



Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners

Planning Design Economics

Newcastle-under-Lyme and Stoke-on-Trent Core Spatial Strategy

Examination in Public

Response to written representations
(reference number 1311) on behalf of
Capital Shopping Centres Plc

Matter 7: Centres and Retail

Capital Shopping Centres reference
number 757

April 2009

Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners Ltd

14 Regent's Wharf
All Saints Street
London N1 9RL

T 020 7837 4477
F 020 7837 2277

london@nlplanning.com
www.nlplanning.com

Offices also in
Cardiff
Manchester
Newcastle upon Tyne

Contents

1.0	Introduction	1
2.0	Inspector's Questions	2

1.0 Introduction

1.1 On behalf of Capital Shopping Centres Plc (CSC), we have been asked by the Inspector to provide additional comments to the Newcastle-under-Lyme and Stoke-on-Trent Core Spatial Strategy Examination in Public, in response to the written representations prepared by RPS Planning and Development on behalf of Asda Stores, March 2009.

1.2 Specifically, we have been asked to provide comments on the following two questions relating to Matter 7: *Centres and Retail* -

- e Does the CS carry forward the RSS Phase Two revision targets for retail floorspace? and
- h Should there be more flexibility to have retail and offices in locations other than centres?

1.3 We set out our additional comments below, in so far as they are relevant to our hearing statement submitted to the Councils in March 2009.

2.0 Inspector's Questions

e) Does the CS carry forward the RSS Phase Two revision targets for retail floorspace?

2.1 CSC would like to refer the Inspector to the comments provided within our Hearing Statement, question e), submitted to the Councils in March 2009. As stated within our hearing statement, the floorspace figures in the Core Strategy are consistent with those identified within the WMRSS as are the time periods they relate to (refer to NLP Hearing Statement paragraph 2.5). CSC supports the Council's identification of comparison floorspace targets within the strategic centre of Stoke-on-Trent City Centre, subject to the suggested amendments within the Hearing Statement submitted by NLP.

2.2 CSC does not wish to provide any further comments in relation to this matter.

h) Should there be more flexibility to have retail and offices in locations other than centres?

2.3 Relevant Documents:

- Newcastle-under-Lyme and Stoke-on-Trent Core Spatial Strategy (Core Strategy, May 2008) – SUB/001 (*Spatial Principles of Targeted Regeneration, SP1.5, page 40*);
- Planning Policy Statement 6: *Planning for Town Centres* (PPS6, 2005) – NAT/003;
- Planning Policy Statement 12: *Local Spatial Planning* (PPS12, 2008) – NAT/008; and
- Planning Policy Statement 4: *Planning for Sustainable Economic Development*, (PPS4, Draft 2008).

2.4 CSC supports the Councils' identification of retail development focused in Stoke-on-Trent City Centre and Newcastle-under-Lyme Town Centre, and that development in other centres will be of a nature and scale appropriate to their respective position and role within the hierarchy of centres in accordance with Spatial Principle SP1.5, page 40 of the Core Strategy (refer to NLP Hearing Statement paragraph 2.16).

2.5 As recognised within our hearing statement, the priority for locating retail should continue to be focused in centres, and in this case, within Stoke-on-Trent City Centre and Newcastle-under-Lyme Town Centre, and that this is in line with the sequential approach to the selection of preferred sites for the location of retail and other town centre uses as identified in PPS6. (NLP Hearing Statement, paragraph 2.17). We also identified that with respect to Stoke-on-Trent City Centre the RSS sets out clear floorspace requirements and that sites exist to meet those requirements over the plan period (NLP Hearing Statement, paragraph 2.17). CSC maintains this position and we believe that the Core Strategy does not require more flexibility and is sound in this regard.

- 2.6 Paragraph 2.15 of the representations submitted by RPS on behalf of Asda Stores refers to draft PPS4 (Planning for Sustainable Economic Development, 2008). The representations suggest that the Core Strategy should contain sufficient flexibility to enable the fruition of retail-led regeneration schemes in line with the objectives of draft PPS4 (RPS representations paragraph 2.17). CSC recognises the importance of sustainable economic development; however CSC acknowledges that this needs to accord with the overarching objectives of PPS6, and specifically the town centre first policy approach. Little weight can be attached to Draft PPS4 at this time in view of its status.
- 2.7 Paragraph 3.5 of the RPS representations refers to additional expenditure growth (and retail floorspace requirements flowing from it) in all sectors which need to be accounted and planned for over and above the figures identified for the strategic centres. This must be done in accordance with the sequential approach to the selection of preferred sites for development in line with the requirements of PPS6. This reinforces the need to identify sites and locations in the city centre (paragraph 2.17 NLP Hearing Statement March 2009) to show that future growth can be provided for in central locations. These matters are already considered in some length in our Hearing Statement submitted to the Councils in March 2009.
- 2.8 Finally, we note that the representations submitted by RPS raise several issues, however, no suggested changes to the wording of the policy or the supporting text within the Core Strategy are provided.