Comments of Johnsey Estates Ltd on Newport Council’s Response to Inspector regarding boundary of Newport Retail Park District Centre

On 5th September 2014 the Council responded to a request from the LDP Inspector for clarification regarding the boundary of Newport Retail Park District Centre in the UDP. The following comments are made in respect of that response.

It is noted that the Council agrees that it failed to delineate the NRPDC boundary following the recommendations of the UDP Inspector but that it has accepted on all occasions since that the district centre would have included all of the original Newport Retail Park. This position is agreed.

However there is one point of clarification we would make, as the position is not totally clear from the second paragraph of the Council’s statement. The plan attached to the Council’s response is an extract from the East Newport Development Framework SPG (May 2007). This framework plan was referred to in the Statement of Common Ground relating to the Megabowl appeal in 2008. It will be noted that there is a red line delineating the full extent of the District Centre with some areas shaded red (indicated as retail but including the 3 car showrooms) and the Johnsey Estates section shaded brown with yellow edging, intended to indicate leisure/recreation uses. The red line district centre boundary, however, embraced both the ‘retail’ and ‘leisure’ areas. In practice, although identified for leisure/recreation use, the Johnsey land included a number of A1 and A3 uses as well as the multi-screen cinema. The closure of the Megabowl unit in 2005, the granting of the retail appeal in 2008 and the commencement of work on the retail scheme has further emphasised its use for a mix of town centre uses. During the same period the Stadium and Tesco sections of the centre have both introduced non-A1 uses, including a number of A3 and D2 operations. In land use terms there can be no reasonable distinction between the Stadium, Tesco and Johnsey elements of the centre.

As the Inspector has asked for a plan of the district centre and the plan sent by the Council is not altogether clear a copy of the plan included in the Appendix to the Statement of Common Ground is attached. This delineates with a red line on an OS base the agreed extent of the district centre insofar as the UDP is concerned.

Finally we note that the Council in its response has partially restated its case in terms of City Centre impact. This has already been addressed in the evidence provided previously and we would not respond further. However we are surprised to note in the first paragraph of the Council response the allegation of the detrimental effect of NRPDC on ‘other District Centres (notably Maindee)’. We do not recall this point being made in the LDP, in the evidence presented by the Council at the Examination or being debated at the Hearing. To our knowledge there is no evidence whatsoever to support this conclusion.
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Key
1  Appeal site
2  Cineworld multi screen cinema
3  Blockbusters/ Sallys hairdressers
4  McDonalds
5  Pizzahut
6  Frankie & Bennys
7  Nissan showroom
8  Volkswagen showroom
9  Peugeot showroom
10  Tesco
11  Shopping Park (Stadium)
12  Matalan clearance store
13  Vacant site