




# Craigavon Town Centre Boundaries & Retail Designations Plan 2010

## Adoption Statement

June 2008



An Agency within the Department of the  
**Environment**

[www.doeni.gov.uk](http://www.doeni.gov.uk)



**Craigavon Town Centre  
Boundaries and Retail  
Designations Plan  
2010**

**Adoption Statement**

**June 2008**



## **1.0 Background to Preparation of the Plan**

- 1.1 The Craigavon Town Centre Boundaries and Retail Designations Plan 2010 has been prepared under the provisions of Part III of the Planning (Northern Ireland) Order 1991 by Planning Service, an Agency within the Department of the Environment (hereinafter referred to as 'the Department').
- 1.2 The Draft Craigavon Town Centre Boundaries and Retail Designations Plan 2010 (hereinafter referred to as 'the Draft Plan') was published on 20 December 2005. A total of 16 letters of objection and 13 counter-objections were received during the statutory public consultation periods that followed its publication.
- 1.3 The Department requested the Planning Appeals Commission (PAC) to facilitate an Independent Examination to consider objections to the draft Plan. The Examination was conducted by Commissioners de-Courcey & O'Hare over three days from 3 to 5 September 2007.
- 1.4 The Independent Examination was carried out in accordance with the provisions of The Planning (Inquiry Procedure) Rules (Northern Ireland) 2006 and the Planning (Development Plans) (Amendment) Regulations (Northern Ireland) 2006. The PAC identified a range of Key Issues and Sub-Issues, which formed the basis for discussion at the Examination.
- 1.5 The Commissioners' Report of the Examination is published today. It contains details of the Commissioners' consideration on each Key Issue and Sub-Issue, reflecting the format of the Examination, and their recommendations to the Department on each Issue. This Adoption Statement also reflects the issues approach adopted by the PAC in the Independent Examination.
- 1.6 The PAC recommendations contained in the Commissioners' Report have been fully assessed by the Department and revisions to the Plan made accordingly.
- 1.7 Appendix 1 to this Adoption Statement lists the Key Issues and Sub-Issues identified by the PAC for consideration, the objections and relevant counter-objections which refer to each issue, the PAC recommendation on each issue and the Department's response to the PAC recommendation.
- 1.8 The Department is also publishing a statement in accordance with Regulation 15 of The Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations (Northern Ireland) 2004 and a "Statement of Finding of No Likely Significant Effects" in accordance with Regulation 64B of The Conservation (Natural Habitats, etc.) (Amendment) Regulations (Northern Ireland) 2007.

## **2.0 Consideration of Commissioners' Report**

- 2.1 Following consideration of the Commissioners' Report of the Examination, the Department confirms its acceptance of all the PAC recommendations. However, the Department wishes to clarify its position on two Key Issues detailed in the Commissioners' Report.

## 2.2 **Key Issue 1 – Retail Strategy and Policy R1**

2.2.1 The Report suggests that the Retail Strategy and Policy R1 are in conflict with regional planning policy, particularly Planning Policy Statement 5 (PPS5): Retailing and Town Centres, and that a policy distinction between the three town centres would have required a change in the status of Central Craigavon town centre. It goes on to suggest that, having been designated as a town centre in the adopted Craigavon Area Plan, Central Craigavon is entitled to the policy benefits which that designation has conferred.

### The relationship of Development Plans to Planning Policy Statements

2.2.2 The relationship between Planning Policy Statements (PPSs) and development plans is set out in the Planning Service Information Leaflet 7, "The Hierarchy of Planning Documents and Their Role in Making a Planning Decision". This indicates that PPSs set out the main planning considerations that the Department takes into account in assessing proposals for the various forms of development and are also often relevant to the preparation of development plans. PPS1: General Principles, also states that the contents of PPSs "will be taken into account in preparing development plans". A plan, therefore, can vary the provisions of a PPS as appropriate, if warranted by particular local circumstances. The Department, however, is aware that paragraph 9 of PPS5, requires new development plans to take account of and be consistent with the policies contained in PPS5. This anomaly in wording will be considered by the Department in the forthcoming review of draft PPS5. The Department would accept the view of the PAC in this particular case.

