

PM 4.1 E1 ALLOCATION OF EMPLOYMENT LAND

Correspondent No.	Representation No.	Correspondent Name
001339	302670	Mr D Marsh

Summary of Objection

The proposed rewording is accepted and the lower case text will be edited by deleting the penultimate sentence and by adding the following text to the final sentence detailed Flood Risk Assessment including issues relating to Ouse Dyke and the potential of flood risk to others from all sources. POLICY E1-ALLOCATION OF EMPLOYMENT LAND PM 4.1 (3) does not correctly reflect Environment Agency position. The statement in the penultimate sentence of proposed text was made in relation to a smaller allocation in letter dated 28 May 2004. PROPOSED CHANGE - Recommended that penultimate sentence ("The Environment Agency have therefore confirmed...") be omitted and following text added to final sentence: "...detailed Flood Risk Assessment including issues relating to Ouse Dyke and the potential of flood risk to others from all sources."

Council's Response and Reasoning

This is a further change requested by the Environment Agency. The area allocated has not changed. Nevertheless, the further amendment is accepted.

Proposed Further Modification

Revise lower case text as requested by the EA.

* **This objection has now been withdrawn** *

Correspondent No.	Representation No.	Correspondent Name
003827	300005	Mr P Tansey

Summary of Representation

The allocation at Teal Close is supported as it would help firms relocating from Waterside.

Response to Representation

Your support for this Proposed Modification is welcomed.

Proposed Further Modification

No change.

PM 4.2 E1 ALLOCATION OF EMPLOYMENT LAND

Correspondent No.	Representation No.	Correspondent Name
005713	302364	Mr C Woodward

Summary of Objection

Ongoing uncertainty about the likely delivery of Gedling A612 Major Integrated Transport Scheme means that delivery of proposed development by 2011 will be

delayed. This delay will be exacerbated by the need for remediation of contaminated land. Other sites less constrained by infrastructure should proceed ahead of this site.

Council's Response and Reasoning

It is noted that this site is dependent on the construction of the A612 Southern Link Road and, as such, it is accepted that this site may come forward for development after other sites. However, it is not considered appropriate to make specific reference to this.

Proposed Further Modification

No change.

Correspondent No.	Representation No.	Correspondent Name
005713	302368	Mr C Woodward

Summary of Objection

The Inspector states that the Council should not allocate all of its employment land needs in one area. However, he recommends 25ha of employment land at Top Wighay Farm. Given this inconsistency the Council should stand by his recommendation to put 25ha at Top Wighay and no employment at Teal Close.

Council's Response and Reasoning

The Inspector considers the relative merits of both Top Wighay Farm and Teal Close as locations for employment at 4.2 and 4.8. He concluded that locational issues did not indicate that the bulk of the Local Plan's employment allocation should be entirely in one location or the other. He acknowledged both the sustainability of the Teal Close location (which justified the release of some land for employment here) and the attractions of the Top Wighay to inward investors. With regards to the size of allocation at each site, the Inspector allocated the bulk of new employment land at Top Wighay as the Teal Close site was not an option for him, for flooding reasons. However, given that he was of the view that the Council should not allocate all of its employment land needs in one area, now that the Teal Close site has been found to be developable in flood risk terms, it is entirely appropriate that employment land should be allocated in both locations.

Proposed Further Modification

No change.

Correspondent No.	Representation No.	Correspondent Name
005009	300009	Mr L Geary

Summary of Objection

The Inspector thought it unnecessary to consider our objection which asked that reference be made in the Plan to a possible fourth Trent River Crossing 'if no allocation is to be made' Gedling Borough Council now proposes to make such an allocation. We ask please that our original suggested amendment wording be now

therefore inserted in the Plan particularly since we are led to believe that the new river bridge will be built at Netherfield.

Council's Response and Reasoning

PPG12 advises that the safeguarding of land for road schemes needs to be realistic about the prospects of the scheme starting in the plan period. Such a road is not included in the Local Transport Plan and at this time there are no finances for the road. Furthermore, an informal indicative route is west of the allocations at Teal Close. As such it is not considered to be appropriate to safeguard the scheme.

Proposed Further Modification

No change.

Correspondent No.	Representation No.	Correspondent Name
000722	302660	Mrs K Martin
000717	301994	Mrs K Haley
003827	300004	Mr P Tansey

Summary of Representation

Supports proposed modification to allocate land at Teal Close for employment contrary to Inspector's recommendations and agrees with the Council's reasoning and response. Support for designating safeguarded land at Teal Close for possible longer term development needs.

