

**PM 2.1 H1 DWELLING PROVISION**

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
000053	300681	Mr K Adams
000090	301054	Mr I Crowe
000111	300509	Councillor J Lonergan
000317	300306	Mr M Scotton
000318	300280	Dr J Longman
000326	300215	Mrs A Newman
000354	301121	Mr A Khosla
000467	300490	Mrs M Bolstridge
000479	300331	Mrs M Pickup
000696	301450	Mr L Green
001634	301767	Mrs M Kerr
001758	300842	Mrs A Pollard
001762	300572	Mr M Fisher
004322	302406	K Peacock
004578	302440	Mrs P M Hall
005024	300020	Mr A Krzesicki
005025	300019	Mrs S Harris
005044	300116	Mrs M A Robinson
005050	300157	Mr A R Foggo
005051	300175	Mrs M E Foggo
005052	300182	Mr H N Jones
005054	300202	Mr D B Reay
005062	300253	Mr I Rowe
005070	300282	Mr & Mrs P & M Himsworth
005075	300316	Mr K Pickup
005089	300400	Mrs K Brookes
005090	300421	Mr A J Walker
005095	300446	Mrs A J Ward
005097	300460	Mr J Cooling
005098	300470	Mrs L J Cooling
005099	300480	Mr P Newman
005155	300644	Mr K Redfern
005156	300647	Mrs K Redfern
005158	300661	Mr D McGeever
005159	300671	Mrs V McGeever
005161	300700	Mrs P Van Grondelle
005191	301523	Mr S J Pidding
005194	300800	Mr R W Collin
005196	300819	Mrs P Whalley
005197	300831	Dr V Pollard
005199	300863	Mrs D Horton
005200	300867	Mr R Horton
005212	300915	Mr M Wilcox
005213	300922	Mrs L K Wilcox
005222	300973	Mr D J Baker
005235	301024	Mrs H J Walker
005242	301044	Mr W F Beckwith

005243	301045	Mrs R Beckwith
005252	301073	Mrs A Flatters
005262	301142	Mrs K F Carlin
005263	301146	Mr E L Carlin
005275	301792	Miss A James
005287	301210	Mrs B Powell
005288	301215	Mrs C Lighthart
005298	301259	Mr J M Godber
005318	301322	Mrs A E Bainbridge
005320	301327	Mrs M A Gee
005321	301331	Mr M R Gee
005334	301404	Mrs M O Ogrizovic
005348	301479	Mr R Evans
005342	301440	Mrs R G Green
005349	301495	Mrs R Evans
005356	301532	Mrs J Aughton
005357	301536	Mr D Aughton
005372	301564	Mrs M Bayley
005388	301636	Mrs K A Coleman
005389	301647	Mr M V Coleman
005395	302085	Mr B Whitelocks
005397	301762	Mr R A Litman
005400	301691	Mrs M Passey
005405	301700	Mrs P Collins
005406	301701	Mrs G C Myford
005416	301711	L Webster
005418	301716	Mrs M Cordin
005419	301720	Mrs M Phelps
005420	301724	Mr A Cordin
005421	301734	Mr W Lewis
005424	301731	Mr A W Browning
005425	301778	Mrs J E Browning
005426	301735	Mr A Kerr
005428	301846	Mrs S Minns
005433	301749	Mr A Foxall
005434	301751	Mr M English
005435	301754	Mr R Brothwell
005436	301758	T & J Carlisle
005438	301764	Mrs J Robinson
005439	301765	Mrs S Januszonok
005440	301766	Ms D Januszonok
005441	301768	Mrs M Waplinton
005442	301769	Mrs D Potter
005443	301772	A Jenkin
005446	301777	Mrs M Baker
005452	301785	Mr N Fowler
005456	301790	M M Millership
005461	301801	Mr B J Barnsdall
005463	301804	Mrs V Lievers
005464	301805	Mrs S Johalla

005466	301808	Mr M Darkaoui
005467	301810	Mrs W Darkaoui
005468	301811	Mrs C S Carter
005475	301822	Mr J Hallam
005482	301837	Mr M Charles
005483	301838	Mrs P Matthews
005503	301875	Miss A Johnson
005511	301885	Mr N Secretan
005512	301961	Mrs N Secretan
005515	301892	Ms L Humber
005518	301897	Mr C Jackson
005524	301905	Mrs V Johnson
005525	301906	Mrs E J Wright
005536	301922	Miss B Hayes
005541	301929	Mr P S Brown
005552	301944	Mr J Radbuorn
005559	301952	Mrs C Sears
005561	301957	Mrs K P Davies-Eyres
005568	301967	Mr J Casey
005572	301974	Miss S Litman
005573	301976	Mr J Porter
005577	302021	Mrs P Newton
005578	302031	Mr D Chambers
005579	302044	Mrs M Chambers
005581	302049	Miss H Newton
005585	302058	Mr R Benfield
005586	302062	Mrs C Benfield
005591	302081	Mr C Newton
005593	302086	Mrs S Clarke
005594	302087	Mr P Clarke
005595	302089	Mrs J A Lewis
005596	302090	Mr R Potter
005597	302092	Mr N Brown
005598	302095	Mr D Brown
005599	302097	Mrs R G Chambers
005605	302475	Mr J W Jacques
005606	302113	Mr D B Gaskell
005607	302119	Ms K M Beresford
005615	302478	Miss E English
005620	302155	Mrs P Harvey
005631	302175	Mr S Walker
005632	302171	Mr R C Holmes
005633	302174	Mrs E Holmes
005634	302178	Mrs K Evans
005635	302180	Mr C Slater
005637	302182	Mrs S Slater
005638	302185	Mrs D Scothern
005639	302189	Mr R Hardy
005640	302192	Mrs M Clissold
005642	302194	Mrs J Cropley

005643	302195	Mr S Enticknap
005644	302196	Mrs S Duckworth
005645	302197	Mr B A Charles
005646	302199	Dr V Foot
005647	302200	Miss K Archer
005649	302201	Mr S D Frawley
005651	302202	Mr A J Frawley
005652	302203	Mrs T Sellars
005656	302211	Mrs W Evans
005677	302256	Mrs D Duke
005687	302284	Mr K Perkins
005696	302326	Mr M Start
005751	302467	Miss H E Scott
005753	302479	Mr J D Watson
005755	302498	Mr V Jackson
005756	302510	Mrs M Beardshaw
005764	302532	Mr H B Watt
005783	302622	Mr J B Duke
005791	302680	Ms W J Little
005794	302690	Mrs M Jemmett-Allen
005812	302715	Mr R Hull
005813	302719	John Chisholm
005816	302730	Anne Chisholm
005827	302773	Mrs A Hurt
005833	302801	Mr J Hurt
005895	302924	Mrs B Davis
005907	302971	Mr G James
005908	302975	Mr T J Manners

### **Summary of Objection**

The decision to remove a number of sites from the Green Belt now will pre-empt the strategic review of the Green Belt to be carried out by the Regional Assembly in 2007.

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

The Local Plan Inquiry Inspector clarifies that the use of safeguarded land policy will not pre-empt future green belt reviews (2.63 paras 19-22).

### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
000053	300682	Mr K Adams
000090	301055	Mr I Crowe
000111	300510	Councillor J Lonergan
000317	300305	Mr M Scotton
000354	301122	Mr A Khosla
000467	300491	Mrs M Bolstridge
000479	300330	Mrs M Pickup

000696	301451	Mr L Green
001750	300079	Miss J Sturton
001758	300843	Mrs A Pollard
001762	300571	Mr M Fisher
004322	302405	K Peacock
004578	302439	Mrs P M Hall
005024	300011	Mr A Krzesicki
005044	300117	Mrs M A Robinson
005050	300158	Mr A R Foggo
005051	300174	Mrs M E Foggo
005052	300183	Mr H N Jones
005054	300203	Mr D B Reay
005062	300247	Mr I Rowe
005070	300283	Mr & Mrs P & M Himsworth
005075	300317	Mr K Pickup
005089	300401	Mrs K Brookes
005090	300420	Mr A J Walker
005095	300447	Mrs A J Ward
005097	300461	Mr J Cooling
005098	300471	Mrs L J Cooling
005099	300481	Mr P Newman
005155	300643	Mr K Redfern
005156	300648	Mrs K Redfern
005158	300662	Mr D McGeever
005159	300672	Mrs V McGeever
005161	300701	Mrs P Van Grondelle
005191	300786	Mr S J Pidding
005194	300801	Mr R W Collin
005196	300820	Mrs P Whalley
005197	300833	Dr V Pollard
005199	300864	Mrs D Horton
005200	300868	Mr R Horton
005212	300914	Mr M Wilcox
005213	300921	Mrs L K Wilcox
005222	300974	Mr D J Baker
005235	301028	Mrs H J Walker
005236	301030	Mr R Butler
005252	301074	Mrs A Flatters
005262	301141	Mrs K F Carlin
005263	301145	Mr E L Carlin
005271	301180	Mrs M A Brown
005275	301791	Miss A James
005283	301205	Mr M Stinchcombe
005287	301211	Mrs B Powell
005298	301260	Mr J M Godber
005318	301324	Mrs A E Bainbridge
005320	301328	Mrs M A Gee
005321	301334	Mr M R Gee
005333	301395	Mrs M H O Ogrizovic
005342	301439	Mrs R G Green