### Weight to be attached to Draft PPSs

2.2.3 Paragraph 50 of PPS1: General Principles states that "emerging policies in the form of draft statements and strategies that are in the public domain, may also be regarded as material considerations, although less weight will be ascribed to them than to final publications". The Department does not accept that no weight should be ascribed to draft PPS5, nevertheless, it is of the opinion that determining weight in this case should be given to the extant PPS5.

### Removal of Retail Strategy

2.2.4 The Department accepts that the removal of the Retail Strategy represents the deletion of a significant element from the Plan. It concurs with the Commissioners' view, however, that the strategic policy context provided by the RDS and PPS5 ensures that the absence of a retail strategy in the Plan is not fatal provided Town Centre boundaries and Primary Retail Cores are identified.

### The Retail Study

2.2.5 The Commissioners' Report at paragraph 1.16 states that "The Retail Study's forensic level of assessment, although robust in its own right, relied on a narrow and an inappropriately cautious range of assumptions about growth." It goes on to conclude, "we see fundamental flaws in the Retail Study and have not been persuaded that the Retail Study's conclusion that there will be no need for additional retail floorspace provides a sound basis for the Retail

Strategy in the draft Plan.” This statement would appear to be at odds with an earlier statement in paragraph 1.13 where it is stated in relation to the Retail Study that, “we agree with the Department that there would have to be substantial changes to the assumptions to make any difference to the conclusions.”

- 2.2.6 The Department accepts that a range of options could have been adopted in relation to the two key assumptions made in the Retail Study of which the PAC is critical, namely those relating to population growth and market share. The Department, however, remains of the opinion that the assumptions adopted in the Retail Study were valid and soundly based for the reasons detailed in the following paragraphs.

### Population Growth

- 2.2.7 In relation to estimated population growth the Commissioners’ Report, reflecting on the fact that the Craigavon Area Plan (CAP) zones 516.21 hectares of land for housing within Lurgan, Portadown and Central Craigavon, states that “in such circumstances it would have been appropriate to assess the implications of the proposals for new development contained in the CAP, particularly in relation to proposed housing.” The Department remains of the opinion that it was appropriate to use NISRA population projections for the following reasons:

- NISRA population projections are generally regarded as being the most accurate projections available and are used across government departments;
- NISRA population projections are the figures upon which the RDS Housing Growth Indicators (HGIs) are based. The use of the NISRA projections for the Retail Study was therefore considered to be appropriate given that the Plan is required to be in general conformity with the RDS;
- housing land zonings have been closely monitored by the Department, since adoption of the Craigavon Area Plan in 2004, through it’s annual Housing Land Availability Monitor. The most recently published housing monitor report indicates that there is sufficient remaining phase 1 land and approved un-zoned land within the range of settlements across the Craigavon Borough to meet the housing needs of the Borough until 2015 and beyond. It is considered that the use of housing land zonings, particularly including phase 2 lands, to estimate population growth would lead to an over-estimation of retail expenditure; and
- the use of house build rates as a basis for determining population growth is considered to be unreliable due to their fluctuation over the years and their dependence on short-term housing market and property investment conditions. In addition these figures take account of factors such as mean household size which in themselves are estimates, creating further potential for uncertainty.

## Market Share

2.2.8 In relation to market share, the Commissioners' Report states that "in addition, given Craigavon's identification as a 'main hub' in the RDS which promotes Craigavon as a major location for service employment, one could reasonably expect that Craigavon Borough might increase its market share of retail expenditure". While the Department accepts that the RDS identifies Craigavon as having high growth potential this should be viewed in the context of the overall Spatial Development Strategy (SDS). The SDS gives pre-eminence to Belfast as the economic driver of the region with a focus on a regeneration of the city centre. Londonderry is also recognised as the regional city and gateway at the centre of a strong North-West Region offering key infrastructure and resources. In relation to Rural Northern Ireland, the SDS seeks a balanced development spread across a polycentric network of hubs/clusters based on the main towns which will have a strategic role as centres of employment and services for urban and rural communities. In this context Belfast and Londonderry are recognised as having regional significance in retail terms. Craigavon is one of a number of main hubs within the region. The Department remains of the opinion that it was appropriate to assume a constant market share for Craigavon for the following reasons:

- The Retail Study indicates that there is no significant trade loss from the area, and therefore any projected increase in the market share for Craigavon Borough would be at the expense of other neighbouring urban centres.
- While the Department recognises the growth potential of Craigavon in the RDS, it considers that this is already reflected in the HGI's which in turn are linked to the NISRA population projections.
- To suggest a higher market share would require trade draw from other centres which the Department would consider to be unrealistic in light of current performance and recent retail developments. This proposal would in fact suggest enhancing the role of Craigavon to the detriment of other main hubs when the Commission accepts that PPS5 makes no distinction between town centres.

