintenance.	Maintaining our streets is one of the Council's priorities, and future maintenance costs would be assessed and planned for during the design stage of any proposed public realm changes.
Internal 1	Drainage and Flooding Manager	Drainage and maintenance sections are acceptable.	Noted and welcomed.
Internal 2	Parking and Traffic Manager	The Strategy document is very good, a lot of thought and work has gone into producing it.	Noted and welcomed
		Conflict between the public realm and other factors such as legislation, signing regulation, safety and provision for all transport modes. The document could cover more about the challenge this conflict brings and how designers must look for ways of overcoming this - need to emphasise that we must look for ways to overcome these conflicts and not use them as an excuse for poor public realm.	This has been considered. However, the constraints have been discussed in section 3, and issues such as safety are covered in other parts of the document (e.g. Guiding Principle D). Adding a concluding paragraph to section 3 to cover the suggested points has been carefully considered, however it would be repetitive of the points in section 3 and other parts of the document.
Internal 3	Transport Development Control and Forward Planning team	3.4 - Constraints - Consider mentioning maintenance costs / durability at this point, in addition to in Guiding Principle J. Some materials can also generate unforeseen consequences - e.g. slipperiness / glare - consider adding this to the list of constraints.	Durability and maintenance costs have been added to the list of constraints. Slipperiness and glare are detailed issues that have been discussed in Guiding Principle D (p.31) - they are not inherent constraints of Bournemouth's circumstances - samples need to be carefully checked and lessons have been learned from previous schemes.
		Guiding Principles - consider an additional principle to encourage economic vitality. Need to take account of the impact of public realm improvements on routes for deliveries, cycling and public transport, as well as the needs of the disabled (parking). Access for customers and deliveries must not be so difficult as to attract people to out/edge of town centres.	This is a sensible suggestion as there are sections specifically referring to environmental and social aspects of sustainability and this would enhance the economic side of sustainability. However, much of this content has already been covered elsewhere in the document, and many of the issues are directly Town Centre related so would be better addressed in more detailed subsequent documents. A section has been added to the Constraints section (para 3.4.2) to acknowledge the issue of attracting people to edge/out of town centres. The

Reference	Name of respondent	Summary of comments	Council response
			importance of the economy is highlighted early in the document in section 1.1.
		Consider including 'practical' 'usable' or 'maintainable' in the title of Principle J to make the meaning clearer.	Title changed to read "Ensure high quality and durable streets and spaces that are straightforward to maintain "
		Guiding Principle A - emphasise the need to consider ease / costs of maintenance and issues including reinstatement - this needs to be made earlier in the document rather than in Principle B so that it does not become an afterthought.	This is covered in Guiding Principles B and J, and the amendment to the title of principle J also brings the subject further forward in the document. There is a danger of repeating the same points across the document, which would water down all the points and make the strategy more difficult to read and use.
		Guiding Principle B - Care must be taken in changing white lines in relation to parking to ensure enforcement is not compromised.	St James' Home Zone demonstrates that white lines are not always necessary to delineate parking areas. Text has been amended to include: " Provided that the correct procedures and regulations are followed to ensure changes are legally enforceable, lines and road markings may be made less conspicuous in a number of ways. "
		Guiding Principle D Care has to be taken to ensure that buses, delivery vehicles, emergency vehicles and refuse trucks, can still access areas when lanes and curve radii are reduced. Bollards could be used instead of railings, these are safer for cyclists and would still stop vehicles mounting the footway. Security - "Provide a choice of routes where pedestrian and cycle routes are integrated with and overlooked by traffic..." - It may not always be possible or desirable to	Text changed to include: " It is important that any changes still ensure that buses and delivery vehicles can access areas where appropriate. " Noted, however railings have been traditionally used as a means of controlling pedestrians and keeping them out of the road rather than keeping vehicles off the pavement, although railings do have that additional effect. Bollards may be appropriate alternatives in some situations but this is too detailed for the document - each case will need to be considered on its own merits. Text has been changed to read " Provide a choice of direct routes where pedestrian and cycle routes are integrated with traffic, avoiding alleyways and

Reference	Name of respondent	Summary of comments	Council response
		<p>achieve this.</p> <p>Guiding Principle H Sentence does not seem to make sense in relation to buses. “Meanwhile, in some areas such as in parts of Bournemouth Town Centre, only frequent bus access and limited access for commercial vehicles, service vehicles and disabled parking may be appropriate.”</p> <p>Breaking up parking and screening with trees / shrubs may create personal security issues for users particularly at night.</p>	<p>underpasses that are constrained and not overlooked by traffic or surrounding properties”</p> <p>Order and punctuation of sentence changed to clarify.</p> <p>Text has been amended.</p>

