

Statement of Consultation Representations and Responses

No.	Name/Organisation	Summary of Comments	Response
001	Individual	There are no proposals on how maintaining and improving air quality in the borough or manage the causes of climate change are included in the SPD. Suggests including recharging points for electric vehicles in HBBC car parks	The document seeks to improve sustainable transport across the town centre which will lead to improvements in air quality. Future provision of charging points could be considered by HBBC but doesn't form part of the SPD
002	East Midlands Regional Assembly	Proposed changes to the Draft RSS have been proposed. Also the report proposes an increase in the number of car parking spaces and these should be managed to encourage shoppers/visitors rather than commuters. Add in policy 55 of RSS	The policy section and report has been amended in paragraphs 2.1.1 and 6.8.3 to reflect the proposed changes to the RSS. The report has been reworded in paragraph 6.1.8 to make clear that the proposed large car parks will operate as short stay car parks for shoppers and visitors. Policy 55 relates to East Midlands Airport.
003	MRP (linked with response number 018 on behalf of S Flude)	Existing GFA for Area 6 quoted as 6,475 sqm in report which is incorrect. This should be 10,373 sqm.	Noted, the report has been revised to reflect the existing are of 10,373 sqm and updated accordingly.
004	Leicestershire Police Authority	Raising the need for community safety with new developments designed to contribute to safe and sustainable communities.	The LPA has further engaged with the Police Authority through its Core Strategy and Infrastructure Plan and generic development policies. Further engagement will continue through consultation on individual planning applications to understand more detailed requirements. No changes required to SPD.
005	National Grid	No comments	No changes required to SPD.
006	National Trust	No comments	No changes required to SPD.
007	DRE Group Limited	Requested what the proposed contributions will be.	The contribution methodology is set out in section 11 of the report and is set out in the executive summary. No changes are required to the SPD.

008	The Coal Authority	No comments	No changes required to SPD.
009	Peacock & Smith (on behalf of Wm Morrison)	Considers the methodology is worded without flexibility and could be contrary to Government Guidance.	The SPD has been drafted following the guidelines of Circular 05/2005 specifically the tests as set out in section B5. A new section has been added in 2.10 and 11.5 to strengthen this.
		As many improvements through the town centre are funded by the town centre developments, the costs to the developments may be unviable and the improvements would not go ahead.	The improvements identified are required to mitigate the impact of the proposed developments. If the developments do not come forward, the improvements will not be required. Any financial viability assessment for each site will need to take this SPD into account. No changes to SPD.
		As the SPD may apply to other developments that come forward, the contribution pot could far exceed the cost of improvements. There should be more flexibility to developments that are not part of the master plan projects.	In paragraphs 1.5, 1.18, 11.2.7 and 11.3.1 the report identifies that the methodology will apply to other development sites within the town centre. These developments may need to provide additional transport infrastructure improvements and the flexibility of the report allows for these contributions to be collected in a transparent and equitable manner. No changes to SPD.
010	English Heritage (EH)	The siting and design of bus stops/shelters at Castle Street and Upper Castle Street should have regard for listed buildings. EH wish to be consulted about the car parks associated with the Atkins building.	This is a detailed issue outside of the scope of the SPD. This will be considered on a site by site basis as part of the consultation process through planning applications.
011	Councillor P S Hall	Is there still a possibility of moving the bus stops in Regent Street into either the new bus station or Lancaster Road? i.e. making at least part of Regent Street fully pedestrianised.	This was not proposed in the masterplan and has not been considered as part of the SPD.