## 2.3 **Key Issue 2 – Designation 1: Town Centre Boundaries**

2.3.1 The Department recognises that there are existing developments and vacant land which were within the town centre boundaries indicated in the draft Craigavon Area Plan 2010 but which are now outside the town centre boundaries in the adopted Craigavon Town Centre Boundaries and Retail Designations Plan. The Department concurs with the PAC view of this issue, detailed in paragraph 2.11 of the Commissioners' Report that "These lands would not be identified for any particular use but would be "white land". As such, the lands would have development potential but would be subject to the provisions of existing policy as set out in the CAP and the various regional planning policy statements."

### **3.0 The Adopted Plan Written Statement and Maps**

- 3.1 The Department is also publishing today The Craigavon Town Centre Boundaries and Retail Designations Plan 2010, containing the amendments referred to in this Adoption Statement.
- 3.2 Amendments to the content of the Draft Plan Written Statement and Proposals Maps have been made as a consequence of the Department's decisions, which followed consideration of objections received including the report of the Independent Examination undertaken by the PAC. These amendments make alterations to the text and the maps of the Draft Plan.

### **4.0 Adoption of The Craigavon Town Centre Boundaries & Retail Designations Plan 2010**

- 4.1 The Department now adopts The Craigavon Town Centre Boundaries and Retail Designations Plan 2010, as amended in the Adoption Statement, as a Development Plan under Article 8 of the Planning (Northern Ireland) Order 1991. The Department has made the necessary Order adopting the Plan. A reproduction of this Order is contained in Appendix 2 to this Statement.

### **5.0 Acknowledgement**

- 5.1 The Department wishes to thank the elected representatives and everyone who contributed to the making of this Plan at all stages. The Department also wishes to thank Commissioners de-Courcey & O'Hare, who conducted the Independent Examination.

**Appendix 1: Key Issues, Sub-Issues, Related Objections & Counter-Objections, PAC Recommendations and the Departments Decision**

| <b>Key Issue</b>   | <b>Sub-Issue</b>   | <b>Objection Numbers</b>   | <b>Counter-Objection Numbers</b>                           |
|--|--|--|--|
| <b>Key Issue 1<br/>Retail Strategy &amp;<br/>Policy R1</b> | (a) Does the plan recognise the established retail hierarchy within the three Town Centres and the differing roles offered by the three locations?   | CTCB/7<br>CTCB/9<br>CTCB/11  | CO/CTCB/1 & 10<br>CO/CTCB/4 & 13<br>CO/CTCB/7<br>CO/CTCB/9 |
|  | (b) Will the strategy achieve the plan aims and objectives?  | CTCB/7<br>CTCB/9   | CO/CTCB/1 & 10<br>CO/CTCB/4 & 13<br>CO/CTCB/7<br>CO/CTCB/9 |
|  | (c) Will the promotion of Lurgan and Portadown Town centres be to the detriment of Central Craigavon Town Centre?  | CTCB/9   | CO/CTCB/4 & 13<br>CO/CTCB/5, 11 & 12                       |
|  | (d) Should the last bullet point of the strategy be omitted and the growth of Central Craigavon Town Centre allowed?   | CTCB/11<br>CTCB/12   | CO/CTCB/1 & 10<br>CO/CTCB/5, 11 & 12                       |
|  | (e) Should the wording of Policy R1 be strengthened? (objection withdrawn)   | CTCB/2 & 17  | CO/CTCB/1 & 10<br>CO/CTCB/3<br>CO/CTCB/5, 11 & 12          |
|  | (f) Should policy R1 be deleted as it is too restrictive and as further comparison retail floorspace at Central Craigavon Town Centre would not have an impact on the vitality and viability of Lurgan and Portadown Town Centres? | CTCB/9<br>CTCB/12  | CO/CTCB/3<br>CO/CTCB/4 & 13<br>CO/CTCB/5, 11 & 12          |
|  | <b><u>PAC Recommendation:</u><br/>That the Retail Strategy and Policy R1 be omitted from the Plan.</b>   | <b><u>Department's Decision:</u><br/>The Department accepts the PAC recommendation, and the Retail Strategy and Policy R1 are omitted from the Plan.</b> |  |