005348	301482	Mr R Evans
005349	301496	Mrs R Evans
005356	301531	Mrs J Aughton
005357	301535	Mr D Aughton
005372	301562	Mrs M Bayley
005383	301621	Mrs I Robinson
005388	301637	Mrs K A Coleman
005389	301648	Mr M V Coleman
005395	301684	Mr B Whitelocks
005397	302972	Mr R A Litman
005400	301690	Mrs M Passey
005417	301713	Mrs Arnold
005418	301715	Mrs M Cordin
005419	301719	Mrs M Phelps
005420	301723	Mr A Cordin
005421	301726	Mr W Lewis
005423	301728	Mrs S Bramley
005424	301729	Mr A W Browning
005428	301739	Mrs S Minns
005428	301741	Mrs S Minns
005432	301747	Mrs J Foxall
005435	302973	Mr R Brothwell
005436	301756	T & J Carlisle
005438	301763	Mrs J Robinson
005443	301771	A Jenkin
005461	301800	Mr B J Barnsdall
005463	301806	Mrs V Lievers
005465	301807	MD MM Millership
005466	301809	Mr M Darkaoui
005471	301818	Mrs R Hodgman
005472	301819	Miss S T Housley
005473	301820	Mrs H Birkhead
005474	301821	Miss A Shawyer
005476	301823	Mr L Twells
005484	301839	Mrs P Braisby
005488	301843	Miss P Richardson
005489	301848	Miss S E Jordan
005495	301856	Mrs S Young
005497	301859	Mr D Ashley
005498	301863	Mrs J Dyer
005500	301868	Miss L Strange
005501	301870	Mrs M Allen
005503	302983	Miss A Johnson
005508	301881	Mrs L How
005511	301884	Mr N Secretan
005515	301894	Ms L Humber
005516	301895	Miss S E Williamson
005527	301909	Miss S Strauther
005528	301912	Mrs B M Dearden
005539	301926	Mrs J Wright

005543	301931	Mrs S J Brown
005544	301932	Mrs P Griffiths
005550	301940	Mrs J Ratcliffe
005551	302985	Mrs L Ridley
005562	301959	Miss S Myford
005574	301979	Miss T Litman
005577	302023	Mrs P Newton
005578	302032	Mr D Chambers
005579	302038	Mrs M Chambers
005581	302048	Miss H Newton
005585	302057	Mr R Benfield
005586	302063	Mrs C Benfield
005588	302073	Mrs L Newton
005591	302079	Mr C Newton
005603	302974	Mrs J English
005605	302474	Mr J W Jacques
005606	302112	Mr D B Gaskell
005607	302118	Ms K M Beresford
005620	302154	Mrs P Harvey
005631	302173	Mr S Walker
005638	302184	Mrs D Scothern
005639	302188	Mr R Hardy
005641	302193	Mr P Clark
005656	302209	Mrs W Evans
005657	302216	Mr D Carless
005658	302217	Miss C Brandreth
005672	302248	Mrs E Cattan
005687	302282	Mr K Perkins
005696	302325	Mr M Start
005728	302388	Mr T J Barker
005751	302470	Miss H E Scott
005753	302493	Mr J D Watson
005755	302497	Mr V Jackson
005764	302531	Mr H B Watt
005772	302859	Mrs K Turner
005792	302685	Mr J Chambers
005812	302714	Mr R Hull
005813	302717	John Chisholm
005816	302727	Anne Chisholm
005827	302772	Mrs A Hurt
005833	302802	Mr J Hurt
005879	302866	Mr P Warren
005891	302918	Mr T Surgeon
005894	302921	Miss F Shepherd
005895	302923	Mrs B Davis

### **Summary of Objection**

The Gedling Local Plan fails to take into account increased house building in the City of Nottingham. No additional housing requirement until after 2021.

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

This objection (that the Council have failed to take into account increased housebuilding in Nottingham City) is essentially requesting the Council to redraft the plan to take account of the emerging Joint Structure Plan. This cannot be done for the reasons set out in the Cabinet report agreed on 21st December 2004 which has since been endorsed by the Full Council and the Council's legal opinion outlined at the beginning of the report.

### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
000409	303077	Mr D Bradley
001672	303050	Mr J Cain
005426	303079	Mr A Kerr
005428	303015	Mrs S Minns
005435	303064	Mr R Brothwell
005523	302987	Mrs L.M. Hatcher
005618	303031	Mrs M J Kimpton
005813	303019	John Chisholm
005816	303030	Anne Chisholm
005908	303081	Mr T J Manners

### **Summary of Objection**

Gedling Borough Council has failed to provide 'exceptional circumstance' as required by Green Belt policies to justify the removal of sites from Green Belt for housing or employment uses.

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

The Inspector has recommended (IR 2.63) that safeguarded land should be identified and the justification for this is clearly set out in his report. PPG 2 which remains extant provides the justification. The principle of releasing Green Belt land to meet the development needs of the Borough was agreed in the Adopted 1996 Structure Plan Review the strategic framework for the Replacement Local Plan. The legal opinion from Mr Spence QC endorses this decision further.

This objection is essentially requesting the Council to redraft the plan to take account of the emerging Joint Structure Plan. This cannot be done for the reasons set out in the Cabinet report agreed on 21st December 2004 which has since been endorsed by the legal opinion outlined at the beginning of the report. This objection to the employment allocation at Top Wighay Farm on the grounds that it opens up large areas of green belt does not raise any new evidence beyond that previously considered when a site of 24.6 hectares was proposed in the First Deposit Plan.

### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.



<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
000111	302253	Councillor J Lonergan
001633	302507	Mr C Taylor
005421	301812	Mr W Lewis
005576	301982	Ms C Neeson
005765	302534	John Chisholm (Clerk)
005765	302543	John Chisholm (Clerk)
005823	302747	Mrs A Madge
005875	302850	Ms J Tattershaw
005668	302238	Mrs J Brothwell

### **Summary of Objection**

New information is represented by Joint Structure Plan (JSP). PPG12 advises "wherever possible new information should be incorporated into the plan before it is adopted thereby ensuring the plan is up to date at the time of adoption". It is clear that JSP was deposited after the end date of Inspector's Inquiry and that he could not have taken it into consideration at that time.

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

Cabinet report agreed 21st December 2004 addresses the issue of whether account should be taken of the emerging Joint Structure Plan. This is further reinforced by the legal opinion from Mr Spence QC following GAG5 legal representation.

### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
000717	301987	Mrs K Haley

### **Summary of Representation**

The proposed modification provides for a level of housing that accords with the requirement of the 1996 Structure Plan.

### **Response of representation**

Your support for this Proposed Modification is welcomed.

### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
000780	302516	Mr P Tipping

### **Summary of Objection**

Since the publication of the Inspector's Report there have been material changes:- Teal Close may now be developed for housing/ employment - it is now confirmed that this land is not liable to flooding. The Council has chosen to ignore the new Joint Structure Plan in particular the reduced housing projections - PPG12 is clear on this. The Council has been aware of emerging housing projections since

September 2003. The Panel Report on the Deposit Draft Joint Structure Plan has been published - the Borough Council delayed the Local Plan process to await this which recommends that 1000 less houses are needed than previously allocated.

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

The argument that the Local Plan should take into account the reduced housing in the Joint Structure Plan is not accepted for reasons set out in the detail of the report considered by Cabinet on 14th December 2004 and adjourned to 21st December 2004. This has been further reinforced by legal opinion from Mr Spence QC following GAG5 legal representation. In terms of housing requirements until 2021 the Regional Spatial Strategy has to take account of the latest household projections and they are currently 18-19% above the annualised rate for the approved Regional Spatial Strategy.

### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
001325	302637	Mr I D Griffiths

### **Summary of Objection**

The plan fails to take into account the latest housing figures which have been available since September 2003 and form part of the 2004 panel report. Removing sites from the greenbelt pre-empts the strategic review for the East Midlands in 2007.

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

The argument that the Local Plan should take into account the reduced housing in the Joint Structure Plan is not accepted for reasons set out in the detail of the report considered by cabinet on 14th December 2004 and adjourned to 21st December 2004. This has been further reinforced by legal opinion from Mr Spence QC following GAG5 legal representation. The Local Plan Inquiry Inspector clarifies that the use of safeguarded land policy will not pre-empt future green belt reviews (2.63 paras 19-22).

### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
001330	302577	Mr A Johnson

### **Summary of Objection**

CPRE objects to the number of allocated sites to be identified in Policy H2. In the light of other objections to modification 2.1 CPRE believe that the number of dwellings to be identified on allocated sites in Policy H2 should be a maximum of 2300 calculated as follows: Completions (2670) Existing Planning Permissions (750) Additional Commitments (380) Urban Capacity (640) Commercial Windfall Allowance (600) Lapsed Permissions (70) Conversions / COUs (140). Sub-total (5

250) Allocated Sites (2 300). Overall total = 7 550. This figure could be reduced by a further 750 dwellings if the emerging structure plan figures were used.

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

A response to the issues raised is addressed under the separate representations 302580 (commercial windfall allowance), (conversions/COU) and 302579 (Joint Structure Plan).

### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
001330	302579	Mr A Johnson

### **Summary of Objection**

CPRE objects to the number of dwellings that need to be provided over the plan period. This should be lower than 8000 as: (a) the emerging structure plan to 2021 demonstrates that the Borough will need to deallocate approx. 1 200 of this number and (b) the Inspector allowed a degree of flexibility. He stated that the Council did not need to meet the 1996 Structure Plan guidelines. 'There is some latitude allowable around the Structure Plan requirement'. In his view 'this would encompass a shortfall as small as on the Second Deposit [68 dwellings] but not one as large as in the First Deposit [485 dwellings]'. CPRE believes that the overall total should be between 450 and 1 200 less than the 1996 Structure Plan guidelines.

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

The argument that the Local Plan should take into account the reduced housing in the Joint Structure Plan is not accepted for reasons set out in the detail of the report considered by Cabinet on 14th December 2004 and adjourned to 21st December 2004. This has been further reinforced by legal opinion from Mr Spence QC following GAG5 legal representation. In terms of housing requirements until 2021 the Regional Spatial Strategy has to take account of the latest household projections and they are currently 18-19% above the annualised rate for the approved Regional Spatial Strategy. It is noted that the Inspector accepted that there is some flexibility allowable around the Structure Plan requirement. Section 2.2 (parag 3) of his report clarifies that this could encompass a shortfall as small as in the Second Deposit but not one as large as in the First Deposit. As such the shortfall of 68 dwellings is likely to be acceptable but a shortfall of 485 dwellings (First Deposit) would not be. As such the CPRE's assertion that the overall total should be between 450 and 1200 less than the 1996 Structure Plan figure is not agreed.

### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
001330	302580	Mr A Johnson

### **Summary of Objection**

CPRE objects to the proposed number of dwellings to be derived from the commercial windfall allowance. Following the Public Inquiry the Borough Council have agreed that it is no longer appropriate to retain employment at Metallifacure Great Northern Way Colwick. This is confirmed by revised policy E3 which now excludes these two sites. Therefore the Commercial Windfall Allowance ought to be increased by 160 dwellings to take these sites into account.