		Traffic light co-ordination Upper Bond St. to Coventry Road. Will this be a clearway and have a cycle path?	This was not proposed in the masterplan and has not been considered as part of the SPD.
		The pedestrianisation of Station Road from the old PO onwards is essential to link the bus station to Castle Street. Improved access is also required from the bus station to Argents Mead.	This was not proposed in the masterplan and has not been considered as part of the SPD. The bus station development site will include measures to link the site to the surrounding area.
		The only way to provide safe cycle routes is by means of a 20/15 mph zone (as in our Cycling Strategy). Will this be considered?	This was not proposed in the masterplan and has not been considered as part of the SPD. However, Hinckley has introduced several 20mph zones and the SPD does not restrict further zones being introduced.
012	Individual	Supports development that will encourage shopping locally. Suggests that Regent Street should be opened up for one-way traffic.	The proposal for Regent Street was not proposed in the masterplan and has not been considered as part of the SPD.
013	Fisher German	Unclear how the SPD in its current form will be applicable to future developments and what area this will apply to.	Paragraphs 1.5, 1.18, 11.2.7 and 11.3.1 state that the methodology proposed in the SPD will be applicable for future developments. The SPD has sufficient flexibility to assess the transport implications of future development and provides the mechanism to collect the contributions to mitigate the transport impacts. For the purpose of the SPD, the town centre boundary is assumed to be the same as the Area Action Plan boundary.
		There does not appear to be an evidence base from which the proposed contributions have been derived.	The SPD identifies the transport impacts of the developments as proposed in the Masterplan, with recent amendments following discussions with HBBC as stated in paragraph 1.18. The costs of the improvements required to mitigate the impacts is identified and the mechanism to equitably and transparently obtain the contributions from the development sites is identified. The process is stated in the executive summary and section 11.
014	Carlton Parish Council	Summary paragraph 2 Table priorities should be high, medium or low. Timescale for implementation might be	The paragraph relates to phasing periods and is therefore considered correct to relate to the terms identified.

		short, medium or long.	
		Paragraph 2.3.5 How would closure and relocation of Mount Road Hospital affect these plans.	Any change to the hospital would be assessed as development proposals are put forward.
		Supports the proposed bus service improvements. The report does not address the source and destination of the existing through traffic as the M69 is a key generator of through traffic.	The purpose of the SPD is to mitigate the transport impact of developments within the town centre and as such the impacts of through traffic are taken into account.
		Concerned about linking traffic signals. 5.14.2 should have an objective to reduce congestion in the town.	The traffic signals in the town centre are currently linked and optimising the signals will help to reduce congestion in the town centre. The Local Transport Plan2 includes measures to tackle congestion in Hinckley town centre, including optimising the traffic signals as stated in Paragraph 5.9.2.
		The figure numbering is unclear and is the junction in Figure 4 to be retained as part of the bus station redevelopment?	Figure 4 is a potential improvement for the bus station site to implement.
015	Leicestershire County Council	In principle LCC supports the proposed SPD. LCC would like to see reference to housing growth included in the executive summary. It should be made explicitly clear that the delivery of town centre measures and measures for housing growth need to be coordinated.	Paragraph 2 of the executive summary now reflects the housing growth status for Hinckley and the need to coordinate town centre improvements. Paragraph 1.4 has also been amended to reflect this.
		Add the following to paragraph 5.14.2 “ at present, subject to any additional measures required to accommodate housing growth.	This has been added.
		LCC support developer contributions and request S106 payments for	The following statement has been added to paragraph 6 of the executive summary and 11.2.3 of the main text “S106 payments will be paid to either

		infrastructure improvements are paid to LCC.	HBBC or LCC and this will be agreed at the relevant time.”
		Paragraph 1.14 should refer to LCC’s “Statement of requirements for developer contributions in Leicestershire”.	This has been added.
		Reference to the proposed Community Infrastructure Levy should be made.	Paragraph 11.2.5 refers to CIL. The SPD is considered to be consistent with the anticipated introduction of CIL.
		Comment should be added to state that HTd has been updated to reflect Manual for Streets and the Dft/CLG guidance on TAs.	Paragraph 2.7.2 has been amended to reflect this.
		Does the SPD reflect the latest position regarding the bus station?	The Lancaster Road bus proposals have been dropped and the report has been updated to reflect this and to be consistent with the bus station development brief, although a reference remains in 2.3.5 which has been removed.
		LCC requested changes to the paragraphs on Park and Ride proposals.	The comments have been added to paragraph 7.10.1.
016	Sport England	Supports improvements to pedestrian routes and cycleways.	No changes required to SPD.
017	Leicestershire Constabulary	No comments	No changes required to SPD.
018	Mayer Brown	Considers SPD doesn’t satisfy all tests of Circular 05/2005.	This is addressed in new paragraphs 2.10 and 11.5
		The process of calculating average impacts does not account for different transport impacts between sites.	All development sites assessed are located within the town centre. The impacts are assessed for all of the town centre developments as a whole as set out in new paragraph 1.25 and the contributions required are based on the size and type of development.
		It is not clear how the impacts of the developments have been assessed. It appears that percentage impacts have	Percentage impacts have been used to determine locations where junction improvements may be required as set out in Appendix B. Paragraph 1.26 identifies that each site should scope its own transport assessment with LCC

