

NEWPORT HARBOUR ACTION GROUP

secretary: CHRISTOPHER DODD BA RIBA (rtd)
28 Sea Street, Newport, IOW. 01983 524567 (cwg28@live.com)

COMMENTS on proposed NEWPORT HARBOUR MASTERPLAN SPD

18 April 2020

1. The whole basis on which this Masterplan has been presented is mistaken, illconceived and legally unacceptable. The reasons for this are as follows-

1.1 it is titled Newport Harbour yet it does not cover more than 15% of the harbour. What is proposed for the remaining 85%?

1.2 it has been produced without any reference to Harbour Law. The part of the plan which includes the harbour estate/land is subject to the following Law - the Harbours, Piers, Docks and Piers Clauses Act 1847 - the Harbours Act 1964 S. 14 & the Transport & Works Act 1992 C.42, Schedule 3, (1)(2B)(C) - which prevents any works being carried out on such land, which are not for harbour operational purposes, without "prior obtaining of an Order from the Minister" (meaning - the IWCouncil has at this time no ability to execute the parts of the plan that are on harbour land). We are not aware that any such Order has been obtained or will be approved. (N.B. The harbour estate comprises land reclaimed from the bed and banks of the River Medina and paid for by public money in accordance with the terms of the River Medina Navigation Act 1852.)

1.3 the parts of the Masterplan which are on harbour land comprise Grade 3 (worst risk) flood plain which is already flooding - see separate Flood Report covering the last 8 months recording 40 flood incidents in the harbour with supporting photographs being sent to Oliver Boulter, Strategic Manager Planning & Infrastructure Delivery today.

1.4 The isolated & scattered clumps of housing shown on harbour land which are not only entirely without any sense of place, without any amenity land nor any dry route escape capability in any flood event. These will also be require to pass a sequential test which we believe they will fail and therefore they will be refused just as application P/00162/08-TCP/28886 for housing at Blackhouse Quay failed in 2008.

2.0 In view of the above if the Masterplan is to have any acceptability it has to be divided into two separate zones - 2.1. - the Newport Harbour part covering the whole extent of the harbour land, to be renamed for instance 'the Old Trading Basin of N.H'. & 2.2 'Newport

Town Land' not in the harbour estate on which there are no Harbour Law restrictions.

2.1.1 Without control of tidal surge flooding, already occurring & p.2

forecast by the EA to steadily increase, we consider no development should be approved on the harbour estate land or any other land on the floodplain. We consider it is negligence to have omitted such tidal surge barrier. It would require twin gates, the lower to retain water in the harbour up to half tide depth and an upper gate to protect against tidal surges. The Masterplan fails without it. This barrier will have a foot/cycle path built over it (connecting to the hospital and the IW College past the north side of B&Q), with opening centre section to permit movement of boats according to the tide. We believe the cost of a 'vanity' bridge, terminating in the middle of a West Bank boat yard plus all the costs of huge building plinths, raising all housing one floor and raised harbour walks will provide much of the cost of the relatively short (approx. 70m) tidal surge protection. It will also protect sections of housing and other very significant assets, much of which is Listed, from future flooding. In addition this will allow practically all the History & Heritage Objects of the Old Trading Basin, as recorded in the Heritage Assessment commissioned by the Regeneration Office in 2018 to be saved.

WE WILL OBJECT IN THE MOST DERERMINED WAY TO THE LOSS OF THIS HARBOUR HERITAGE which we believe has been almost totally ignored by the Masterplan.

2.1.2 the Plan shows no provision for boat related uses whatsoever, apart from winter storage on the same land as the 'raised walk'! The harbour land North of the old Bus Museum and West of the arch roof shed has to be a secure fenced & gated yard for both boat winter storage and repair/maintenance.

2.1.3 the Plan has a totally unrealistic approach to land transport. It removes 'hundreds' of car parking places but has no apparent or visible or space to provide public transport into or through the site. And in view of the proposed public buildings and other intensive uses this is an unacceptable omission by the Masterplanners.

2.1.4 the multi storey car park at the very focal North end of the plan at the precise line of transition from development to parkland is both ridiculously inadequate in its capacity and placed in the most unacceptable & puerile location.

2.1.4 the harbour walk raised approx 1.5m above the harbour walls seems to have no meaningful starting or ending point except that both ends will be inundated by all flooding events making it inaccessible to walkers.

2.1.5 the Masterplan is unacceptably vague about the continuing existence of the hopelessly narrow Sea Street bridge entrance to the Site?

2.2.6 in our view any development will be prejudiced by the p.3

continuing location of the existing allotment site. This needs to be repositioned, not removed, to a new more level location along the North side of the Cemetary. The land released, with imagination, could accommodate a stepped 'crescent' of dwellings forming part of a civic area open on the West to the harbour front with cafe/shops at street level.

2.2.1 Newport Town Land - the Masterplan totally lacks imagination and will be judged as an entirely missed opportunity. All the land East

of the Riverside Centre should be included for housing, with necessary contamination treatment, to include a medium-high 'Harbour' landmark apartments building; the land behind County Hall should have several levels of parking with, attached to at its East end, several levels of small flats lifted above the pavement on pilotis. The allotment site to be as above.

These three groups of dwellings will achieve reasonable mass and a sense of place to bring life into the new harbour area sufficient to begin supporting a new neighbourhood.

I believe that, as navigation of the river for harbour purposes has ceased South of the Medina Way bridge, the culverting South of Medina Way should be extended Westwards to widen the land available for 'a' building of some sort on the Council Car Park site. However I object to its plinth which will cause very considerable costs and access problems.

SUMMARY -

This conception driving this Masterplan is virtually NILL and it cannot be saved even by the repeated words 'lively facade' etc. I consider a newly graduated Architect would have done a better job.

Suggestion pay the Masterplanners' expenses, retain their entire fee, discharge them and threaten to bring negligence charges against them. I am sure the first firm of pre plan Architects would have done a very much better job.

Christopher Dodd BA (hons Lond) RIBA rtd.