4 List of organisations contacted as part of the public consultation

Age UK
Arts Council England, South West
Atkins
Bournemouth Accommodation and Hotel Association (BAHA)
Bellway Homes (Wessex)
BNP Paribas
Borough of Poole
Boscombe Area Forum
Boscombe Cliff Residents Association
Boscombe Traders Association
Bournemouth & Poole College of Further Education
Bournemouth & Poole Greenpeace
Bournemouth & Poole Primary Care Trust
Bournemouth and Poole College
Bournemouth Area Hospitality Association
Bournemouth Borough Council
Bournemouth Chamber of Trade and Commerce
Bournemouth Civic Society
Bournemouth Cycling Forum
Bournemouth Development Company
Bournemouth Islamic Centre & Mosque
Bournemouth Jewish Representative Council
Bournemouth Sports Forum For The Disabled
Bournemouth Town Centre Detached Youthwork Project
Bournemouth University
Bournemouth Youth Council
British Blind Sport
British Gas
British Telecom
British Transport Police
Burnett Planning & Development Ltd
Business In The Community
Business Link Wessex
Charminster Community Youth Project
Christchurch Borough Council
Churches Together
Coastal BID Manager
Colin Buchanan & Partners
Colliers CRE
CPRE Dorset Office
Dave Wells Properties
David Ames Associates (on behalf of David Wilson Homes Ltd)
David Wilson Homes Southern
Department for Transport Rail Group
Disability Sport England
Disabled Drivers Association
Disabled Living Foundation
DLP Consultants Ltd
Dorset Association For The Disabled
Dorset Christian Activity Centre

Dorset Community Action (DCA)
Dorset County Council
Dorset Cyclist's Network Bournemouth Branch
Dorset Fire and Rescue Service
Dorset Police
Dorset Race Equality Council
Dorset Wildlife Trust
Dorset, Bournemouth & Poole Workers Education Association
East Dorset District Council
English Heritage South West Region
Ensburry Park & Wallisdown Area Forum
Ensburry Park Residents Association
Entec UK Ltd
Environment Agency
Equality & Human Rights Commission
Equality South West
Federation of Small Businesses
George Wimpey Southern Ltd
Goadsby
Green Pastures Christian Centre
GVA Grimley
Hengistbury Residents' Association (HENRA)
Henry Brown Youth Centre
Home Builders Federation Ltd
Hurn Parish Council
IBEX / Churches Together in Bournemouth
Indigo Planning Limited
Jones Lang LaSalle

Ken Parke Planning Consultants
Kingsbridge Homes
Kinson Area Forum
Kinson Community Association
Linden Homes Southern
Littledown & Iford Community Forum
Martin Hanham MRTPI, Chtrd Town Planner
Martin Robeson Planning Practice (on behalf of Trinity Corporate Finance)
Meyrick Estates Management Ltd
Mobile Operators Association
Moordown Community Association
Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners
National Housing Federation South West
Natural England
NHS Bournemouth and Poole
North Bournemouth Area Forum
North Dorset District Council
nPower
Persimmon Homes South East
Planning Issues Ltd
Planning Potential
Planning Solutions
Pokesdown South Residents Association
Quantum Homes
Queen's Park & Charminster Community Forum
Religious Society of Friends (Quakers)
Royal Bournemouth Hospital
Royal Mail Group

RPS Planning
RSPB
Savills
Scottish and Southern Energy
Sembcorp Bournemouth Water Ltd
South West Ambulance Service NHS Trust
South West Councils
South West Forum
South West Regional Assembly
South West Regional Development Agency
South West Trains
Southbourne Area Forum
Springbourne Area Forum
Springbourne Community Office
St Michael's Church
St Peter's Church
Symonds and Sampson on behalf of the Cooper-Dean Estate.
Talbot & Branksome Woods Community Forum
Talbot Village Trust
Tanner & Tilley
Taylor Wimpey Strategic Land
Terence O'Rourke Ltd
Tetlow King Planning
The Arts Institute at Bournemouth
The Bell Cornwell Partnership
The Planning Bureau Ltd
Throop, Muscliff, Strouden, Townsend and Holdenhurst Area Forum
Town Centre BID Manager

Transdev Yellow Buses
Wessex Water
West Dorset District Council
West Howe Community Enterprises
West Parley Parish Council
Westover Business Forum
White Young Green Planning Consultants
Wilts and Dorset Bus Company
Winton Area Forum
Winton Community Forum
Winton Recreation Ground Resident's Association
Woolf Bond Planning

The following groups of Council officers were also consulted:

- Planning, Transport and Licensing Officers
- Property Services, Street Services (including maintenance) and Street Lighting Officers
- Economic Regeneration, Tourism, Seafront Services and Town Centre Management Officers
- Parks and Open Space Officers
- Officers with responsibility for Arts Development and CCTV