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

It is accepted that given that the sites at Metallifacure and Great Northern Way are no longer to be protected as employment sites they should be taken into account elsewhere in the housing figures. The CPRE suggest that they should be included within the Commercial Windfall allowance however the Addendum to Technical Paper 1 'Addendum to Urban Capacity Study 'Windfalls' Revised 30.1.02' explains that all industrial sites are included under the Industrial Contingency figure. The Inspector concluded that the figure for the industrial contingency allowance should be included with all other windfalls however in taking this view he does not suggest altering the overall windfall figure. Accordingly the addition of these two sites to the industrial contingency allowance does not affect the overall windfall figure and consequently has no impact on the number of dwellings to be allocated.

### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
001330	302581	Mr A Johnson
001332	302546	Mr J Chisholm

### **Summary of Objection**

Objection to the reduction in conversions / change of use from 140 to 20. CPRE notes that additional sources of conversions / change of use such as conversions of flats over shops are not included within the urban capacity figures despite recommendations contained within the government guidance and therefore ought to be included here. 'Tapping the Potential' states that 'there is likely to be potential to convert the space over shops (and local offices etc) to flats whatever the size of settlement including villages'. Estimates of the potential vary but all point to its significance.

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

The Inspector considered the issue of including flats over shops in the Urban Capacity Study. He concluded that the Study was fairly robust and was prepared to use its conclusions. As such this issue has already been considered. Conversions and changes of use (including flats over shops and the re-use of former factories) are taken into account separately in the housing figures and the amended figure of 20 dwellings for this element of housing supply is clearly explained in the SDPM.

### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
001332	302545	Mr J Chisholm

### **Summary of Objection**

Housing allocation should be reduced to reflect the reduction in housing numbers required under the new Joint Structure Plan (JSP):- Gedling have been aware of revised housing requirements since September 2003 supported by EIP Panel - note PPG12 paragraph 6.32. As JSP has progressed beyond deposit stage it should be treated as being adopted. Plan fails to take into consideration the latest information contrary to PPG12 and condemns large swathes of Green Belt land unnecessarily. - Plan does not take into consideration additional housebuilding in Nottingham City where 17 000 houses have been identified as opposed to original 8000 SP figure subject to public scrutiny with priority to brownfield sites and corresponding reduction in greenfield development outside City boundary. To take land out of Green Belt to serve development needs after 2021 is wholly inappropriate in light of proposed review of Notts/ Derby Green Belt. Even if JSP is not used the Inspector agreed a degree of flexibility on dwelling provision - in section 2.2 paragraph 3 Inspector commented that 'there is some latitude (flexibility) around the SP requirement'...'this could encompass a shortfall as small as on Second Deposit [68 dwellings] but not one as large as in the First Deposit [485 dwellings]'.

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

Cabinet report agreed 21st December 2004 addresses the issue of whether account should be taken of the emerging Joint Structure Plan. This is further reinforced by the legal opinion from Mr Spence QC following GAG5 legal representation. This objection (that the Council have failed to take into account increased housebuilding in Nottingham City) is essential requesting the Council redraft the plan to take account of the emerging Joint Structure Plan. This cannot be done for the reasons set out in the Cabinet Report agreed on 21st December 2004 which has since been endorsed by Full Council and the Council's legal opinion outlined at the beginning of the report. Previous drafts of the Local Plan have allocated brownfield sites for development and these sites have already come forward such that the majority of the allocations remaining in the Local Plan are now greenfield (and cannot be released until the Local Plan is adopted). The urban capacity study considered opportunities for the development or redevelopment for employment and housing purposes of brownfield sites and other underutilised land in the urban area. The Local Plan Inquiry Inspector clarifies that the use of safeguarded land policy will not pre-empt future green belt reviews (2.63 paras 19-22). It is noted that the Inspector accepted that there is some flexibility allowable around the Structure Plan requirement. Section 2.2 (parag 3) of his report clarifies that this could encompass a shortfall as small as in the Second Deposit but not one as large as in the First Deposit. As such the shortfall of 68 dwellings (or very close to this figure) is likely to be acceptable but a shortfall of 485 dwellings (or nearly as large) (First Deposit) would not be.

**Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
001634	301814	Mrs M Kerr

**Summary of representation**

The Gedling Local Plan fails to take into any consideration a reduction in housing numbers in the new Joint Structure Plan. Gedling will need 1 000 less homes than at present. Object to proposed allocation of 595 dwellings as no requirement. 595 houses will generate unacceptable amount of traffic on local roads.

**Council's Response and Reasoning**

Cabinet report agreed 21st December 2004 addresses the issue of whether account should be taken of the emerging Joint Structure Plan. This is further reinforced by the legal opinion from Mr Spence QC following GAG5 legal representation. This objection (that 595 houses at Top Wighay Farm are not required) is essentially requesting that the Council redraft the Plan to take account of the emerging Joint Structure Plan. This cannot be done for the reasons set out in the Cabinet report agreed on 21st December 2004 which has since been endorsed by the legal opinion outlined at the beginning of the report.

**Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
001721	302485	Mrs K George

**Summary of Objection**

The Council is using the outdated 1996 Structure Plan so is now unable to justify taking land south of Regina Crescent out of the Green Belt. The Proposed density of building is out of character.

**Council's Response and Reasoning**

Cabinet report agreed 21st December 2004 addresses the issue of whether account should be taken of the emerging Joint Structure Plan. This is further reinforced by the legal opinion from Mr Spence QC following GAG5 legal representation. The Inspector states at paragraph 20 of section 2.40 of his report that higher density would increase diversity in the village's housing stock and this will imply less expensive dwellings than most of the village. This meets the Government's aim of creating mixed communities as set out in PPG3 (March 2000).

**Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
005023	300010	Mr J Box

### **Summary of Objection**

I object to houses being built on Top Wighay site. You have failed to provide exceptional circumstances as required by Green Belt policies to justify the removal of these sites from the Green Belt for housing. The proposed development will have a detrimental impact on the Linby/Newstead Local Nature Reserve.

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

The Inspector has recommended (IR2.63) that safeguarded land should be identified and the justification for this is clearly set out in his report. PPG2, which remains extant, provides the justification.

Notts Wildlife Trust objected to the Top Wighay Farm site and the Inspector takes their objection into account at sections 2.52 and 4.8 in his report (specifically rep no. 3314 and from that cross reference to rep no. 3184). The impact on flora fauna and their associated habitats will be considered at the detailed design stage. The Borough Council will consult English Nature (with regards to Local Nature Reserves) and the Nottinghamshire Biological and Geological Records Centre (with regards to Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation) where development may have an impact and will take into account any comments and the provision of appropriate mitigation measures will be considered. It should be noted that SINC designation does not preclude all development.

### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
005311	301314	Mr C J Shaw

### **Summary of Objection**

The Gedling Local Plan fails to take into account increased house building in the City of Nottingham. No additional housing requirement until after 2021.  
+ non standard letter.

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

This objection (that the Council have failed to take into account increased housebuilding in Nottingham City) is essential requesting the Council redraft the plan to take account of the emerging Joint Structure Plan. This cannot be done for the reasons set out in the Cabinet Report agreed on 21st December 2004 which has since been endorsed by Full Council and the Council's legal opinion outlined at the beginning of the report. Previous drafts of the Local Plan have allocated brownfield sites for development and these have already come forward such that the majority of the allocations remaining in the Local Plan are now greenfield (and cannot be released until the Local Plan is adopted). The urban capacity study considered opportunities for the development or redevelopment for employment and housing purposes of brownfield sites and other underutilised land in the urban area. Cabinet report agreed 21st December 2004 addresses the issue of whether account

should be taken of the emerging Joint Structure Plan. This is further reinforced by the legal opinion from Mr Spence QC following GAG5 legal representation. With regards to highway issues a Transport Assessment for a larger site than that is now allocated has previously been largely agreed with County Highways. This will need to be updated as part of a planning application on the basis of the current site area. The provision of supporting services to accommodate the proposed development has already been addressed by the Inspector in paragraphs 26-28 of IR 2.52 and will be considered further in the Development Brief to be prepared for the site. The Inspector noted (IR2.52) that the Top Wighay Farm site is relatively 'contained' visually and that it is in a wide Green Belt tract such that the coalescence of settlements would not result from development in this location. Following extensive debate over the rate of deliverability of dwellings on the Gedling Colliery site the Inspector concluded (IR2.62) that it would be reasonable and realistic to assume that only 700 dwellings are likely to be completed by 2011. The Borough Council has accepted this recommendation. In addition the progress on this site has been delayed by the owners who are aware that they are behind the project plan presented at the Local Plan Inquiry. Regarding the provision of more employment land at Teal Close the Inspector states at IR4.2 parags 23 and 28 of his report that the whole of the Teal Close employment site is not needed.

#### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
005360	301540	Mrs S Clark

#### **Summary of Objection**

The Gedling Local Plan fails to take into account increased house building in the City of Nottingham. No additional housing requirement until after 2021. There is going to be no doctors surgery no schools. No thought to more traffic or car parks.

#### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

This objection (that the Council have failed to take into account increased housebuilding in Nottingham City) is essentially requesting the Council redraft the plan to take account of the emerging Joint Structure Plan. This cannot be done for the reasons set out in the Cabinet Report agreed on 21st December 2004 which has since been endorsed by Full Council and the Council's legal opinion outlined at the beginning of the report. The Regional Spatial Strategy has to take account of latest household projections and they are currently 18-19% above the annualised rate for the approved RSS. The provision of supporting services to accommodate the proposed development has already been addressed by the Inspector in paragraphs 26-28 of IR 2.52 and will be considered further in the Development Brief to be prepared for the site. With regards to highway issues a Transport Assessment for a larger site than that is now allocated has previously been largely agreed with County Highways. This will need to be updated as part of a planning application on the basis of the current site area.

#### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.



<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
005469	301815	Mr R Kerr

### **Summary of Objection**

The Gedling Local Plan fails to take into any consideration a reduction in housing numbers in the new Joint Structure Plan (JSP) which precludes the need for any housing on these sites. Fail to understand any justification for this omission when GBC have considered the JSP regarding parking provisions!