	been used to consider requirements for improvements, capacity assessments should be used.	and HBBC, using the SPD as a framework document, with the final transport assessment produced in accordance with the DfT/CLG guidance.
	Are contributions necessary and relevant to planning for all sites? It is felt that the framework transport assessment does not conform to the local plan policy IMP1.	The contributions identified are relevant for all sites used to inform the SPD, i.e. the 8 masterplan sites and the Jarvis Porter site. Paragraph 1.15 identifies how the SPD supports IMP1. The methodology assesses contributions based on the transport infrastructure required to mitigate the development and the development size and type. It is therefore considered to conform to local plan policy IMP1 and circular 05/2005.
	The proposals could stifle development of sustainable transport alternatives as contributions are proposed for the provision of new road space. Care should be taken to ensure that developments do not become too car orientated.	Transport mitigation measures identified include car parks, a bus station, bus service improvements, a rail station interchange, pedestrian and cycle infrastructure as well as some localised junction improvements. There is no new road space proposed. This statement also contradicts the later statement by Mayer Brown that a 10% target for car use is too onerous.
	There is limited information on the methodology for calculating the contributions per dwelling / 100sqm floorspace.	The SPD has estimated the transport infrastructure required to mitigate the developments in the town centre. These improvements have been costed and apportioned to development type in an equitable manner following the methodology identified in section 11.
	It is advised that a one size fits all approach is not advisable as it assumes that the transport impacts for urban sites compare with rural.	This SPD is for the assessment of developments in the town centre only as detailed in paragraph 1.25 and it is not intended to apply directly to rural developments.
	It is not clear whether the transport improvements are listed in the Local Transport Plan (LTP). If not the schemes should be robustly audited. It is important that developers are not forced to mitigate existing problems.	The transport improvements are not required in order to mitigate existing problems. The SPD proposes a methodology to identify and mitigate the transport impact of the development sites included in the masterplan along with the Jarvis Porter site to ensure future development of the town centre is undertaken in accordance with the masterplan. As detailed in paragraph 1.22 any LTP contributions are subject to LCC approval.
	The contributions are based on the scale of development rather than	The contribution is based on the size and operational use of the development and their estimated impact.

	impact.	
	The mechanism for windfall sites is unclear.	Paragraphs 1.5, 1.18, 11.2.7 and 11.3.1 state that the methodology proposed in the SPD will be applicable for future developments. The SPD has sufficient flexibility to assess the transport implications of future development and provides the mechanism to collect the contributions to mitigate the transport impacts
	It is unclear how the document will account for development that is not the core type (commercial/housing/flat) and how project timescales effect contributions. It is also unclear of the effect of one or two projects not moving forward.	The SPD does not address phasing and timing of developments (see paragraph 1.25 and 11.4.1). As detailed in paragraph 11.2.6, The SPD is based on development proposals as identified in the masterplan. It is considered that these are accounted for in the commercial/housing/flat categories. Should future development come forward which do not fit into these categories then this will need to be discussed with HBBC and LCC.
	The impact figures have been calculated in TRICS and contributions should be commensurate with traffic impact (in this case the development could be neutral or positive due to the existing site use).	Existing uses at each of the sites have been taken into account as identified in paragraph 4.1.1. The net traffic generation was used in the assessment of the traffic impacts across the town centre. Appendix B sets out the methodology used to determine the combined traffic impact of the development proposals.
	No TRICS outputs have been provided, a one size fits all approach would raise concern.	The trip rate assumptions applied to each of the land uses is identified in Table 1 of Appendix B and the trip rates used are identified in Table 2 of Appendix B.
	We note a separate traffic impact assessment report has been completed. Will this information be made available to developers?	This information is included within Appendix B of the SPD.
	Can guarantees be given that contributions to infrastructure will be directly relevant to individual sites (eg will contributions fund local bus stops?).	The contributions will mitigate the impact of the development across the town centre. The SPD allows sufficient flexibility for HBBC and LCC to determine the phasing of the improvements. As the town centre improvements are local to all of the development sites, any infrastructure proposals introduced will be local to all of the developments.

