

4.1 E1 ALLOCATION OF EMPLOYMENT LAND – GENERAL OBJECTIONS

Mr J A Chisholm for GAG 5

Summary of Objection

1. Flexibility of employment figures not fully covered in Modifications.
2. See objection by GAG 5 to 4.8 point 1.
3. The range of employment land with enlarged Teal Close (see rep on PM 4.2) can be within 41- 53 hectares and reduced Teal Close still possible.
4. No need for Top Wighay.

Council's Response and Reasoning

1. See response to GAG 5 objection to 4.8 point 1, later in report.
2. See response to GAG 5 objection to 4.8 point 1, later in report.
3. The C.P.R.E. claimed the allocation could be reduced to 41 hectares at the Public Inquiry, but the Inspector recommended a figure in the range between the Council's 53 hectares and CPRE's 41 hectares as a broad guideline indicating the approximate order of magnitude of what has to be found. The Inspector goes on to state he places little reliance on the CPRE arguments that more land than anticipated by the Structure Plan is likely to be found in Nottingham City or that the Structure Plan needs reviewing. The Proposed Modifications show 49.5 hectares to be allocated for the Borough as a whole, so if Top Wighay were removed the overall provision would be below the figure proposed by CPRE. The Teal Close objection is dealt with in the earlier part of this report, (representation number 302688).
4. There remains a need for Top Wighay, for the reasons explained above.

Proposed Further Modification (Ref PFM 4.1)

No change.

4.2 E1 ALLOCATION OF EMPLOYMENT LAND OBJECTION SITE: TEAL CLOSE

97 objections submitted.

Summary of Objection

More land could be allocated at Teal Close.

Council's Response and Reasoning

The Inspector's report at section 4.2, paragraph 23 addresses the geographical differences between Top Wighay and Teal Close and the Inspector concludes this paragraph with 'Whilst this may justify the release of some land for employment here, it does not suggest that the whole of this site is needed or that the great majority of the borough's allocated employment land should be here.'

Proposed Further Modification (Ref PFM 4.2)

No change.

4.2 E1 ALLOCATION OF EMPLOYMENT LAND OBJECTION SITE: TEAL CLOSE

Mrs. J O'Neill (Burton Joyce Residents Association)

Summary of Objection

Remove employment land as Environment Agency letter not subject to proper scrutiny, and there is a lack of a defensible boundary. The land was not allocated in the first draft plan. Commercial objectives of Severn Trent not function of the Plan.

Council's Response and Reasoning

The flooding issue was debated extensively at the Public Inquiry and the assurance from the Environment Agency is in keeping with Government advice on assessing flood risk. The boundary to the site is clearly explained in the Inspector's report at section 4.2 paragraphs 28 – 40. The site was allocated as safeguarded land in the First Deposit Plan and shown as a major development area in the Consultative Draft Plan. The commercial interests are not a planning consideration.

Proposed Further Modification (Ref PFM 4.2.i)

No change.

4.7 E1 ALLOCATION OF EMPLOYMENT LAND OBJECTION SITE: SOUTH OF VICTORIA PARK

103 objections submitted.

Summary of Objection

More land could be allocated South of Victoria Park.

Council's Response and Reasoning

Section 4.7 of the Inspector's report at paragraph 12 states 'On balance I conclude that the employment allocation should be deleted. This is only due in part to the SINC designation but also takes into account the shape, size and condition of the site. In my view with or without the SINC, the site is most unlikely to deliver a worthwhile amount of developable land within the lifetime of this Local Plan. The SINC is an added but important complication. In these circumstances it seems to me that designation as employment land is, at best, premature or, at worst, little more than a hollow gesture in the direction of finding more land'. The Inspector's findings are consistent with a previous planning appeal when the employment provision of this site was criticised.

Proposed Further Modification (Ref PFM 4.7)

No change.

4.7 E1 ALLOCATION OF EMPLOYMENT LAND OBJECTION SITE: SOUTH OF VICTORIA PARK

Mr. A Johnson (CPRE).

Summary of Objection

If the Council agree to safeguard land this site should be included on the basis that the Inspector said the site is 'unlikely to deliver a worthwhile amount of developable land within the life of this local plan'.