Response to Representation

Your support for this Proposed Modification is welcomed.

Proposed Further Modification

No change.

Correspondent No.	Representation No.	Correspondent Name
001339	302671	Mr D Marsh

Summary of Objection

Teal Close - While not supporting promotion of the site, Agency support reasoning put forward by the Council. However proposed modification refers to text amendments proposed by PM 4.1 (3a) to which Agency has made a representation. This would be resolved by Agency's recommended change to PM 4.1 (3a).

Council's Response and Reasoning

See response to 302670.

Proposed Further Modification

No change.

Correspondent No.	Representation No.	Correspondent Name
005789	302688	Mr J A Chisholm

Summary of Objection

Support allocation of land at Teal Close for employment purposes. Full allocation will help meet shortage of manufacturing sites in Nottingham built up area and will assist in regeneration by allowing relocation of displaced firms within a reasonable distance of their original location.

Council's Response and Reasoning

The Inspector considers the relative merits of both Top Wighay Farm and Teal Close as locations for employment at 4.2 and 4.8. He concluded that locational issues did not indicate that the bulk of the Local Plan's employment allocation should be entirely in one location or the other. He acknowledged both the sustainability of the Teal Close location (which justified the release of some land for employment here) and the attractions of the Top Wighay to inward investors. With regards to the size of allocation at each site the Inspector allocated the bulk of new employment land at Top Wighay as the Teal Close site was not an option for him for flooding reasons. However given that he was of the view that the Council should not allocate all of its employment land needs in one area now that the Teal Close site has been found to be developable in flood risk terms it is entirely appropriate that employment land should be allocated in both locations. With regards to the market suitability of both sites expert witnesses for both the Council and County Estates provided evidence relating to the Top Wighay Farm and the Teal Close sites at the Local Plan Inquiry.

Proposed Further Modification

No change.

PM 4.7 E1 ALLOCATION OF EMPLOYMENT LAND

Correspondent No.	Representation No.	Correspondent Name
000717	301995	Mrs K Haley

Summary of Representation

The deletion of employment allocation South of Victoria Park is supported as the site is designated as a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation - Netherfield Disused Railway Line SIN.

Response to Representation

Your support for this Proposed Modification is welcomed.

Proposed Further Modification

No change.

Correspondent No.	Representation No.	Correspondent Name
005888	302913	Tom Lamshead

Summary of Objection

Employment allocation South of Victoria Park - Structure Plan gives a guideline of 70 ha of employment land to be provided between 1991-2011. Revised Deposit Local Plan sets out that 17 ha had been developed leaving some 53 ha to be provided in replacement Local Plan. While SP suggests that 70 ha figure is only a guideline the Revised Deposit Local Plan goes on to suggest an underprovision is inappropriate. Deletion of land South of Victoria Park casts doubt on deliverability of an appropriate amount of employment land. Inspector's Report specifically references need to identify more employment land especially in this part of the Borough. Furthermore Inspector states that he has not been told of any scheme or plan for reclamation of site. Planning application for site was submitted by Railtrack in 2001. Site lies adjacent to existing employment area and is surrounded by the railway forming a logical boundary. Recommended that Council does not accept Inspector's Recommendation and reinstates employment allocation

Council's Response and Reasoning

No evidence has been provided to address the reasons given by the Inspector for deleting the employment allocation from this site. The reasons stated by the Inspector for deleting the allocation include the SINC status but also it's shape size and condition.

Proposed Further Modification

No change.

PM 4.8 E1 ALLOCATION OF EMPLOYMENT LAND

Correspondent No.	Representation No.	Correspondent Name
000717	302006	Mrs K Haley
001158	302502	Mr D Buckland

Summary of Representation

The inclusion of reference to 9 hectares of land for employment uses at Top Wighay Farm is supported.

Response to Representation

Your support for this Proposed Modification is welcomed.

Proposed Further Modification

No change.