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

This objection (that the Council have failed to take into account increased househousing in Nottingham City) is essentially requesting the Council to redraft the plan to take account of the emerging Joint Structure Plan. This cannot be done for the reasons set out in the Cabinet Report agreed on 21<sup>st</sup> December 2004, which has since been endorsed by the Full Council and the Council's legal opinion outlined at the beginning of the report.

Previous drafts of the Local Plan have allocated brownfield sites for development and these sites have already come forward such that the majority of the allocations remaining in the Local Plan are now greenfield (and cannot be released until the Local Plan is adopted). The urban capacity study considered opportunities for the development or redevelopment for employment and housing purposes of brownfield sites and other underutilised land in the urban area.

Cabinet report agreed 21st December 2004 addresses the issue of whether account should be taken of the emerging Joint Structure Plan. This is further reinforced by the legal opinion from Mr Spence QC following GAG5 legal representation. The Inspector noted (IR2.52) that the Top Wighay Farm site is relatively 'contained' visually and that it is in a wide Green Belt tract such that the coalescence of settlements would not result from development in this location. The Inspector considers the location of the site at paragraph 7 of IR2.52. The Inspector notes at paragraph 10 of IR2.52 that there is no suggestion of a flood risk at this site. The strategic justification for employment land needs is set out in the Structure Plan and the emerging Joint Structure Plan increases the amount of employment land needed after the local plan period. Sites related to the MARR are beyond Gedling Borough and the Structure Plan deals with district figures. In response to the point that the Top Wighay Farm employment site does not serve the need of Gedling's unemployed this is addressed in the Inspector's report (IR 4.8). The Inspector has recommended (IR2.63) that safeguarded land should be identified and the justification for this is clearly set out in his report. PPG2 which remains extant provides the justification. Notts Wildlife Trust objected to the Top Wighay Farm site and the Inspector takes their objection into account at sections 2.52 and 4.8 in his report (specifically rep no. 3314 and from that cross reference to rep no. 3184). The impact on flora fauna and their associated habitats will be considered at the detailed design stage. The Borough Council will consult English Nature (with regards to Local Nature Reserves) and the Nottinghamshire Biological and Geological Records Centre (with regards to Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation) where development may have an impact and will take into account any comments and the provision of appropriate mitigation measures will be considered. It should be noted that SINC designation does not preclude all development. As noted by the Inspector

(IR2.52) the Top Wighay Farm wite is not a special wildlife habitat and it's noteworthy features in this respect can be protected as part of any development.

**Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
005427	302976	Mrs C Collins
005488	302977	Miss P Richardson
005489	302979	Miss S E Jordan
005498	302981	Mrs J Dyer
005501	302982	Mrs M Allen
005551	302968	Mrs L Ridley
005609	302969	Mrs J Smith
005630	302984	Mr J Smith

**Summary of Objection**

Object to site being taken out of Green Belt. Gedling has no further housing requirements to 2021.

**Council's Response and Reasoning**

The Regional Spatial Strategy has to take account of latest household projections and they are currently 18 to 19% above the annualised rate for the approved RSS. Regarding the provision of housing at Top Wighay Farm until after 2021 this issue relates to the emerging Joint Structure Plan and this is dealt with in the response to GAG 5's legal representation summarised at the beginning of the report and also in more detail elsewhere in this report.

**Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
005588	302074	Mrs L Newton

**Summary of Objection**

The decision to remove a number of sites from the Green Belt now will pre-empt the strategic review of the Green Belt to be carried out by the Regional Assembly in 2007. No need to develop on land due to new Joint Structure Plan. Not necessary to provide extra houses. With regards to employment land there is no employment in Linby or Papplewick and low unemployment in Hucknall and Newstead. The area of highest unemployment is in Netherfield so it would seem more logical to develop Teal Close. People are not willing to travel far reaches of the Borough for employment. Traffic would increase on what are now very busy roads if people were to travel to work there.

**Council's Response and Reasoning**

The Local Plan Inquiry Inspector clarifies that the use of safeguarded land policy will not pre-empt future green belt reviews (2.63 paras 19-22). Cabinet report agreed

21st December 2004 addresses the issue of whether account should be taken of the emerging Joint Structure Plan. This is further reinforced by the legal opinion from Mr Spence QC following GAG5 legal representation. The strategic justification for employment land needs is set out in the Structure Plan and the emerging Joint Structure Plan increases the amount of employment land needed after the local plan period. In response to the point that the Top Wighay Farm employment site does not serve the need of Gedling's unemployed this is addressed in the Inspector's report (IR4.8). The Inspector states at IR4.2 paras 23 and 28 of his report that the whole of the Teal Close employment site is not needed.

### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
005688	302290	Mr M J Womble
005679	302261	Mr C Womble
005689	302298	Mrs S Womble

### **Summary of Objection**

The Gedling Local Plan fails to take into account lower housing requirements as identified by Joint Structure Plan (JSP). It is required by both PPG12 and Inspector that the Plan be amended to take account the emerging Structure Plan. GBC argues that JSP has not been adopted and cannot be used until it is. However at the same time they are proposing a modification to policy T10 to include Supplementary Planning Guidance issued under JSP before it had even been to Examination in Public. Removing the sites from Green Belt now will pre-empt the strategic review of the Green Belt to be carried out by the Regional Assembly in 2007. Gedling Borough Council has failed to demonstrate 'exceptional circumstances' for allocating this land.

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

Cabinet report agreed 21st December 2004 addresses the issue of whether account should be taken of the emerging Joint Structure Plan. This is further reinforced by the legal opinion from Mr Spence QC following GAG5 legal representation. With regards to updating the the parking guidelines attached as an appendix to the Local Plan this Supplementary Planning Guidance had already been adopted as County Council policy (on 23rd June 2004). The Joint Structure Plan is not yet adopted. The Local Plan Inquiry Inspector clarifies that the use of safeguarded land policy will not pre-empt future green belt reviews (2.63 paras 19-22). The principle of releasing Green Belt land to meet the development needs of the Borough was agreed in the Adopted 1996 Structure Plan Review the strategic framework for the Replacement Local Plan. The legal opinion from Mr Spence QC endorses this decision further.

### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b> 005730	<b>Representation No.</b> 302394	<b>Correspondent Name</b> Mrs M A Barker
------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	---

**Summary of Objection**

Councils decision to remove a number of sites from the Green Belt now will pre-empt the strategic review of the Green Belt to be carried out by the Regional Assembly in 2007. Also it fails to take into account increased house building in the City of Nottingham. No additional housing requirement until after 2021.

**Council's Response and Reasoning**

The Local Plan Inquiry Inspector clarifies that the use of safeguarded land policy will not pre-empt future green belt reviews (2.63 paras 19-22). This objection (that the Council have failed to take into account increased housebuilding in Nottingham City) is essential requesting the Council redraft the plan to take account of the emerging Joint Structure Plan. This cannot be done for the reasons set out in the Cabinet Report agreed on 21st December 2004 which has since been endorsed by Full Council and the Council's legal opinion outlined at the beginning of the report.

**Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b> 005773	<b>Representation No.</b> 302588	<b>Correspondent Name</b> Mr and Mrs A J Johnson
------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	---

**Summary of Objection**

Objects to reduction in conversions / change of use from 140 to 20. Notes that additional sources of conversions / change of use such as conversions of flats over shops are not included within the urban capacity figures despite recommendations contained within the government guidance and therefore ought to be included here. 'Tapping the Potential' states that 'there is likely to be potential to convert the space over shops (and local offices etc) to flats whatever the size of settlement including villages'. Estimates of the potential vary but the increased use of former factories for housing suggest that sources of housing is likely to increase not decrease.

**Council's Response and Reasoning**

The Inspector considered the issue of including flats over shops in the Urban Capacity Study. He concluded that the Study was fairly robust and was prepared to use it's conclusions. As such this issue has already been considered. Conversions and changes of use (including flats over shops and the re-use of former factories) are taken into account separately in the housing figures and the amended figure of 20 dwellings for this element of housing supply is clearly explained in the SDPM.

**Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
005773	302589	Mr and Mrs A J Johnson

### **Summary of Objection**

Housing allocation should be reduced to reflect the reduction in housing numbers required under the new Joint Structure Plan (JSP):- Gedling have been aware of revised housing requirements since September 2003 supported by EIP Panel - note PPG12 paragraph 6.32. As JSP has progressed beyond deposit stage it should be treated as being adopted. Plan fails to take into consideration the latest information contrary to PPG12 and condemns large swathes of Green Belt land unnecessarily. Plan does not take into consideration additional housebuilding in Nottingham City where 17 000 houses have been identified as opposed to original 8000 SP figure subject to public scrutiny with priority to brownfield sites and corresponding reduction in greenfield development outside City boundary. To take land out of Green Belt to serve development needs after 2021 is wholly inappropriate in light of proposed review of Notts/ Derby Green Belt. Even if JSP is not used the Inspector agreed a degree of flexibility on dwelling provision - in section 2.2 paragraph 3 Inspector commented that 'there is some latitude (flexibility) around the SP requirement '...'this could encompass a shortfall as small as on Second Deposit [68 dwellings] but not one as large as in the First Deposit [485 dwellings]'.

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

The argument that the Local Plan should take into account the reduced housing requirement in the Joint Structure Plan is not accepted for the reasons set out in the detail of the report considered by Cabinet on 14th December 2004 and adjourned to 21st December 2004. This has been further reinforced by legal opinion from Mr Spence QC following GAG5 legal representation. In terms of exceptional circumstances the principal of releasing green belt land to meet the development needs of the Borough was agreed in the Adopted Structure Plan Review the strategic framework for the Replacement Local Plan, again agreed in the advice from Mr Spence. With regards to flexibility in meeting the Structure Plan figure the range recommended by the Inspector (section 2.2 paragraph 3) is noted although he is clearly suggesting that any shortfall should be closer to 67 than 485 given that the latter resulted in a conformity issue.

### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
005789	302673	Mr J A Chisholm

### **Summary of Objection**

Inspector's Recommendations/ Proposed Modifications are based on 1991-2011 housing requirement set out in Structure Plan Review (1996). For reasons set out in D E Manley QC legal advice (summarised by GAG5 rep 1) GAG5 do not believe there are special circumstances to justify basing LP on out of date strategy. Implications of JSP for housing provision - JSP - 5000 dwellings (250 per annum) 2001-2021. 1991-2001 requirement - 400 dwellings per annum = 4000 (1996 SP). 2001-2011 requirement - 250 dwellings per annum = 2500 (JSP). Supply of housing

land = 4970. - Allocations are required to meet 1530 dwellings shortfall. - Capacity of allocations = 2335 dwellings - provision of allocated sites exceeds JSP requirement by around 800 dwellings. New JSP - will be adopted in due course - proposed modifications could result in completion of 5000 dwellings in first half of plan period with a residual requirement of 0 dwellings for second half. - Even if outdated SP is used H2 allocations (excluding Top Wighay) would provide a 6 year supply at SP rates and 8.5 year supply at past completion rates. + Covering letter and GAG Rep 2 statement

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

In terms of special circumstances the principal of releasing green belt land to meet the development needs of the Borough was agreed in the Adopted Structure Plan Review the strategic framework for the Replacement Local Plan. The argument that the Local Plan should take into account the reduced housing in the Joint Structure Plan is not accepted for reasons set out in the detail of the report considered by Cabinet on 14th December 2004 and adjourned to 21st December 2004. This has been further reinforced by legal opinion from Mr Spence QC following GAG5 legal representation. In response to the suggestion that the ASP should be used for the period 1991-2001 and the JSP should be used for 2001-2011 the County Council have previously indicated that this would not be an appropriate course of action. Either the Local Plan must be prepared in the context of the ASP or it should be reviewed in full to accord with the JSP. The Cabinet report dated 21st December 2004 explains the decision reached. Regarding the need for housing land the housing requirement of 6500 (instead of 8000) is disputed for the reasons given above. It is agreed that the figures listed under 'supply of housing land' accord with the Council's table under PM2.1. It is not accepted that the provision of allocated sites excluding Top Wighay and Regina Crescent exceeds the requirement by 800 dwellings again for the reasons given in the previous paragraph and in any event if fewer dwellings were to be required it would not necessarily be these two sites that would be deleted.

### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
005797	302695	D E Manley QC

### **Summary of Objection**

Legal representation on modifications.

I) Asked to advise in respect of a variety of issues. Background to the relevant matters depends upon a clear understanding of the background matters.

II) Adopted Structure Plan

IV) Comments on para 1.83 of ASP - the injunction to review the adopted Green Belt boundaries in affected districts was based upon the view that such was necessitated by reason of the levels of development proposed in policies 13/1 and 13/2.

VII) Local alteration of Green Belt boundaries can only be made if exceptional circumstances necessitate it. The mere fact that Policy 1/5 of the ASP noted that a review of local boundaries would be appropriate in 1995 is not in itself however an

exceptional circumstance. Such circumstances would need to necessitate a review at a local level at the time of the proposed change of boundaries.

VIII) Gedling Local Plan - Inspector's covering letter is clear in his advice to the Council with regard to the need for the Council to have regard to any subsequent revisions to government advice or policy that occurred prior to adoption of the plan. They are:- emergence of the SP review; review of RPG 8 and the Regional Assembly's strategic green belt review.

XV) Statutory modifications produced - clear they (GBC) are proceeding to provide in accordance with the adopted SP requirement. In respect of Top Wighay they have reduced the Inspector's recommended allocation to reflect 400 units at Teal Close to reflect the flooding issue being resolved. Employment land reduced to 9 ha.

Statement (of decisions) does not explain why any allocation of employment land is appropriate at Top Wighay. No analysis of implications of this for housing allocation. Key issues to note however is that the LPA are proceeding on the basis of the adopted structure plan requirements. Unable to discover in the statement any explanation of why. Needs to be in the statutory statement.

XVI) Further matter - Cabinet meeting 14/12/04. Purpose was to agree stat mods and it may be that the reasoning in the report forms part of the formal statement of decisions that is not with my papers. Within that report Option 2 i.e. continuing with the local plan as based on the ASP was recommended and presumably adopted.

XVII) Shall move onto the appropriateness of the LPA's chosen course of action but before doing note as follows: a) Almost certainly right mods to take on board new SP would lead to inquiry with only a risk that plan could not be adopted. b) Risk of appeals on green belt sites should not be basis for moving to adopt out of date plan. By the time appeal heard RPG and SP provisions would be adopted which would support a case for restraint in land release. c) Option 1 would not involve a constant review of green belt boundaries; they would stay where they are and any review would follow a strategic review. In any event the key issue now is whether exceptional circumstances now exist sufficient to justify Green Belt release. d) Cost is no reason for adopting a flawed plan. I hesitate to record as much but JSP figures have been available for some time. Council's complaints under Option 1 are to a degree self inflicted as they have ignored shifting strategic context.

XVIII) Option 3 abandon Lplan and move towards new LDF will leave policy vacuum cannot accept this. Many authorities have done this no policy vacuum because RPG and JSP will be sufficient for decisions in interim period of 2 years. No detailed consideration in option 3 or 1 of compelling necessity in light of new figures for large-scale greenfield release also no defence of need to identify safeguarded land in these issues.

XIX) Integrity of LPA's position is not legally sound.

XX) PPG 12 refers to late info at paras 6.31 - 6.32. New JSP figures available since September 2003. Panel report for last 3 months Inspector refers to this. PPG 12 Para 6.2 notes that where SP on deposit assumption maybe made those SP proposals have been adopted.

XXI) LPA proceeding to adopt Plan Inspector's reasoning based upon adopted SP which land requirements amounted to exceptional circumstances and no need for phasing. Ultimate question is whether LPA's conduct is reasonable in Wednesbury sense. Statement of decisions do not grapple with these issues in a transparent way (although that may be a reflection upon the details of my instructions). What is manifestly clear is that the exceptional circumstances justifying green belt release cannot be assumed to still exist. In that respect the plan is flawed. Safeguarded land

is further indefensible given JSP panel and RPG wholesale review in 2 years time. XXII) Conclusion the LP will be out of date the day it is adopted LPA recognise but consider such a position is better than having no plan at all. S78 challenges would not be heard for about 15 months by which time new SP / RPG figures will be in place. Flawed plan as significant green belt / Greenfield release without considering whether such is genuinely necessary in up-to-date strategic context. First step bring to attention of Sec of State who should be urged to direct Gedling not to adopt the Plan.

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

As a result of the legal representation submitted on behalf of GAG 5, the Council have sought an opinion from Malcolm Spence QC of 2-3 Gray's Inn Square London. The following Council's response is based upon that opinion.

Mr Spence QC states ' Concerning the advice of Mr David Manley QC I need make no comment on the first twenty paragraphs which do not contain any legal opinion'.

However, some planning comments can assist, for example, on Mr Manley's paragraph VII), it is useful to point out that it is not the function of the Structure Plan to make revisions of detail. The Inspector's covering letter (11 March 2004), states clearly in paragraph 19:

"As I have said, I have largely accepted the case advanced by the Council concerning how much land will be needed for residential development to satisfy the requirements of the Structure Plan. What flows from this is the recognition that a considerable amount of greenfield land will need to be developed and that this will involve taking land out of the Green Belt".

Paragraphs 20 and 21 develop this point further.

At paragraph XV Mr. Manley states that the Statement of Decisions and Modifications (SDPM) does not explain why an allocation of employment land is appropriate at Top Wighay. In response to this the Council refer to section 4.2 of that document which clearly states why there remains a balance of employment land to find at Top Wighay. The Inspector's report assists further in section 4.8, paragraph 6 of his report. On the question of the implications of this for the housing allocation the SDPM shows agreement with the Inspector's recommendation on the mix of employment and housing at Top Wighay in section 4.8.

Paragraph XXI) of Mr David Manley's advice refers to Wednesbury and in the words of Mr Spence 'they smack of judicial review, as opposed to statutory review under section 287, and I have already explained that such a course of action would be impossible'. On the matter of 'properly directing themselves in law', Mr Spence states this is appropriate, but he concludes that 'I can find nothing in this case upon which a challenge could be founded on any of these headings'.

Mr Spence advises that it would be prudent to include three further matters in the Statement of Decisions and Modifications (SDPM). Firstly he advises that the Cabinet report prepared for the 14<sup>th</sup> December 2004 be attached to it. This was and remains in the public realm, was a background paper for the decision on the SDPM, and was made available to GAG 5. It is available on the Council's web site and can be accessed through the following link:



[Legal and Democratic Services Home Page - Gedling Borough Council.](http://committee-web.gedling.gov.uk/askgedling/users/public/admin/kab12.pl?cmte=CAB&meet=19&rc=71)

(<http://committee-web.gedling.gov.uk/askgedling/users/public/admin/kab12.pl?cmte=CAB&meet=19&rc=71>).

Secondly he suggests a paragraph be added explaining the justification for the release of the disputed area (Top Wighay), on the basis of the Adopted Structure Plan. The SDPM includes an explanation at the front of the document, which states that it must be read in conjunction with the Inspector's report and the Revised Deposit Plan. The Inspector's report includes his covering letter and specifically paragraph 19, which is quoted above.

Finally Mr Spence refers to the need for material referring to the guidance in PPG 2 (Green Belts) and concerning in particular 'permanence'. As explained above the SDPM must be read in conjunction with the documents mentioned and the Revised Deposit Plan states at paragraph 2.4 of the Housing Chapter that 'Green Belts require a degree of permanency in that they should be protected as far as can be seen ahead'. The relevance of the new planning legislation becomes apparent here because the strategic context will change and the new statutory Regional Spatial Strategy rather than Structure Plans will guide the future land needs.

Mr Spence goes on to say that 'it is the function of the Council to ensure a minimum of Green Belt boundary changes'.