Council's Response and Reasoning

The Inspector's report is clear in that the allocation should be deleted only in part due to the SINC designation, but also he takes into account the shape, size and condition of the site. None of these additional matters are mentioned in the objection and consequently no new evidence has been submitted to change the Council's decision to accept the recommendation of the Inspector.

Proposed Further Modification (Ref PFM 4.7)

No change.

4.8 E1 ALLOCATION OF EMPLOYMENT LAND ADDITIONAL SITE: TOP WIGHAY FARM

136 objections submitted.

Summary of Objection

Site not required. Employment in the Hucknall area has almost reached full capacity i.e. Hucknall Job Centre to close.

Council's Response and Reasoning

The issue of employment land provision outside of the Borough is covered by the Inspector's report. Specifically section 4.2 paragraph 32 explains that it 'is not, of course, for the Local Plan or me to consider sites outside the borough'.

Proposed Further Modification (Ref PFM 4.8.i)

No change.

4.8 E1 ALLOCATION OF EMPLOYMENT LAND ADDITIONAL SITE: TOP WIGHAY FARM

176 objections submitted.

Summary of Objection

Sufficient employment sites in this vicinity i.e. Sherwood Park, Rolls Royce site.

Council's Response and Reasoning

The issue of employment land provision outside of the Borough is covered by the Inspector's report. Specifically section 4.2 paragraph 32 explains that it 'is not, of course, for the Local Plan or me to consider sites outside the borough'.

Proposed Further Modification (Ref PFM 4.8.ii)

No change.

4.8 E1 ALLOCATION OF EMPLOYMENT LAND ADDITIONAL SITE: TOP WIGHAY FARM

97 objections submitted.

Summary of Objection

Hucknall's allocation for employment at 70 hectares under the 1996 Structure Plan is greater than that for the whole of Gedling.

Council's Response and Reasoning

The issue of employment land provision outside of the Borough is covered by the Inspector's report. Specifically section 4.2 paragraph 32 explains that it 'is not, of course, for the Local Plan or me to consider sites outside the borough'. Furthermore this is a strategic issue and in the 1996 Structure Plan, Ashfield is allocated 305 hectares compared with 70 hectares allocated to Gedling.

Proposed Further Modification (Ref PFM 4.8.iii)

No change.

4.8 E1 ALLOCATION OF EMPLOYMENT LAND ADDITIONAL SITE: TOP WIGHAY FARM

98 objections submitted.

Summary of Objection

Attract employees / companies away from M.A.R.R. (Mansfield Ashfield Regeneration Route), and more deprived areas to the North of the County.

Council's Response and Reasoning

The issue of employment land provision outside of the Borough is covered by the Inspector's report. Specifically section 4.2 paragraph 32 explains that it 'is not, of course, for the Local Plan or me to consider sites outside the borough'. Furthermore this is a strategic issue and in the 1996 Structure Plan, Ashfield is allocated 305 hectares compared with 70 hectares allocated to Gedling.

Proposed Further Modification (Ref PFM 4.8.iv)

No change.

4.8 E1 ALLOCATION OF EMPLOYMENT LAND ADDITIONAL SITE: TOP WIGHAY FARM

170 objections submitted.

Summary of Objection

The site at Top Wighay does not serve the needs of Gedling's unemployed, as placed well away from the vast majority of Gedling's residents.

Council's Response and Reasoning

The Inspector deals with this issue in section 4.8 of his report, at paragraphs 6 to 8. The balance between the alternative sites of Top Wighay and Teal Close is clearly explained in the Council's response and reasoning of the Proposed Modifications report at Section 4.8, page 4-9.

Proposed Further Modification (Ref PM 4.8.v)

No change.

4.8 E1 ALLOCATION OF EMPLOYMENT LAND ADDITIONAL SITE: TOP WIGHAY FARM

121 objections submitted.

Summary of Objection

Any advantage of a nine hectare employment site are outweighed by the harm to the environment as a result of opening up large areas of Green Belt land.

Council's Response and Reasoning

Paragraphs 9 to 11 of Section 4.8 of the Inspector's report deals with this objection. A key statement made by the Inspector is 'I am satisfied that the development would be no more harmful here than in any other possible Greenfield location. Moreover, the site is in a wide enough Green Belt tract for the coalescence of settlements to be avoided'.

Proposed Further Modification (Ref PFM 4.8.vi)

No change.