		The calculation of the total contribution amount requires clarification.	This is detailed in section 11 of the report and set out in the executive summary.
		The SPD takes no account of the revenue raised from the parking. The total budget costs for the car park are approx £3m, based on estimated income this could meet the construction costs in 6.8-10.5 years.	The developer may chose to operate the car park and therefore would receive all revenue generated. There are many ongoing management costs associated with car parks e.g. staffing and maintenance and the Mayer Brown calculation of the payback period is considered too simplistic.
		A contribution methodology based on the impact of the respective developments would be a more equitable approach to developer contributions.	New paragraph 1.25 explains the reasoning behind the methodology. The SPD proposes a methodology to identify and mitigate the transport impact of the development sites included in the masterplan along with the Jarvis Porter site to ensure future development of the town centre is undertaken in accordance with the masterplan. If the developments are not assessed together then the proposals as set out in the masterplan would not be achievable.
		A target modal shift of 10% shift from car is rather high as is public transport and the walk and cycle modal splits appear low. We consider the modal split should be assessed on a site by site basis.	Paragraph 1.25 identifies that travel plans should be scoped with both HBBC and LCC. Additionally paragraph 10.4.1 explains that each travel plan will be expected to set out the modal share targets specific to each development.
019	CABE	No specific comments	No changes required to SPD.
020	Highways Agency	The document should assign responsibility for delivery of each scheme, triggers for implementation and priorities for delivery in the form of an implementation plan.	The SPD cannot provide an implementation plan as that is too specific and the scheduling of developments is unknown at this stage. Also the SPD has been derived based on the development areas set out in the masterplan. Market conditions are changing rapidly and the final development will come forward based on market demand.
		The SPD could be improved by widening its scope to cover the entire borough rather than just the town centre.	The SPD is for developments in the town centre, although the approach could extend to the borough but this is outside the scope of this document. The area covered the SPD is defined in paragraph 1.1.

		<p>The SPD could be enhanced through consideration of the operational issues for the collection and distribution of monies received. The SPD could also highlight triggers for implementation of schemes to ensure that the network capacity is in place prior to the occupation of a new development.</p>	<p>The SPD cannot provide an implementation plan as that is too specific and the scheduling of developments is unknown at this stage. Timing and phasing of developments and associated infrastructure improvements will be agreed with LCC and HBBC. This is identified in paragraph 11.4.1.</p>
		<p>It is not clear on the thresholds at which a contribution will be sought and it is not clear how the contributions have been derived or will be prioritised.</p>	<p>Thresholds – no minimum levels are set. Contribution derivation is described in section 11.2. Prioritisation will depend on the phasing of developments.</p>
		<p>It is not clear how the guidance on travel plans goes further than national guidance.</p>	<p>As detailed in paragraph 10.1.2, Travel Plan guidance has been included to assist with the development of framework and site travel plans and sites are required to undertake their own travel plan when they submit planning applications.</p>
		<p>The HA is concerned about the focus on car parking provision and is considered inconsistent with principles of sustainable transport and may detract from the 10% reduction in private car modal shift. Some additional parking may be required but the focus should be on shopper and visitor parking.</p>	<p>The increases in parking are for visitor/short stay parking spaces to serve the town centre. Paragraph 6.1.8 has been updated to state that the four main car parks will be short stay parking spaces for visitors and shoppers.</p>
		<p>There is inconsistency in the number of increased parking spaces with 273 spaces, 330 space and higher numbers referred to.</p>	<p>There is no inconsistency in the number of spaces proposed in the report, the increase is 273 public parking spaces made available during weekdays, evenings and weekends and this is the figure from Table 6. 330 was the figure proposed in the masterplan.</p>