| Key Issue   | Sub-Issue  | Objection Numbers | Counter-Objection Numbers   |
|---|--|-------------------|---|
| <b>Key Issue 2<br/>Designation 1 –<br/>Town Centre<br/>Boundaries</b> | (a) Should the plan incorporate a specific provision for the development of the service sector within the Town Centres?  | CTCB/2 & 17       | CO/CTCB/3<br>CO/CTCB/4 & 13<br>CO/CTCB/5, 11 & 12<br>CO/CTCB/7<br>CO/CTCB/9   |
|   | (b) Should any Town Centre Boundary include Opportunity Sites?   | CTCB/2 & 17       | CO/CTCB/3<br>CO/CTCB/4 & 13<br>CO/CTCB/5, 11 & 12<br>CO/CTCB/9  |
|   | (c) Should the text be amended to address acceptable uses on Opportunity Sites and/or to restrict retailing on such sites to retail warehousing only?  | CTCB/8<br>CTCB/11 | CO/CTCB/1 & 10<br>CO/CTCB/4 & 13<br>CO/CTCB/5, 11 & 12  |
|   | (d) Should Central Craigavon Town Centre Boundary be omitted?  | CTCB/11           | CO/CTCB/1<br>CO/CTCB/3<br>CO/CTCB/7<br>CO/CTCB/9  |
|   | (e) Should a policy for, and zoning of, land beyond Town Centre boundaries be included in the Plan?  | CTCB/12           | CO/CTCB/1<br>CO/CTCB/5  |
|   | <p><b><u>PAC Recommendation:</u></b><br/> <b>While there is no formal recommendation on this Key Issue, the Report recognises the status of all three town centres in the adopted Craigavon Area Plan. The Report suggests that the RDS and PPS5 do not allow for a policy distinction to be made between the town centres, and that all three are entitled to all of the policy benefits which town centre designation confers. The Report states that Development Opportunity Sites do not have to be included in the TCBs and there should be no change to the plan in this respect. The Report states that there is no necessity for the plan to be amended to incorporate a specific provision for the development of the service sector within the town centre, but that the town centre boundary needs to be drawn to make adequate provision for the development of the service sector. The Report comments on lands that have been excluded from the TCBs identified in the draft plan which would remain within the development limit for Craigavon Urban Area. These lands would not be identified for any particular use but would be “white land”. As such, the lands would have development potential but would be subject to the provisions of existing policy as set out in the CAP and the various regional planning policy statements.</b></p> |                   | <p><b><u>Department’s Decision:</u></b><br/> <b>The Department accepts the PAC consideration of this Key Issue.</b></p> |

