

# Bury But Better 2009

 urbed

**BURY COUNCIL**



Development Strategy

13.



This strategy has taken as its starting point the Bury But Better masterplan illustrated below. Over this we have layered the projects that have progressed since the completion of the original masterplan such as The Rock, Townside and Chamberhall Business Park. We have also explored the projects that have not happened such as the 2003 proposals to redevelop part of the Millgate Shopping Centre as well as factoring in other opportunities that have arisen such as the plans to relocate part of the college and the potential redevelopment of the leisure centre.

The masterplan and strategy set out in this report will form part of the evidence base for Bury's Local Development Framework (LDF). The strategy will be adopted by the council

as a material consideration when dealing with planning applications. It is not however intended that the strategy will be developed as a statutory planning document, either an Area Action Plan or a Supplementary Planning Document.

This is a planning strategy, rather than a regeneration strategy so that the aim has not been to undertake a detailed appraisal of the viability of every project. This would in any case be difficult in current market conditions where very little is likely to be viable. However the aim is to create a 20 year vision for the town centre and in 20 years the market conditions in 2009 will hopefully be a distant memory. The masterplan has therefore sought to balance realism with the need to create a bold and imaginative vision for the town centre:



## Bury But Better 2003

- The first plan covers the first three years includes all of the projects that are either on site at the moment or committed.
- The second plan shows the long-term masterplan and how it can reach into the surrounding areas around the town centre. It shows substantial new mixed use quarters to the east and west of the centre and the removal of Angouleme Way to allow the retail centre to expand further.

The project matrix is intended to be a realistic assessment of development viability but it is not intended to be a prescriptive phasing timetable.

While this is not a regeneration strategy, the statutory planning process requires the consideration of deliverability. We have therefore briefly assessed the 62 projects set out in the previous section in terms of likely viability, funding and deliverability. The results of this exercise are set out on the phasing plans and in the project matrix on the following pages. This matrix shows that in terms of deliverability the projects fall broadly into three types which are colour coded on the project matrix:

- **Market-led schemes:** These will be brought forward by the market without the requirement for public intervention or subsidy. The main requirement of the planning system in respect of these schemes is to ensure that planning policies and allocations reflect the masterplan.
- **Mixed projects:** There are some projects that are viable but are likely to require an element of public intervention. This will range from a full joint venture between the council and a developer such as at Townside, to assistance with land assembly as in The Rock scheme. In these cases the involvement of the council is necessary to assemble the land and ensure a comprehensive approach to regeneration.
- **Public projects:** Finally there are projects that can only be undertaken by the public sector. These include public realm improvements, the development of public facilities such as the leisure centre, college, and police and fire stations. However even in these situations a degree of public private partnership is likely and funding is likely to come from a combination of Section 106 requirements and land receipts. In the case of S106 we recommend that the council explores the potential for a public realm 106 formula of the kind pioneered by Holbeck in Leeds so that all new development contributes to the cost of public realm works.