		It is not clear how the SPD will evolve in line with the transfer from Local Plan to LDF or publication of the Planning Bill with provision for councils to introduce a CIL.	11.2.5 refers to CIL. The SPD is considered to be consistent with the anticipated introduction of CIL. Clearly the document will need to be reviewed in light of development in policy and plan making.
021	Cyclist s' Touring Club	No specific comments on the SPD	No changes required to SPD.
022	James Bailey Planning	Makes an objection to the SPD in its current form. There is no assessment of financial viability and the impact on the sites.	The SPD has been developed to assess the transport improvements required in the town centre to accommodate the developments as proposed in paragraph 1.18. The financial viability assessment for each site will need to take this SPD into account.
		Why should the development sites be expected to pay the infrastructure costs when the highway authority pay a token sum and Borough Council pay nothing?	The costs identified in the SPD are required to mitigate the transport impacts of the development sites.
		There is no mention of the London Road college site in the SPD or masterplan.	The SPD has been developed to assess the transport improvements required in the town centre to accommodate the developments as proposed in paragraph 1.18. The London Road site is not included in this list as there are no current proposals for the site. If and when proposals come forward they will be assessed as a emerging/future site and treated as identified in paragraphs 1.5, 1.18, 11.2.7 and 11.3.1. The SPD has sufficient flexibility to assess the transport implications of future development and provides the mechanism to collect the contributions to mitigate the transport impacts.
		Transport costs are only one element of contribution and owners have had mixed messages from the council on the flexibility in calculating total contribution costs.	The SPD provides a Transport Framework Assessment which clearly identifies and provides budget costs for the highways and transportation measures required to provide access to, and mitigate the impact of, proposed development sites in Hinckley town centre.
		There does not appear to be a plan of the town centre used in the SPD.	For the purpose of the SPD, the town centre boundary is assumed to be the same as the Area Action Plan boundary. The SPD is updated in paragraph

		1.1 to state this.
	The cost breakdown shows a shortfall of £650,000, where will this additional money come from?	The shortfall allows for emerging/future sites coming forward. Additionally, the level of transport improvements proposed is based on the developments as stated in paragraph 1.18. These will be subject to change and consequently the total in the pot will also change.
	A site 200m from Stockwell Head (Martin Rumble) has not had to provide a substantive transport contribution.	This site was not included within the masterplan or the list of sites as identified in paragraph 1.18. If the site is within the town centre boundary as identified in the Area Action Plan and a planning application comes forward, the site will be assessed as a windfall site and contributions will be sought in a similar manner.
	The car park cost at Stockwell Head is £85,050 higher than the contribution but there is no clarification of this point.	If the car park is delivered as proposed then the site will receive money from the contribution pot to assist with the costs.
	Table 2 underestimates the existing employment use on the site by at least a third.	It is accepted that there is an underestimate in respect of the employment provision on the site .However this doesn't constitute a material change in the number of trips generated from the existing usage. Consequently this doesn't affect the developer contribution in respect of the redevelopment of the site.
	The development proposals for the Stockwell Head site include large numbers of flats and substituting houses for flats will reduce the number of dwellings on site and the contribution required.	The SPD is based on the information available for the masterplan and subsequent discussions with HBBC. The flexible approach of the SPD allows the development impact for revised development proposals to be taken into account. This is stated in paragraph 1.24.
	It is unlikely that the Stockwell House office building will be redeveloped and this has significant implications for the viability of Area 1.	The SPD is based on the information available for the masterplan and subsequent discussions with HBBC. The flexible approach of the SPD allows the development impact for revised development proposals to be taken into account. This is stated in paragraph 1.24.
	There is no indication in the SPD how the contribution formula includes land values as some sites have 100% of the land area for development whereas Stockwell Head will loose a large area	The contribution formula does not directly take the land values into account. This would need to be discussed on a site by site basis with HBBC.