| Key Issue  | Sub-Issue  | Objection Numbers   | Counter-Objection Numbers   |
|--|--|---|---|
| <b>Key Issue 3<br/>Designation 2 –<br/>Primary Retail Cores<br/>(PRCs)</b>     | (a) Is the PRC boundary required for Central Craigavon?  | CTCB/11   | CO/CTCB/1<br>CO/CTCB/3<br>CO/CTCB/9   |
|  | (b) Should there be a clear policy in the plan for the PRCs?   | CTCB/2 & 17   | CO/CTCB/1 & 10<br>CO/CTCB/3<br>CO/CTCB/5, 11 & 12<br>CO/CTCB/9              |
|  | (c) Does the PRC policy need to be more explicit to include a specific policy to the effect that proposals for retail development will be directed towards the PRC and retail investment outside PRCs will be restricted to bulky goods?   | CTCB/18   | CO/CTCB/1 & 10<br>CO/CTCB/4 & 13<br>CO/CTCB/5 & 11                          |
|  | <p><b>The Report confirms that, having given Central Craigavon town centre its status as a town centre, it is entitled to the benefits attached to such a status that are conferred on it by regional policy.</b></p> <p><b>The Report concludes that a further policy restricting changes of use from retailing within the PRC has not been warranted and that there should be no change to the plan in this respect.</b></p> <p><b>The Report goes on to confirm that sequential testing and the paragraph 39 tests (PPS5) are applied to major retail proposals within town centres but outside the PRC, providing adequate protection for the PRC, and that a further policy directing retail development to the PRC is unnecessary.</b></p> <p><b>The Report states that it is not necessary, or indeed desirable, that all retail investment should be restricted to the PRC. It also states that it would be neither appropriate nor necessary to restrict retail investment outside the PRC but within the town centre to bulky goods shopping.</b></p> <p><b><u>PAC Recommendation:</u></b><br/><b>That no other policies are applied to Designation 2.</b></p> | <p><b><u>Department's Decision:</u></b><br/><b>The Department accepts the PAC recommendation and consequently the plan contains no additional policy in respect of Designation 2.</b></p> |   |
|  |  |   |   |
| <b>Key Issue 4<br/>Plan Policy R2</b>  | (a) Is the policy too restrictive and should it be deleted?  | CTCB/12   | CO/CTCB/5, 11 & 12  |
|  | (b) Could the policy be expressed more fully?  | CTCB/2 & 17   | CO/CTCB/1 & 10<br>CO/CTCB/3<br>CO/CTCB/5, 11 & 12<br>CO/CTCB/7<br>CO/CTCB/9 |
|  | <p><b><u>PAC Recommendation:</u></b><br/><b>No change in Policy R2.</b></p>  | <p><b><u>Department's Decision:</u></b><br/><b>The Department accepts the PAC recommendation and there is no change in Policy R2 (now Policy R1 in the Adopted Plan).</b></p>             |   |
|  |  |   |   |
| <b>Key Issue 5<br/>Designation 3 –<br/>Primary Retail<br/>Frontages (PRFs)</b> | (a) Are the PRFs for Lurgan and Portadown too restrictive and should they be deleted? (objection withdrawn)  | CTCB/12   | CO/CTCB/1 & 10  |
|  | <b>Key Issue not considered by PAC</b>   |   |   |

| Key Issue   | Sub-Issue   | Objection Numbers  | Counter-Objection Numbers   |
|---|---|--|---|
| <b>Key Issue 6<br/>Town Centre<br/>Boundary for<br/>Portadown</b>         | (a) Should the boundary incorporate derelict or semi-derelict land on the edge of the Town Centre, particularly the existing Curran St site and the former bakery at Obins Street?  | CTCB/2 & 17  | CO/CTCB/1 & 10<br>CO/CTCB/3<br>CO/CTCB/5, 11 & 12<br>CO/CTCB/6<br>CO/CTCB/9                   |
|   | (b) Should the boundary be reduced: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To exclude lands as per map TA2 of objection CTCB/9;</li> <li>To be amended as per map No 4 of objection CTCB/18; and</li> <li>To exclude lands at Edenderry, opportunity site P1?</li> </ul>  | CTCB/9<br>CTCB/11<br>CTCB/18   | CO/CTCB/1 & 10<br>CO/CTCB/3<br>CO/CTCB/4 & 13<br>CO/CTCB/5, 11 & 12<br>CO/CTCB/6<br>CO/CTCB/9 |
|   |   | CTCB/6 – relied on original letter of objection  | CO/CTCB/5   |
|   | <p><b><u>PAC Recommendation:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>That the town centre boundary for Portadown be amended to exclude Development Opportunity Site (DOS) P1; and</li> <li>That the town centre boundary for Portadown be amended to exclude properties on the northern and southern side of Bridge Street frontage (at Edenderry).</li> </ul>   | <p><b><u>Department's Decision:</u></b><br/>The Department accepts the PAC recommendation and the town centre boundary for Portadown is amended to exclude DOS P1 and properties on the northern and southern side of Bridge Street frontage (at Edenderry).</p>   |   |
| <b>Key Issue 7<br/>Town Centre<br/>Boundary for Central<br/>Craigavon</b> | (a) Should the boundary be extended to include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Turkington site; and</li> <li>Lands to west of Central Way and adjacent to the Borough Council Offices?</li> </ul>   | CTCB/7<br>CTCB/9<br>CTCB/12<br>CTCB/15   | CO/CTCB/3<br>CO/CTCB/5<br>CO/CTCB/7<br>CO/CTCB/8  |
|   |   | CTCB/3 - relied on original letter of objection<br>CTCB/15 – dealt with by way of written representation   | CO/CTCB/1<br>CO/CTCB/5<br><br>CO/CTCB/1<br>CO/CTCB/5<br>CO/CTCB/7                             |
|   | <p><b><u>PAC Recommendation:</u></b><br/>That the town centre boundary for Central Craigavon be amended to include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lands to the east of Lakeview Road and to the north and south of the Civic Centre; and</li> <li>Lands to the west of the Courthouse and Marlborough House as far as Highfield Road and extending southwards as far as Mandeville Road to include Marlborough Retail Park and adjacent open areas.</li> </ul> | <p><b><u>Department's Decision:</u></b><br/>The Department accepts the PAC recommendation and extends the town centre boundary for Central Craigavon to include all of the land specified.<br/>In accepting the recommendation to include lands to the east of Lakeview Road and to the south and east of the Civic Centre, however, the Department points out that any development of this land will be subject to the provisions of prevailing regional planning policy, including PPS8: Open Space, Sport and Outdoor Recreation.</p> |   |