Mr Spence continues ' I consider the Report for the 14<sup>th</sup> December 2004 to be well balanced, rehearsing, as it does, all the relevant factors (save maybe for strengthening it as I have suggested in paragraph 2(ii) and (iii) above) which are germane to the Council's decision as to whether to proceed under Option 1 or Option 2 – or indeed 3 or 4. I should also mention at this juncture that the court is not entitled to substitute its own opinion in place of the Council's decision, even if it wanted to, except under the Wednesbury principle, which, as I explained in paragraph 1 above, in my opinion does not apply in this class of case, and anyway the experience in the Administrative Court is that arguments based on Wednesbury are hardly ever successful nowadays'.

'I do not consider that bringing the matter to the attention of the Secretary of State would help the parties at all'.

The conclusion of the representation from Mr Manley states that the Local Plan will be out of date the day it is adopted. Section 78 appeals would not be heard for about 15 months by which time new Structure Plan / Regional Planning Guidance figures will be in place.

In response to this matter it must be pointed out that the delays caused by such an approach would mean the Council would be clearly failing in its duty to ensure a minimum of 5 years housing development is proposed. The main argument put forward in this representation is that exceptional circumstances justifying the green belt release cannot be assumed to still exist. This is not accepted. Even if the emerging Joint Structure Plan housing figure could be used independently of the other strategic land requirements, significant areas of the green belt would still be required for release to meet just the housing development needs. PPG 2 remains the relevant Government advice on Green Belts and as the Local Plan explains at paragraph 2.4, the need for permanent boundaries remains a clear element specific to green belt policy.

**Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
005855	302820	Mrs H Daniels

**Summary of Objection**

The 2004 Joint Structure Plan was placed on deposit one month after the Local Plan inquiry and recommendations on lower housing requirements in Gedling should be taken into account. No exceptional circumstances have been shown to take land out of the green belt.

**Council's Response and Reasoning**

Cabinet report agreed 21st December 2004 addresses the issue of whether account should be taken of the emerging Joint Structure Plan. This is further reinforced by the legal opinion from Mr Spence QC following GAG5 legal representation. The principle of releasing Green Belt land to meet the development needs of the Borough was agreed in the Adopted 1996 Structure Plan Review the strategic framework for the Replacement Local Plan. The legal opinion from Mr Spence QC endorses this decision further.

**Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
005879	302865	Mr P Warren

**Summary of representation**

The decision to remove a number of sites from the Green Belt now will pre-empt the strategic review of the Green Belt to be carried out by the Regional Assembly in 2007. + letter.

**Council's Response and Reasoning**

The Local Plan Inquiry Inspector clarifies that the use of safeguarded land policy will not pre-empt future green belt reviews (2.63 paras 19-22). The principle of the development of the site in terms of highways impact has been confirmed as acceptable by County Highways. These issues will be considered again in the context of a specific planning application. The Urban Capacity Study provides a rationale for windfall provision of housing completions across the Borough. There has been some double counting and the evidence from 2 years of permissions is insufficient to justify a review at this stage. The Inspector has considered environmental and sustainability issues relating to development in Ravenshead in section 2.40 parag 11 of his report. In addition the Environmental Assessment of the Local Plan establishes environment measures. The capacity of existing services to accommodate the proposed development has already been comprehensively addressed in the Inspector's Report which refers to 'the (perceived) inadequacy of particular services in Ravenshead' (section 2.40 parags 7-9) including local schools

and medical services. The type of housing need in Ravenshead is addressed in section 2.40 (paragraphs 17-19) of the Inspector's Report.

**Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
005885	302906	Mrs M Solomonides

**Summary of Objection**

The Gedling Local Plan fails to take into account increased house building in the City of Nottingham. No additional housing requirement until after 2021. Hundreds of properties have been built within the City this must relieve pressure on number of houses needed in Gedling. Overall need for more housing needs to be looked at.

**Council's Response and Reasoning**

This objection (that the Council have failed to take into account increased housebuilding in Nottingham City) is essentially requesting the Council to redraft the plan to take account of the emerging Joint Structure Plan. This cannot be done for the reasons set out in the Cabinet report agreed on 21st December 2004 which has since been endorsed by the Full Council and the Council's legal opinion outlined at the beginning of the report.

**Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
005909	302978	Miss S Harrison
005910	302980	Mrs M Ashley

**Summary of Objection**

Object to site being taken out of Green Belt. Gedling has no further housing requirements to 2021.

**Council's Response and Reasoning**

The Regional Spatial Strategy has to take account of latest household projections and they are currently 18 to 19% above the annualised rate for the approved RSS. Regarding the provision of housing at Top Wighay Farm until after 2021 this issue relates to the emerging Joint Structure Plan and this is dealt with in the response to GAG 5's legal representation summarised at the beginning of the report and also in more detail in the earlier part of this report.

**Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

## **PM 2.1 H2 DISTRIBUTION OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT**

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
005799	302857	Miss S Gilbert

### **Summary of Objection**

Local Plan fails to take into consideration reduction in housing figures in new Joint Structure Plan. Gedling will need 1000 less homes than at present.

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

Cabinet report agreed 21st December 2004 addresses the issue of whether account should be taken of the emerging Joint Structure Plan. This is further reinforced by the legal opinion from Mr Spence QC following GAG 5 legal representation.

### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
000007	301673	Mrs P Andrews
000008	301592	Mr B Ashton
000043	301355	Mr G Turner
000053	300680	Mr K Adams
000081	300968	Councillor B J Carver
000090	300632	Mr I Crowe
000111	300508	Councillor J Lonergan
000173	301105	Mr J Kendrick
000188	301188	Mr A Browne
000277	301339	Mr & Mrs J Cooke
000278	300537	Mrs E Hewitt
000300	300100	Mr A Holmes
000317	300301	Mr M Scotton
000323	300425	Mr L Butt
000326	300214	Mrs A Newman
000337	301375	Mr A Price
000344	302363	Mr A Knox
000345	300334	Mrs J Shooter
000354	301120	Mr A Khosla
000364	300757	Mr R Buckley
000369	301150	Ms C Justice
000373	301020	Mrs K Browne
000376	300529	Mr J Cooke
000381	302376	Mrs H Knox
000414	300177	Mrs J Bailey
000425	300395	A Evans
000463	301166	Mr I Shaw
000467	300489	Mrs M Bolstridge
000478	301270	Mrs S Camm
000479	300332	Mrs M Pickup
000487	302970	Mrs G Congdon
000495	301295	Mr J Hunt

000531	300391	Mr D Chamberlain
000544	301659	Mr D Hammond
000545	301655	Mrs G Hammond
000564	301245	Mr I Talbot
000567	301230	Mrs C Talbot
000574	301168	Mrs S Shaw
000674	300933	Mr K Briddon
000696	301449	Mr L Green
001015	301616	Mrs K Holdsworth
001032	301082	Mr J Pykett
001054	301133	Mr M Haskew
001061	301608	Mrs G Lowe
001065	302853	Mr & Mrs R Thompson
001136	300814	Mr J Walton
001156	301612	Mr C Lowe
001198	302829	Mrs H Orlandich
001743	300437	Mr S Eves
001747	302957	Mr P Summerfield
001752	302318	Mr J Unwin
001755	300357	Mr C Abrahams
001758	300841	Mrs A Pollard
001760	300409	Mrs D Gill
001761	300828	Mrs P Parr
001762	300570	Mr M Fisher
003844	301420	Mrs E Wileman
003858	300520	Mr G Shephard
003859	300235	Mrs B Todd
003872	300513	Mrs A Lonergan
004322	302403	K Peacock
004578	302437	Mrs P M Hall
005032	300052	Mrs S Howard
005033	300057	Mrs J Hill
005035	300063	Mr I Shields
005043	300106	Mr & Mrs B Burton
005044	300115	Mrs M A Robinson
005045	300125	Mr M Baxter
005046	300131	Mrs P Baxter
005048	300143	Mrs A Powell
005049	300154	Mr W G Morgan
005050	300156	Mr A R Foggo
005051	300176	Mrs M E Foggo
005052	300181	Mr H N Jones
005053	300190	Mr G Farr
005054	300201	Mr D B Reay
005055	300204	Mrs H Foster
005056	300208	Mr D Foster
005057	300218	Ms M Stealey
005058	300225	Mrs N Eves
005059	300226	Mrs M McConville
005060	300231	Mrs D Thompson

005061	300239	Mrs D M Townroe
005062	300243	Mr I Rowe
005063	300254	Mrs S Rowe
005064	300259	Mr R Clark
005067	300268	Mrs J Clark
005068	300269	Ms S Daykin Farr
005069	300273	Mrs C M Clarke
005070	300281	Mr & Mrs P & M Himsworth
005071	300296	Mrs I Stealey
005072	300300	Mr J Britten
005073	300307	Mr T Daykin
005074	300311	Mrs L Daykin
005075	300315	Mr K Pickup
005076	300338	Miss S A Morgan
005077	300344	Mr R M Riley
005078	300346	Mrs H D Matthews
005079	300356	Mrs L M Whiston
005083	300367	Mrs J M Newton
005084	300371	Mrs J A Abrahams
005085	300375	Mr I C Bailey
005086	300379	Mr B N Newton
005087	300383	Mrs G Evans
005088	300387	Mrs B Chamberlain
005089	300399	Mrs K Brookes
005090	300422	Mr A J Walker
005091	301117	Mr J E Greasley
005092	300429	Mrs K E Butt
005093	300433	Mrs D A Moore
005094	300441	Mr F A Burrow
005095	300445	Mrs A J Ward
005096	300455	Mr P N Rowden
005097	300459	Mr J Cooling
005098	300469	Mrs L J Cooling
005099	300479	Mr P Newman
005100	300499	Mrs D Noble
005101	300521	Mrs V B Pritchard
005102	300525	Mrs M Cooke
005103	300533	Mrs K J Newton
005105	300542	Mrs L Cook
005106	300546	Mr G W Cook
005109	300555	Dr I A Jan
005110	300559	Mrs C A Jan
005111	300573	Mr C J Cain
005152	300620	Mrs M Rhind
005153	300624	Mr B J Waterfield
005154	300631	Mrs V Waterfield
005155	300645	Mr K Redfern
005156	300646	Mrs K Redfern
005157	300656	Mr A Morrey
005158	300660	Mr D McGeever