		of development to the car park thus contributing the land and the car park which is unfair.	
023	Barton Wilmore	The preparation of the SPD at the current time could be considered premature in the absence of an adopted DPD.	It is considered with key proposals identified that will impact on Hinckley town centre over the coming months/years that the timing of the SPD is correct. Clearly the SPD will require revising in future to ensure it remains relevant and up to date in respect of changes to policy and plan making.
		The AAP is not included in the list of documents used to inform the SPD.	The AAP was being drafted at the same time as the SPD and was used to form the SPD. This is referred to in paragraphs 1.15 and 2.11 of the SPD.
		The SPD includes the floor areas for Area 3 as set out in the masterplan, although detailed discussions have been undertaken with HBBC since which change the proposals significantly and the SPD states this area is long term but the developer should submit a planning application before the end of 2008.	The SPD is flexible and allows for sites being delivered to their own timescales in a form to suit market requirements. The floor areas as set out in the planning application will be used in order to determine the level of contribution required.
		Is the methodology reliable as the proposals across the town centre are based on masterplan developments and traffic generation assumptions and junction impacts cannot be robust as it is unknown what the development proposals will be.	The SPD has been developed to assess the transport improvements required in the town centre to accommodate the developments as proposed in paragraph 1.18. The SPD has sufficient flexibility to assess the transport implications of future development and provides the mechanism to collect the contributions to mitigate the transport impacts
		How are the contribution figures derived?	The SPD explains the methodology used to determine the contributions and is set out in the executive summary and section 11 of the SPD.
		The SPD must reflect Circular 05/2005.	New paragraphs 2.10 and 11.5 have been added to rebut this.
		The SPD refers to PPS12:Local Development Frameworks which has since been replaced by PPS12:Local	The SPD has been amended to reflect this comment.

		Spatial Planning.	
		The TA framework and the SPD should be updated, revised and reissued.	The SPD has been updated.
024	Marrons	It is considered that the draft SPD fails to accord with Circular 05/2005 in that the SPD proposes to apply a formulaic approach towards developer contributions for transport improvement in a blanket manor regardless of the actual impact of the development proposed. As such the contributions relate to obligations that are not necessary to make the proposed development acceptable in planning terms or directly related to the proposed development or fairly or reasonably related to the development in scale.	As stated in paragraphs 1.15, 1.16 and 1.17 the SPD has been developed to ensure that future development within the town centre is undertaken in accordance with the masterplan. The transport requirements to mitigate the impacts for the developments as proposed in paragraph 1.18 has been assessed with the costs split on an equitable and transparent basis. This accords with circular 05/2005 as detailed in paragraph 11.5.
		The approach adopted is fundamentally flawed in its analysis and findings. There can be no certainty that any of the key development sites will come forward or be developed as assessed so the inputs are speculative. Given that the scale or type of development is not known it is not possible to identify in advance the transport implications or costs and developer contributions cannot be assessed in advance. Therefore it is not possible to identify a	The approach adopted in the SPD is equitable and transparent. This approach has been used by several local authorities across the country. Paragraph 1.24 states that the contribution level has been determined based upon the developments as set out in the masterplan and should the scale or uses change within the site, then the level of contribution will also change. The SPD allows sufficient flexibility for HBBC and LCC to determine the phasing of the improvements. Timing and phasing of developments and associated infrastructure improvements will be agreed with LCC and HBBC. This is identified in paragraph 11.4.1.

	levy in terms of fixed charge per unit head of development.	
	There is no justification given for the rates of levy or why a flat has a contribution of 82% that of a house.	As detailed in paragraph 11.2 the rates are calculated based on the transport infrastructure required across the town centre in proportion to the scale of development proposed in the masterplan.
	Inadequate consideration has been given to differential charging of the proposed levy. The effect of the levy will be to deter the provision of smaller scale accommodation as the levy represents a higher proportion of the sales cost.	As detailed in paragraph 1.25 the levy is applied based on the impact of all the town centre developments as a whole to avoid a piecemeal approach.
	No justification is given why a uniform charge should be levied on all forms of non-residential development.	As detailed in paragraph 11.2.6, The SPD is based on development proposals as identified in the masterplan. It is considered that these are accounted for in the commercial/housing/flat categories. Should future development come forward which do not fit into these categories then this will need to be discussed with HBBC and LCC.
	Appendix B of the SPD makes clear that different uses have different levels of traffic generation with different impacts on the highway network.	The SPD considers all modes of transport and does not just assess the highway impact for the developments. There is the public transport, walking, cycling contributions and car parks for visitors and shoppers to consider too.
	No regard has been had to the existing use on the sites and their traffic generation and the assessment appears to be based on each site generating entirely new additional traffic.	Existing uses at each of the sites have been taken into account as identified in paragraph 4.1.1. The net traffic generation was used in the assessment of the traffic impacts across the town centre. Appendix B sets out the methodology used to determine the combined traffic impact of the development proposals.
	The bus station site is intended to provide a car park, bus station and improvement to Rugby Rd/Brunel Rd with no further contribution to the overall pool. The costs of the other	As detailed in paragraph 1.18, the bus station site provides a bus station, the main car park for the town centre and a junction improvement. This is their contribution to the town centre transport improvements which is transparent and equitable.