Correspondent No.	Representation No.	Correspondent Name
001330	302560	Mr A Johnson

Summary of Objection

CPRE objects to development at Top Wighay Farm. The Inspector 'was prepared to accept a figure in range between Councils 53ha and CPREs 41ha as a broad guideline'. The Inspector proposed to allocate 45.4 hectares for employment purpose. CPRE notes that 49.5ha are proposed for development in the Councils Proposed Modifications. CPRE believe the allocation could be reduced by a further 9ha and still meet Inspector's guidelines. The Inspector commented that 'considerably more land is needed and the only practical way of achieving anything approaching what is required is by the release of one of the two large sites' - Teal Close and Top Wighay Farm. CPRE believe Teal Close is the appropriate one to be developed - it is less damaging to the Green Belt and well related to urban area of Nottingham. The decisive reason for Inspector rejecting Teal Close was because of unresolved issue of flood risk. However new information has come forward from Environment Agency that is sufficient to now justify the allocation of the site. CPRE believe that now the flooding risk at Teal Close has been resolved choices are in front of the Council that were not available to the Inspector. The Inspector stated 'largely reunsolved flood risks [at Teal Close]... the land at Top Wighay is the only viable alternative that is left to me... But such choices are not in front of me'. There is no need to develop Top Wighay Farm for housing.

Council's Response and Reasoning

The Inspector considers the relative merits of both Top Wighay Farm and Teal Close as locations for employment at 4.2 and 4.8. He concluded that locational issues did not indicate that the bulk of the Local Plan's employment allocation should be entirely in one location or the other. He acknowledged both the sustainability of the Teal Close location (which justified the release of some land for employment here) and the attractions of the Top Wighay to inward investors. With regards to the constraints relating to the Top Wighay site, the Inspector's comments as quoted in the representation are noted. However the site is not constrained by the need to provide extensive infrastructure and, in any event, the reduction in the size of the site as per the Proposed Modifications will enable the site to come forward more quickly than anticipated by the Inspector. By allocating land for employment at both Top Wighay Farm and Teal Close, the Council have sought to provide a greater variety of readily available sites than the Inspector was able to recommend. The final comment by the objector that the site would not provide the more integrated mixed use development sought by the Inspector (given the objector's view that there is no need to develop the site for housing) is dismissed for the reasons set out under the Council's response to the objector's specific representation relating to the housing site.

Proposed Further Modification

No change.

PM 4.12 E1 ALLOCATION OF EMPLOYMENT LAND

Correspondent No.	Representation No.	Correspondent Name
000717	302018	Mrs K Haley

Summary of Objection

Object to modification to redefine employment land from uses within class B1 2 and 8 of the 1987 Use Classes Order to the broader and vague term of "employment generating uses and development" as the loss of planning control over employment land sites could give rise to significant losses and consequent shortfalls against the NSP employment provisions.

Council's Response and Reasoning

No evidence has been provided to discount the Inspector's recommendation. The rewording of the Policy has been clearly explained by the Inspector in paragraphs 9 - 14 of IR 4.1.

Proposed Further Modification

No change.

PM 4.14 E3 RETENTION OF EMPLOYMENT

Correspondent No.	Representation No.	Correspondent Name
000717	302019	Mrs K Haley

Summary of Objection

Object to modification to redefine employment land from uses within class B1, 2 and 8 of the 1987 Use Classes Order to the broader and vague term of "employment generating uses and development" as the loss of planning control over employment land sites could give rise to significant losses and consequent shortfalls against the NSP employment provisions.

Council's Response and Reasoning

No evidence has been provided to discount the Inspector's recommendation. The rewording of the Policy has been clearly explained by the Inspector in paragraphs 9 - 14 of IR 4.1.

Proposed Further Modification

No change.

PM 4.17 E3 RETENTION OF EMPLOYMENT

Correspondent No.	Representation No.	Correspondent Name
000721	302400	St Modwen Developments Ltd

Summary of Objection

Object to this Modification which does not follow Inspector's recommendation. At Public Inquiry St Modwen representatives explained the difficulty in marketing the retained employment site from major transport networks. The Council's modification will restrict the marketing of the site even further. Protection of the adjoining housing site is covered in the body of policy as recommended by the Inspector. The additional rider to Park Road Bestwood is not therefore required and should be removed.

Council's Response and Reasoning

The modification has been made as a result of the proximity of the proposed housing allocation and protected employment site in order to protect the amenity of the future housing site and also for the sake of consistency with other employment sites (where housing is in close proximity). If the amenity concerns can be overcome by a use excluded by the policy, the case can be made at the planning application stage.

Proposed Further Modification

No change.