005159	300670	Mrs V McGeever
005160	300690	Mr A J Morton
005161	300699	Mrs P Van Grondelle
005162	300702	Mrs V J Willson-Lloyd
005163	300706	Mr M A Willson-Lloyd
005164	300710	Mr B Stevens
005165	300714	Miss J E Plowright
005166	300715	Mr B Robinson
005167	300719	Mr D Hooton
005168	300726	Mr A H Macdiarmid
005169	300727	Mrs M B Rowleston
005170	300731	Mr C D Newton
005172	300736	Miss L Burton
005175	300742	Mr G E Yallup
005176	300746	Mrs S Peatfield
005177	300750	Mr J B Peatfield
005185	300768	Mrs M Yallup
005186	300774	Mrs J Coates
005191	300907	Mr S J Pidding
005192	300791	Miss P F Butler
005193	300795	Mrs P A Collin
005194	300799	Mr R W Collin
005195	300809	Mrs V A Walton
005196	300818	Mrs P Whalley
005197	300832	Dr V Pollard
005198	300851	Mr G Flatters
005199	300862	Mrs D Horton
005200	300866	Mr R Horton
005202	300877	Mrs C James
005204	300885	Mrs J M Marvally
005205	300889	Mr W J M Marvally
005206	300893	Miss K J Green
005207	300895	Mr J G D Moore
005208	300899	Mrs C A Yeo
005209	300903	Mr D A Yeo
005210	300908	Mr C H Mason
005211	300912	Mr J R Malloney
005214	300929	Mr J W Morgan
005215	300937	Mrs K Briddon
005216	300941	Mrs C Fearn
005217	300947	Mr G E Nash
005218	300952	Mrs B J Osborn
005219	300956	Mr J Osborn
005220	300960	Mrs J Burkitt
005221	300964	Mr S Burkitt
005222	300972	Mr D J Baker
005225	300984	Mrs A Wilson
005226	300988	Mr I Wilson
005227	300992	Mr C Read
005228	300997	Mr D W Hammond

005229	301000	Mr J P Malloney
005230	301003	Mr P J Malloney
005231	301004	Ms A B Robinson
005232	301010	Mrs C Haskew
005233	301022	Mr A J Browne
005235	301027	Mrs H J Walker
005237	301031	Mrs S Butler
005240	301036	Mrs J Crowe
005241	301040	Mrs M Baggon
005244	301046	Dr L A Kubik
005245	301050	Mrs M B Kubik
005246	301056	Mr E G Aspley
005249	301062	Mrs D Read
005250	301066	Mrs R Nash
005251	301070	Mrs L Malloney
005252	301072	Mrs A Flatters
005253	301089	Mrs D Pykett
005254	301090	Mr K Scott
005255	301094	Mrs S Scott
005257	301101	Mrs R Kendrick
005258	301109	Mr J Daynes
005259	301113	Miss H V Foggo
005260	301134	Miss J Haskew
005262	301143	Mrs K F Carlin
005263	301144	Mr E L Carlin
005264	301154	Mrs E Smith
005265	301158	Mr G Smith
005266	301162	Mr J R Hannaford
005267	301171	Mr & Mrs J B & S White
005270	301179	Miss R Smith
005273	301183	Mr C Cooke
005275	301794	Miss A James
005287	301209	Mrs B Powell
005290	301221	Dr M Breach
005291	301222	Mrs L C Breach
005292	301226	Mr I Watson
005293	301234	Mr M J Ford
005294	301238	Mrs M A Ford
005295	301246	Mrs E Price
005296	301250	Mr & Mrs N C Leafe
005297	301254	Mr J Gerrard
005298	301258	Mr J M Godber
005299	301266	Mr B M Camm
005300	301274	Mr W Camm
005302	301282	Mr F Draper
005303	301283	Mrs S Draper
005304	301287	Mrs J Wharton
005305	301291	Mrs J Adcock
005306	301299	Mr J M Wharton
005311	301312	Mr C J Shaw



005314	301318	Mr G Bennison
005317	301321	Mr M Dermody
005318	301325	Mrs A E Bainbridge
005320	301330	Mrs M A Gee
005321	301333	Mr M R Gee
005322	301335	Mrs D E Canty
005323	301343	Mr G Dunn
005324	301348	Mrs P A Oscroft
005326	301367	Mrs E Price
005327	301368	Mr A Risdall
005329	301378	Mr M Cooke
005330	301379	Mr A M Breach
005331	301387	Mrs C A Belcher
005332	301391	Mrs D R Richmond
005334	301403	Mrs M O Ogrizovic
005337	301408	Mr A E Hutchinson
005338	301412	Mrs A D Singh
005339	301416	Mr K Singh
005340	301424	Miss J Wileman
005341	301428	Mr I Walton
005342	301441	Mrs R G Green
005343	301452	Miss M Hutchinson
005344	301456	Mr B H Elliott
005345	301461	Mrs E C Elliott
005346	301466	Mrs D Ramscar
005347	301472	Mrs O Cooper
005348	301478	Mr R Evans
005349	301494	Mrs R Evans
005350	301505	Mrs V A Moody
005351	301512	Mr I R Moody
005356	301530	Mrs J Aughton
005357	301534	Mr D Aughton
005360	301541	Mrs S Clark
005364	301546	Mrs C A Flint
005369	301551	Mr J Robson
005371	301557	Mrs P A Bister
005372	301558	Mrs M Bayley
005375	301574	Mrs J Richards
005376	301579	Mr A Turner
005377	301580	Mrs P A Andrews
005378	301584	Miss K L Bailey
005379	301588	Mr B M Andrews
005380	301596	Mr R Foulds
005381	301600	Mrs S Foulds
005382	301604	Mrs S J Hall
005384	301623	Mr J Robinson
005386	301627	Mrs G Dodd
005387	301631	Mr B Dodd
005388	301635	Mrs K A Coleman
005389	301646	Mr M V Coleman

005390	301661	Mr B Richmond
005391	301669	Mrs B A Leslie-Green
005392	301670	Miss M Martin
005394	301677	Mr S Marsh
005395	301682	Mr B Whitelocks
005398	301686	Mr A Litman
005400	301689	Mrs M Passey
005418	301714	Mrs M Cordin
005419	301718	Mrs M Phelps
005420	301722	Mr A Cordin
005421	301910	Mr W Lewis
005425	301732	Mrs J E Browning
005427	301737	Mrs C Collins
005428	301740	Mrs S Minns
005433	301748	Mr A Foxall
005434	301753	Mr M English
005434	302433	Mr M English
005435	301755	Mr R Brothwell
005436	301759	T & J Carlisle
005443	301770	A Jenkin
005448	301780	Mrs W Walker Kirk
005451	301783	M M F Fowler
005453	301787	Miss K Evans
005461	301799	Mr B J Barnsdall
005477	301824	Mrs C Twells
005478	301829	Mr K A Dowling
005479	301832	Mrs D White
005481	301836	Mrs J E Upton
005488	301844	Miss P Richardson
005489	301847	Miss S E Jordan
005496	301857	Mrs A Wild
005497	301860	Mr D Ashley
005498	301862	Mrs J Dyer
005499	301865	Mrs M Bingham
005500	301867	Miss L Strange
005501	301871	Mrs M Allen
005503	301876	Miss A Johnson
005510	301883	Mrs J Butler
005513	301889	Mrs M A Yeomans
005515	301893	Ms L Humber
005529	301913	Mrs P. Burke
005538	301925	Mr G Gibson
005547	301935	Mrs C J Taylor
005550	301941	Mrs J Ratcliffe
005551	301943	Mrs L Ridley
005559	301951	Mrs C Sears
005561	301955	Mrs K P Davies-Eyres
005562	301960	Miss S Myford
005564	302105	Mrs N English
005571	301972	Mrs S Litman

005575	301981	Mrs J Timms
005576	302963	Ms C Neeson
005577	302024	Mrs P Newton
005578	302033	Mr D Chambers
005579	302043	Mrs M Chambers
005581	302050	Miss H Newton
005585	302055	Mr R Benfield
005586	302065	Mrs C Benfield
005588	302072	Mrs L Newton
005591	302077	Mr C Newton
005600	302101	Mr J D English
005605	302472	Mr J W Jacques
005606	302111	Mr D B Gaskell
005607	302117	Ms K M Beresford
005609	302125	Mrs J Smith
005610	302128	Miss S Allen
005612	302132	Mr P Coleman
005615	302137	Miss E English
005616	302147	Miss M Hall
005620	302153	Mrs P Harvey
005624	302162	Mr N Penlington
005631	302172	Mr S Walker
005634	302179	Mrs K Evans
005637	302191	Mrs S Slater
005638	302183	Mrs D Scothern
005639	302187	Mr R Hardy
005648	302208	Mrs J Cooke
005655	302207	Mrs W Evans
005658	302218	Miss C Brandreth
005663	302223	Mrs S James
005665	302225	Mrs M Simms
005666	302229	Mrs D M Sayward
005667	302299	Mrs M C Malpas
005670	302241	Mrs M Andrews
005671	302243	Mr L Sayward
005677	302255	Mrs D Duke
005678	302259	Mrs C Wright
005687	302281	Mr K Perkins
005690	302308	Mr D.Booth
005691	302300	Mr D G D Stewart
005692	302304	Mr D W Stewart
005693	302309	Mrs J L Castledine
005694	302314	Mr D Riley
005696	302323	Mr M Start
005706	302343	Mr & Mrs J Gretton
005725	302402	Mrs N Ricketts
005728	302396	Mr T J Barker
005730	302392	Mrs M A Barker
005737	302410	Mrs P Davey
005739	302416	Mr M Davey

005743	302425	Mr J Manchester
005750	302456	Mr K H Effingham
005751	302471	Miss H E Scott
005752	302461	Mr & Mrs G Rogers
005753	302481	Mr J D Watson
005755	302495	Mr V Jackson
005764	302530	Mr H B Watt
005767	302535	Mrs S M Cross
005770	302554	Mr D A Cross
005771	302555	Mrs M G Thomson
005779	302603	Mrs A Ankenbauer
005781	302608	Mr R Ankenbauer
005782	302614	Mrs P A Brown
005793	302687	Mrs C J Smith
005796	302696	Mr G A Gilbert
005812	302713	Mr R Hull
005813	302718	John Chisholm
005815	302725	Mrs C Wyles
005816	302728	Anne Chisholm
005818	302735	Mr R Wyles
005820	302743	Mr S Clay
005824	302750	Mr C J Madge
005825	302753	Master J Madge
005826	302755	Miss R Madge
005827	302775	Mrs A Hurt
005828	302757	Mr S Blagg
005833	302777	Mr J Hurt
005850	302810	Mr V Orlandich
005869	302837	Mrs V A Jones
005873	302843	Mr D Grenham
005874	302846	Mr C L Moore
005879	302864	Mr P Warren
005880	302874	Mrs K Clay
005881	302879	Mrs J Jackson
005882	302884	Mr K Jackson
005883	302889	Mr and Mrs J Rollinson
005893	302920	Mr S Perkins
005905	302965	Mrs S May
000253	302462	Mr B Slater
000445	302877	Mr J Rose
005288	301214	Mrs C Lighthart
005542	301930	Mrs J Shaw
005675	302268	Mr K Sercombe
005740	302420	Mr s Andrews
005817	302740	Mrs C McGriskin
005838	302792	Mr B McGriskin
005892	302919	Mrs H Surgeon
005895	302922	Mrs B Davis
005082	300363	Mrs N McCullough
005830	302771	Mr P McGriskin

### **Summary of Objection**

The Gedling Local Plan fails to take into any consideration a reduction in housing numbers in the new Joint Structure Plan. Gedling will need 1 000 fewer homes than at present. + letter.