4.8 E1 ALLOCATION OF EMPLOYMENT LAND ADDITIONAL SITE: TOP WIGHAY FARM

120 objections submitted.

Summary of Objection

The Inspector at the Local Plan Inquiry agreed that employment allocation could be reduced to 41 hectares. No need to allocate the site at Top Wighay.

Council's Response and Reasoning

The C.P.R.E. claimed the allocation could be reduced to 41 hectares at the Public Inquiry, but the Inspector recommended a figure in the range between the Council's 53 hectares and CPRE's 41 hectares as a broad guideline indicating the approximate order of magnitude of what has to be found. The Inspector goes on to state he places little reliance on the CPRE arguments that more land than anticipated by the Structure Plan is likely to be found in Nottingham City or that the Structure Plan needs reviewing.

The Proposed Modifications show 49.5 hectares to be allocated for the Borough as a whole, so if Top Wighay were removed the overall provision would be below the figure proposed by CPRE.

Proposed Further Modification (Ref PFM 4.8.vii)

No change.

4.8 E1 ALLOCATION OF EMPLOYMENT LAND ADDITIONAL SITE: TOP WIGHAY FARM

Ashfield District Council

Summary of Objection

The Inspector at the Local Plan Inquiry agreed that employment allocation could be reduced to 41 hectares. No need to allocate the site at Top Wighay, as it is more remote from the main urban area than Teal Close. The emerging Joint Structure Plan employment land needs should be resolved through the new Local Development Framework (LDF). The specific allocation of employment land for

the first time in the Proposed Modifications has not allowed adequate consultation and debate particularly at the Public Inquiry. A new Inquiry should be opened.

Council's Response and Reasoning

The C.P.R.E. claimed the allocation could be reduced to 41 hectares at the Public Inquiry, but the Inspector recommended a figure in the range between the Council's 53 hectares and CPRE's 41 hectares as a broad guideline indicating the approximate order of magnitude of what has to be found. The Inspector goes on to state he places little reliance on the CPRE arguments that more land than anticipated by the Structure Plan is likely to be found in Nottingham City or that the Structure Plan needs reviewing.

The Proposed Modifications show 49.5 hectares to be allocated for the Borough as a whole, so if Top Wighay were removed the overall provision would be below the figure proposed by CPRE.

The emerging Joint Structure Plan requirement is an increase on the current strategic land needs and the land use allocations for the period between 2011 and 2021 will be dealt with in the new LDF.

The final point made in this Council's representation highlights their misunderstanding of our Local Plan process. Employment land was allocated in the Deposit Plan as clearly shown on the Proposals Map accompanying that version of the Plan. Ashfield's misunderstanding is made all the more frustrating because Ashfield District Council actually objected to the employment allocation in the Deposit Plan. Furthermore, they received notice of this Council's response to that objection and as a planning authority should be fully aware of the statutory planning process.

Proposed Further Modification (Ref PFM 4.8.viii)

No change

4.8 E1 ALLOCATION OF EMPLOYMENT LAND ADDITIONAL SITE: TOP WIGHAY FARM

145 objections submitted.

Summary of Objection

Gedling Borough Council has failed to provide 'exceptional circumstances' as required by Green Belt policies to justify the removal of these sites from the Green Belt for employment use.

Council's Response and Reasoning

The Local Plan sets out in the Introduction (page ii) that the first requirement from the Secretary of State to review Nottingham's green belt was made in his approval letter for the 1991 Structure Plan. At that time it was mainly the employment land needs (together with housing and movement land needs) for the conurbation, which led the Secretary of State to his conclusion.

More recently the legal representation submitted on behalf of GAG5, (dealt with in more detail elsewhere in this report), argues that there are no exceptional circumstances justifying green belt release and this is countered by the legal opinion used for the response to this representation. The employment land need is relevant because in the longer term the emerging Joint Structure Plan proposes a further 12 hectares of employment land in Gedling post 2011.

Proposed Further Modification (Ref PFM 4.8.ix)

No change.

4.8 E1 ALLOCATION OF EMPLOYMENT LAND ADDITIONAL SITE: TOP WIGHAY FARM

Mrs. M Greensmith.

Summary of Objection

Busier roads and many more accidents especially at turn off to Newstead Village.

Council's Response and Reasoning

The Inspector's report addresses the transport concerns in sections 2.52 paragraph 8 and 4.8 paragraph 12.