		transport improvements identified for the town are therefore to be provided by all other developments and this is inequitable.	
		Many of the improvements are not site specific. £300,000 is sought for bus service improvements which are being sought to remedy an existing deficiency and under Circular 05/2005 there is no justification for developer contributions to be paid for this service. Also the cost of signage to car parks appears to conflict with Circular 05/2005.	Paragraph 1.25 + 5.14.2 explain that the mitigation is not to solve existing problems but to mitigate the impact of the development. The SPD provides transport mitigation for the combined town centre developments as identified in paragraph 1.18 and 1.25 therefore all mitigation measures are relevant to all development sites. In order to provide sustainable transport options for the scale of development proposed additional bus services are required. Although these services do not currently exist, the creation of the additional demand generated by the development sites will require improvements to the local bus services. This is allowed for under Circular 05/2005 specifically section B21, as described in paragraph 2.10 and 11.5 of the SPD.
		The rail station site owners have not responded to proposals at the rail station, although £310,000 has been allocated for its improvement and this is considered speculative.	The Council has sought to engage with landowners throughout consultation on the SPD and throughout its plan making requirements and will continue to encourage a positive engagement with landowners.
		It is unreasonable to seek contributions from other sites to contribute to improvements with no delivery mechanism and no indication of need or agreement for provision has been identified.	The rail station is a key site identified in the masterplan as stated in paragraph 2.3.1. The SPD clearly sets out the infrastructure proposals required to improve the rail station in line with the masterplan and also includes the delivery mechanism through the levy on developments within the town centre.
		Improvements at the rail station relate to the remediation of an alleged existing deficiency and is therefore contrary to Circular 05/2005.	In order to provide sustainable transport options for the scale of development proposed improvements to the rail station are required and this need has been identified within the masterplan. The creation of the additional demand generated by the development sites will require improvements to the rail station and this is in line with circular 05/2005.
025	The Theatres Trust	No specific comments	No changes required to SPD.

026	HBBC Town Centre Manager	The following lines should be added to the SPD in respect of CCTV, "To assist in the prevention of crime and disorder, developer contributions will be sought to enhance current provision, for example the installation of new CCTV cameras, employment of street wardens and the expansion of the Hinckley Radio Network."	These comments are outside the scope of the SPD as they are not related to transport.
027	Hinckley Town Centre Partnership	We believe that priority should be given to creating consolidated car parking at the top end of Castle Street/Hill Street. We believe that such a car park is essential to maintain the balance of the town centre with the planned redevelopment of the bus station site.	The expansion of the Hill Street car park as identified in the masterplan is not possible as HBBC do not own the site and it would be dependent on Coop's development aspirations. The 180 space car park proposed for the Stockwell Head site will provide additional parking spaces to the north of the town centre and along with the Britannia car park will provide 428 parking spaces in this area.
		Concerns have been expressed with regard to the limited numbers of available car parking spaces at the top of Castle Street and around the Regents Street area and the effect this is having on trade, resulting in the highest level of vacant units in the town centre area. We would therefore request that consideration be given to any short term solutions that may be able to help.	Site 2 now includes 282 car parking spaces that will be available to the public outside of term time and during evenings and weekends. This will increase the number of car parking spaces in this area.