

# Policy 26

## Id No Respondent

## Policy 26

57 Capital Shopping Centres

Within this section of the RSS Policy 26 relating specifically to MetroCentre is obviously of most interest to CSC. Suggested amendments based on RSS Technical Paper No.3, the WYG Study 2002 etc.

The amended wording (see document for details of all suggested amendments) as proposed by the CSC should read in conjunction with changes proposed to policies 6 and 13. Together they seek to give a 'strategic' steer as to the role that MetroCentre might play in regenerating the Gateshead Tyne River Corridor and the basis for taking this forward within Development Plans and Local Development Frameworks. With regard to the retail role, the Local development Framework should set out the basis for consideration of proposals to, or redevelopment of, MetroCentre, and the amended text sets out in more detail guidance as to how they should do that.

Considers the approach proposed directly responds to the requirements of RPG1 The approach seeks to provide more information on existing and potential future role of MetroCentre from a land use, transport and regeneration perspective. Within the supporting text it specifically recognises the need to maintain its existing role and the need to update and improve its offer, in line with the comments in section 3 of these representations. It recognises the requirements of Central Government policy contained within PPS6 and sets out the basis on which policies will need to be formulated in Local Development Documents.

202 Durham County Council

Free parking at the Metro Centre has regional implications. Any future expansion should require the introduction of parking charges

200 Environment Agency

Support

329 Friends of the Earth South Tyneside

MetroCentre

South Tyneside Friends of the Earth strongly objects to any further development of the site due to its adverse impact on local town economies, and its unsustainable relationship with car use. To that end we would request that a car parking charge or levy is applied in order to remove its unfair advantage over local shopping centres, and assist in bringing about a modal change to public transport.

8 Gateshead Council

Policy 26 - The Council supports the approach recommended to proposals at MetroCentre, which does not rule development/upgrades to the centre out, but which requires proposals to be fully tested and justified. It also states that proposals to be fully tested and justified. It also states that proposals should result in better integration with the surrounding area and improvements to access by public transport - this is consistent with the approach taken in the draft Unitary Development Plan.

215 Government Office For The North East

Policy is in conflict with PPS6.

160 Highways Agency

Any proposals should be considered sequentially and public transport promoted.

94 Nectar

Policy 26 is supported by NECTAR

341 Newcastle City Council

The Council supports the joint Tyne and Wear response on policies within this section. The Council wishes to make an additional response on this section in relation to policy on urban and rural centres. The Council supports policies 25, 26, 27 which seek to steer new town centre type development to appropriate locations. Within this the Council strongly supports the need to ensure further development at the MetroCentre is fully justified.

66 Railfuture

Policy 26 is supported by Railfuture northeast but note that improvements to the rail service to the MetroCentre should be pursued in the short term.

**Id NoRespondent****Policy 26**

151	Sunderland ARC	MetroCentre: Sunderland arc does not envisage a case for any further significant extension to MetroCentre and accordingly supports the proposed Policy 26.
105	Tynedale Council	This policy, which, among other things, seeks to ensure that the impact of new proposals on the vitality and viability of other urban and rural centres is properly assessed, should be welcomed.