| Key Issue   | Sub-Issue   | Objection Numbers          | Counter-Objection Numbers  |
|---|---|----------------------------|--|
| <b>Key Issue 8<br/>Town Centre<br/>Boundary for Lurgan</b>                      | (a) Should the boundary be extended along the north-east side of William Street to include gateway commercial areas and to make it clear that new accesses are required for Opportunity Sites L1 and L4?  | CTCB/2 & 17                | CO/CTCB/1 & 10<br>CO/CTCB/3<br>CO/CTCB/5, 11 & 12<br>CO/CTCB/8<br>CO/CTCB/9  |
|   | (b) Should the boundary be redefined as indicated on map TA3 of objection CTCB/9?   | CTCB/9                     | CO/CTCB/3<br>CO/CTCB/5, 11 & 12  |
|   | (c) Should the boundary be amended/reduced?   | CTCB/11                    | CO/CTCB/1 & 10<br>CO/CTCB/3<br>CO/CTCB/9<br>CO/CTCB/8  |
|   | (d) Should the boundary be amended to include the factory site at Malcolm Rd? (objection withdrawn)   | CTCB/13                    | CO/CTCB/1 & 10   |
|   | <b>PAC Recommendation:</b><br>That the following lands are excluded from the town centre boundary for Lurgan: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lands at Kitchen Hill;</li> <li>• The area to the east of Malcolm Road and south of Queen Street;</li> <li>• Land to the east and north of Johnson's Row;</li> <li>• Development Opportunity Site (DOS) L2 at Castle Lane and terraced properties along Wellington Street south-east of its junction with Church Walk;</li> <li>• The housing area to the rear of Lidl on the south-eastern side of Castle Lane; and</li> <li>• Land and premises on the north and north-eastern side of Charles Street and along William Street north of Spar supermarket.</li> </ul> |                            | <b>Department's Decision:</b><br>The Department accepts the PAC recommendation and the town centre boundary for Lurgan is amended to exclude all of the areas specified. |
| <b>Key Issue 9<br/>Primary Retail Core<br/>(PRC) for Portadown</b>              | (a) Should the boundary exclude land not in active retail use and some distance from the established retail core?   | CTCB/9                     | CO/CTCB/3<br>CO/CTCB/5, 11 & 12<br>CO/CTCB/4 & 13<br>CO/CTCB/6   |
|   | (b) Should the boundary be amended per Fig 3 of objection CTCB/11?  | CTCB/11                    | CO/CTCB/3<br>CO/CTCB/4 & 13<br>CO/CTCB/6<br>CO/CTCB/9  |
|   | <b>PAC Recommendation:</b><br>No change in the defined PRC boundary for Portadown.  |                            | <b>Department's Decision:</b><br>The Department accepts the PAC recommendation and the defined PRC for Portadown remains unchanged.                                      |
| <b>Key Issue 10<br/>Primary Retail Core<br/>(PRC) for Central<br/>Craigavon</b> | (a) Should the PRC be expanded to include the retail park?  | CTCB/9<br>CTCB/12(w'drawn) | CO/CTCB/3<br>CO/CTCB/5, 11 & 12<br>CO/CTCB/8   |
|   | <b>PAC Recommendation:</b><br>That the PRC boundary for Central Craigavon be extended to encompass the retail park at the Rushmere complex.   |                            | <b>Department's Decision:</b><br>The Department accepts the PAC recommendation and the PRC for Central Craigavon is extended to encompass the Rushmere Retail Park.      |

