

Draft Primary Shopping Frontages (PSF) SPG – Report of Consultation

Draft PSF SPG Consultation Responses					
Representor	Object/Support /Comment	Comment	Requested Change	LPA Response	Recommendation
Dick Cole, Abergavenny and District Civic Society	Support	1. Considers the Draft SPG provides helpful clarification of Policy RET1, particularly the provision of exceptions to the main policy which should prove flexible enough to accommodate any opportunities for town centre improvement. At the LDP Review the Society will seek policy revision that reflects WG policy and their views on how policy should respond to the changing nature of retailing and the role of town centres like Abergavenny.	1. No change requested.	1. Support noted. The LDP retail policy framework reflects the objectives of current WG retail planning policy. Of note, national retail planning policy guidance, including Technical Advice Note 4 'Retailing and Town Centres', is currently being reviewed by WG – a sustained key objective of which is to enhance the vitality, attractiveness and viability of established retail centres. The revised guidance will be considered as part of the LDP review process.	1. N/A
John Moran, Health & Safety Executive	Comment	1. No Comment	1. N/A	1. N/A	1. N/A
Mrs J O Hall, Monmouth	Comment	1. Note that Monmouth Chamber of Commerce who officiate on the sale/ letting of shop frontages in Monmouth and Monmouth Town Planning Committee have managed this project well. Therefore suggest that they be allowed to run their town as they always have done.	1. No specific change requested.	1. Comment noted. Policy RET1 of the Monmouthshire LDP applies to all Primary Shopping Frontages within the County. The sale /letting of shop frontages in Monmouth by Chamber of Trade is a separate matter. Proposals for change of use of frontages within the Primary Shopping Frontages in Monmouth would need to comply with Policy RET1 and the provisions of the SPG.	1. No change necessary.

Draft PSF SPG Consultation Responses

Representor	Object/Support /Comment	Comment	Requested Change	LPA Response	Recommendation
David Cummings, Monmouth and District Chamber of Trade and Commerce	Comment	1. Queries the accuracy of the mix and uses and vacancy rates in Monmouth town centre as reported in the July 2015 Draft PSF SPG.	1. No specific change requested.	1. The annual retail health check survey, which surveys ground floor uses and vacancy rates, was updated in October 2015 and the SPG has been updated accordingly.	1. The SPG background data has been updated to reflect the findings of the most recent retail health check (i.e. October 2015)
	Comment	2. Welcomes the low vacancy rate in Monmouth (1% compared to a Welsh average believed to be 10.5%) but considers the town centre's success in attracting visitors may be hampered by parking issues and urges support for the proposed Rockfield and Queens Head car parks. Queries if the weekend market is resulting in a loss of car parking.	2. No specific change requested.	2. Comments noted. The Rockfield car park has since been approved by Planning Committee and the Wyebridge Street car park proposal will be presented to Planning Committee in the near future.	2. No change necessary.

Draft PSF SPG Planning Committee Members' Comments 07.07.15

Member	Object/Support/Comment	Comment	Requested Change	LPA Response	Recommendation
Cllr Bob Haywood	Comment	1. Questioned whether there is anything in the SPG regarding preferences for the use of units above ground floor premises in Primary Shopping Frontages.	1. Clarification sought.	1. Comment noted. The PSF SPG supports LDP Policy RET1 Primary Shopping Frontages which applies to ground floor premises only. Minor amendments will be made to the SPG to qualify this. In addition, a new paragraph will be included in the SPG to clarify that with regard to proposals for the development and change of use of premises above ground floor level in primary shopping frontages consideration will be given to LDP Policy RET2 'Central Shopping Areas'.	1. Include additional references in the SPG to qualify that the SPG (RET1) applies to ground floor premises only. Include additional paragraph (2.6) to provide further clarification on proposals for above ground floor premises as noted.
	Comment	2. Questioned how the SPG will be applied to proposals for mixed retail and non-retail uses within a single ground floor premises in primary shopping frontages e.g. one unit comprising of a gift shop and a cafe (A1/A3 uses).	2. Clarification sought.	2. Commented noted. This issue will be given further consideration and clarified in the SPG.	2. Additional paragraph (4.5) included to explain how proposals for mixed retail /non-retail proposals will be considered.
	Comment	3. Questioned why the SPG does not make any reference to out-of-town retail development.	3. No specific change requested.	3. Out-of-town retail development is dealt with in Policy RET4 - New Retail Proposals.	3. No change necessary.
Cllr Ruth Edwards	Comment	1. Commented that the issue of security regarding residential uses above shops can be difficult.	1. No change requested.	1. Comment noted. This is not a matter that can be addressed by the SPG.	1. No change necessary.

Draft PSF SPG Planning Committee Members' Comments 07.07.15

Member	Object/Support/Comment	Comment	Requested Change	LPA Response	Recommendation
Cllr David Dovey	Comment	1. The PSF boundaries do not include any premises beyond the Gatehouse in Chepstow, including for example Post Office, Wilkinsons, Co-op. Questioned why there is no PSF designation in this area of Chepstow town centre as this is an area of potential that shouldn't be ignored.	1. No specific changed requested.	1. The PSF boundaries set out in the SPG are based the current LDP designations. Any amendments to the PSF boundaries would need to be considered as part of the LDP review process. The area to the north of the Gatehouse in Chepstow town centre is within the Central Shopping Area and as such Policy RET2 would apply. PSF designations will be considered as part of the LDP review process.	1. No change necessary.
	Comment	2. There is an issue regarding shop front windows being a 'health hazard'.	2. No change requested.	2. Comment noted. This is not a matter that can be addressed by the SPG.	2. No change necessary.
Cllr Doug Edwards	Comment	1. Is there any significance in the way PSF1 is separated from PSF3 in Abergavenny?	1. No change requested.	1. The PSF designations in the SPG are based on the proportion of A1 and non-A1 uses at ground floor level. PSF 3 is considered to be distinct from PSF1 given the higher proportion of non-A1 uses within PSF3 which is reflected in the SPG designation.	1. No change necessary.