Proposed Further Modification (Ref PFM 4.8.x)

No change.

4.8 E1 ALLOCATION OF EMPLOYMENT LAND ADDITIONAL SITE: TOP WIGHAY FARM

Mr J A Chisholm for GAG 5

Summary of Objection

This objection quotes Proposed Modification 4.3 but as it deals with Top Wighay it is set out here.

1. Employment land developed for other uses has been high but uses such as hotels, and car dealers should lead to an adjustment of 20% below structure plan guideline.
2. Teal Close may now stay in Plan.
3. On the figures in 1, no need for Top Wighay.
4. Teal Close not well related to motorway but allocations in other local plans are, e.g. Blenheim and Nottingham Business Park. These sites not mentioned at Inquiry.
5. Teal Close well placed to meet needs of residential Gedling, Top Wighay is not.
6. Conclusion from above
7. Gedling Borough Council reduced Teal Close and included part of Top Wighay for secondary reason, namely unsuitability of Teal Close as only large-scale allocation. Not backed by independent market opinion.
8. Large B 8 warehousing will cause harmful effect on green belt and nearby houses.
9. Landscape issues and wildlife issues not evidenced by experts at inquiry.
10. Highway and public transport issues and views not put forward by objectors at inquiry. Object to housing on traffic generation and road safety grounds.

Council's Response and Reasoning

Taking each point in turn:

1. The Borough Council proposed a more flexible approach to employment land needs but this resulted in an objection from the Structure Plan Authority. The Inspector's report summarises this at section 4.1 paragraphs 9 – 13. The reworded policy rules out some uses, which are more appropriate in town centres, and the demand for sites for cars sales is reducing as evidenced by recent discussions with one of the major car franchises in the UK. Hotel uses from the evidence submitted, are attracted to locations nearer the motorway so these alternative uses are more likely on sites such as Top Wighay rather than Teal Close where a planning permission for a hotel use at Victoria Park (granted in 2000), has not been implemented because of a lack of demand in that location. So the 20% suggestion is not accepted.
2. The Inspector's report at section 4.2, paragraph 23 addresses the geographical differences between Top Wighay and Teal Close and the Inspector concludes this paragraph with 'Whilst

this may justify the release of some land for employment here, it does not suggest that the whole of this site is needed or that the great majority of the borough's allocated employment land should be here'.

3. See response to point 1 above.
4. The issue of employment land provision outside of the Borough is covered by the Inspector's report. Specifically section 4.2 paragraph 32 explains that it 'is not, of course, for the Local Plan or me to consider sites outside the borough'.
5. The Inspector deals with this issue in section 4.8 of his report, at paragraphs 6 to 8. The balance between the alternative sites of Top Wighay and Teal Close is clearly explained in the Council's response and reasoning of the Proposed Modifications report at Section 4.8, page 4-9. Furthermore, Teal Close has poor public transport links for a significant proportion of Gedling's residents.
6. Summary of above points.
7. Independent market opinion was obtained for the Inquiry, see the Inquiry Core Document J12. Exceptional circumstances are relevant, see the response to the legal objection made on behalf of GAG 5, elsewhere in this report.
8. The Transport Assessment was made on a split between B1, B2 and B8 uses. B8 uses are an appropriate use at this site.
9. The Inspector's report section 4.8, paragraph 13 summarises this issue. The Inspector's report also addresses this issue in 2.52, paragraph 10. Furthermore the Notts Wildlife Trust raised the wildlife concerns and the Inspector addresses these in sections 2.72 and 4.8 of his report.
10. This is dealt with in the Inspector's report at section 4.8, paragraph 12.

Proposed Further Modification (Ref PFM 4.8.xi)

No change.

5.10 T4 PARK AND RIDE – TOP WIGHAY FARM

147 objections.

Summary of Objection

Object to Park and Ride site – the site at Top Wighay is not within the Hucknall and Nottingham Transport corridor. Until such time conclusive evidence is provided to support an extension of NET Line One. No assumption should be made that this is the case.

Council's Response and Reasoning

The Inspector's report at section 5.10 is very clear and this objection seeks conclusive evidence presumably before the policy and proposal is adopted. The Inspector counters this argument in paragraph 7 of his report.

Proposed Further Modification (Ref PFM 5.10)

No change.