| <b>Key Issue</b>   | <b>Sub-Issue</b>  | <b>Objection Numbers</b>   | <b>Counter-Objection Numbers</b>                               |
|--|---|--|--|
| <b>Key Issue 11<br/>Primary Retail Core (PRC) for Lurgan</b>     | (a) Should the PRC boundary be amended to include land to the rear of 23 High Street (retail site containing Laser outlet)? | CTCB/4 & 16 - relied on original letter of objection<br>CTCB/10(w/drawn)   | CO/CTCB/1 & 10<br>CO/CTCB/8                                    |
|  | (b) Should the PRC be amended as per map TA3 of objection CTCB/9? (objection withdrawn)                                     | CTCB/9   | CO/CTCB/5<br>CO/CTCB/11<br>CO/CTCB/12                          |
|  |   | CTCB/1 - relied on original letter of objection  | CO/CTCB/1 & 10   |
|  | <b><u>PAC Recommendation:</u></b><br><b>No change in the defined PRC boundary for Lurgan.</b>                               | <b><u>Department's Decision:</u></b><br><b>The Department accepts the PAC recommendation and the defined PRC for Lurgan remains unchanged.</b> |  |
|  |   |  |  |
| <b>Key Issue 12<br/>Primary Retail Frontage (PRF) for Lurgan</b> | (a) Should the PRF be extended from Church Walk to 20 High Street?  | CTCB/2 & 17  | CO/CTCB/1 & 10<br>CO/CTCB/3<br>CO/CTCB/5, 11 & 12<br>CO/CTCB/9 |
|  | <b><u>PAC Recommendation:</u></b><br><b>No change in the defined PRFs for Lurgan.</b>                                       | <b><u>Department's Decision:</u></b><br><b>The Department accepts the PAC recommendation and the defined PRFs for Lurgan remain unchanged.</b> |  |

## **Appendix 2**

### **THE PLANNING (NORTHERN IRELAND) ORDER 1991**

#### **CRAIGAVON TOWN CENTRE BOUNDARIES AND RETAIL DESIGNATIONS PLAN 2010 (ADOPTION) ORDER (NORTHERN IRELAND) 2008**

**Made 19 June 2008**

WHEREAS the Department of the Environment (hereinafter referred to as 'the Department') in accordance with Part III of the Planning (Northern Ireland) Order 1991 (hereinafter referred to as 'the Order') has consulted with Craigavon Borough Council and prepared a Development Plan in respect of town centre boundaries and other retail designations for the three town centres within the Borough.

AND WHEREAS the Department has complied with Article 5 of the Order;

AND WHEREAS objections and representations have been duly made within the time stated for making objections, the Department caused an Independent Examination to be held, in accordance with Article 7 of the Order, by the Planning Appeals Commission over three days from 3 to 5 September 2007 for the purpose of considering such objections;

AND WHEREAS the Department has considered the said objections and representations and the Report of the Planning Appeals Commission on the said Examination;

NOW THEREFORE the Department in exercise of the powers conferred by Article 8 of the Order and all other powers enabling it in that behalf hereby orders as follows:

1. This Order may be cited as the Craigavon Town Centre Boundaries and Retail Designations Plan 2010 (Adoption) Order (Northern Ireland) 2008;
2. (i) The Plan is hereby adopted as a Development Plan to the extent approved and endorsed by the Department in the Statement entitled 'Craigavon Town Centre Boundaries and Retail Designations Plan 2010 Adoption Statement 2008';  
  
(ii) The Plan together with the said Statement shall be known as the Craigavon Town Centre Boundaries and Retail Designations Plan 2010 which shall become operative on 30 June 2008.

Sealed with the Official Seal of the Department of the Environment on 19 June 2008.

T J CLARKE

---

Senior Officer of the Department of the Environment