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

Cabinet report agreed 21st December 2004 addresses the issue of whether account should be taken of the emerging Joint Structure Plan. This is further reinforced by the legal opinion from Mr Spence QC following GAG 5 legal representation. The capacity of existing services to accommodate the proposed development has already been comprehensively addressed in the Inspector's Report which refers to 'the (perceived) inadequacy of particular services in Ravenshead' (section 2.40 parags 7-9) including local schools and medical services. The Urban Capacity Study provides a rationale for windfall provision of housing completions across the Borough. There has been some double counting and the evidence from 2 years of permissions is insufficient to justify a review at this stage.

### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
000418	301351	Mr J Oscroft

### **Summary of Objection**

The Gedling Local Plan fails to take into any consideration a reduction in housing numbers in the new Joint Structure Plan. Gedling will need 1 000 less homes than at present. + letter.

GBC discounted new facts which were so relevant that the findings should be reexamined. This was outlined in 2 letters from P.Tipping MP to Councillors which also emphasised the prime consideration that should be given to local residents over the interests of developers. GBC decision was so perverse and contrary to their previous attitude at the Inquiry that it should be in contravention of the Human Rights of the great majority of Ravenshead residents who object to the development.

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

Cabinet report agreed 21st December 2004 addresses the issue of whether account should be taken of the emerging Joint Structure Plan. This is further reinforced by the legal opinion from Mr Spence QC following GAG 5 legal representation. The capacity of existing services to accommodate the proposed development has already been comprehensively addressed in the Inspector's Report which refers to 'the (perceived) inadequacy of particular services in Ravenshead' (section 2.40 parags 7-9) including local schools and medical services. The Urban Capacity Study provides a rationale for windfall provision of housing completions across the Borough. There has been some double counting and the evidence from 2 years of permissions is insufficient to justify a review at this stage. Current planning legislation enables sites to be promoted by developers through the local plan process and for the Inspector to consider the merits of those sites through the Local

Plan Inquiry. Modifications to the Local Plan to include an alternative site are subject to a consultation exercise and this provides the opportunity for representations to be made in relation to the 'new' site. The current procedure is therefore analogous to that for objections to previous stages of the local plan. Following the end of the consultation period the Council have carefully considered all the representations submitted. The reference to the Human Rights legislation is noted but without more specific information it is difficult to add more to the above response.

**Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
000446	301383	Dr & Mrs P C Risdall

**Summary of Objection**

The Gedling Local Plan fails to take into any consideration a reduction in housing numbers in the new Joint Structure Plan. Gedling will need 1 000 less homes than at present. GBC and County Council need to address the current problems before further increasing them by encouraging more development. Health Centre is struggling to provide adequate appointment service inadequate shopping and parking facilities and drainage system is becoming overloaded. Public transport does not serve the village at all well and with heavy reliance on private cars this has created traffic and road safety problem. All problems will get worse with further dwellings.

**Council's Response and Reasoning**

Cabinet report agreed 21st December 2004 addresses the issue of whether account should be taken of the emerging Joint Structure Plan. This is further reinforced by the legal opinion from Mr Spence QC following GAG 5 legal representation. The capacity of existing services to accommodate the proposed development has already been comprehensively addressed in the Inspector's Report which refers to 'the (perceived) inadequacy of particular services in Ravenshead' (section 2.40 parags 7-9) including local schools and medical services. Highway Authority raise no objection to the allocation.

**Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
000463	302940	Mr I Shaw
005897	302938	Mr & Mrs CA & CE Ford
005898	302944	Mrs T Foster
005899	302947	Mrs M E Newman
005900	302948	Mr & Mrs M & SE Fretwell
005901	302955	Mr P Walters

005902	302953	Mr R Forster
005904	302961	Mr J & Ms S Clarke

**Summary of Objection**

Plan fails to use the new Joint Structure Plan (JSP) - no justification was provided. Should use new up-to-date material information or revisions viz JSP and provide most clear and full justification for chosen course of action. JSP was deposited a month after the Inspector's Inquiry and should be considered but Gedling still use outdated 1996 Structure Plan.

**Council's Response and Reasoning**

Cabinet report agreed 21st December 2004 addresses the issue of whether account should be taken of the emerging Joint Structure Plan. This is further reinforced by the legal opinion from Mr Spence QC following GAG 5 legal representation.

**Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
001750	300076	Miss J Sturton

**Summary of Objection**

The decision to remove a number of sites from the Green Belt now will pre-empt the strategic review of the Green Belt to be carried out by the Regional Assembly in 2007.

**Council's Response and Reasoning**

The Local Plan Inquiry Inspector clarifies that the use of safeguarded land policy will not pre-empt future green belt reviews. (2.63 paras 19-22)

**Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
003916	302340	Mrs H Hibbert

**Summary of Objection**

The Gedling Local Plan fails to take into any consideration a reduction in housing numbers in the new Joint Structure Plan. Gedling will need 1 000 less homes than at present. + letter.  
According to the Parish Council GBC are still using the outdated 1996 Structure Plan. To date no 'exceptional circumstances' for using Green Belt land for housing has been mentioned or proved. Loss of special wooded rural character. Services are stretched to the limit with parking difficulties at the shops long waiting hours for medical appointments and traffic problems at peak times. No consideration has been given to real needs of the community.

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

Cabinet report agreed 21st December 2004 addresses the issue of whether account should be taken of the emerging Joint Structure Plan. This is further reinforced by the legal opinion from Mr Spence QC following GAG 5 legal representation. The Urban Capacity Study provides a rationale for windfall provision of housing completions across the Borough. There has been some double counting and the evidence from 2 years of permissions is insufficient to justify a review at this stage. The principle of releasing Green Belt land to meet the development needs of the Borough was agreed in the Adopted 1996 Structure Plan Review the strategic framework for the Replacement Local Plan. The legal opinion from Mr Spence QC endorses this decision further. There are no preserved trees on the proposed site. The capacity of existing services to accommodate the proposed development has already been comprehensively addressed in the Inspector's Report which refers to 'the (perceived) inadequacy of particular services in Ravenshead' (section 2.40 parags 7-9) including local schools and medical services. Highway Authority raise no objection to the allocation.

### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
005047	300137	Mr C J Powell

### **Summary of Objection**

The Gedling Local Plan fails to take into any consideration a reduction in housing numbers in the new Joint Structure Plan. Gedling will need 1 000 less homes than at present. Was one of those objected to the site being in the original Plan. Withdrew objection when site was taken out of the Plan and now feel let down that decisions have been made without an opportunity for people to voice their opinions. Drainage and sewerage systems are inadequate and overloaded inadequate public transport with heavily reliance on cars. Waiting time for doctor's appointment is unacceptable.

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

Cabinet report agreed 21st December 2004 addresses the issue of whether account should be taken of the emerging Joint Structure Plan. This is further reinforced by the legal opinion from Mr Spence QC following GAG 5 legal representation. The capacity of existing services to accommodate the proposed development has already been comprehensively addressed in the Inspector's Report which refers to 'the (perceived) inadequacy of particular services in Ravenshead' (section 2.40 parags 7-9) including local schools and medical services. Current planning legislation enables sites to be promoted by developers through the local plan process and for the Inspector to consider the merits of those sites through the Local Plan Inquiry. Modifications to the Local Plan to include an alternative site are subject to a consultation exercise and this provides the opportunity for representations to be made in relation to the 'new' site. The current procedure is therefore analogous to that for objections to previous stages of the local plan. Following the end of the consultation period the Council have carefully considered all the representations submitted. Highway Authority raise no objection to the



allocation. Severn Trent have no objections but states that drainage work will be required.

**Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
005288	301213	Mrs C Lighthart
005368	301550	Mrs L A Hillier
005538	301924	Mr G Gibson

**Summary of Objection**

The Gedling Local Plan fails to take into account increased house building in the City of Nottingham. No additional housing requirement until after 2021.

**Council's Response and Reasoning**

This objection (that the Council have failed to take into account increased housebuilding in Nottingham City) is essentially requesting the Council to redraft the plan to take account of the emerging Joint Structure Plan. This cannot be done for the reasons set out in the Cabinet report agreed on 21st December 2004 which has since been endorsed by the Full Council and the Council's legal opinion outlined at the beginning of the report. The Regional Spatial Strategy has to take account of latest household projections and they are currently 18 to 19% above the annualised rate for the approved RSS.

**Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
005373	301563	Mr D W Orton

**Summary of Objection**

The Gedling Local Plan fails to take into any consideration a reduction in housing numbers in the new Joint Structure Plan. Gedling will need 1 000 less homes than at present. Unfair to allow a development which is clearly against local democratic wishes and with infrastructure of shops schools doctors and facilities for younger people being inadequate for present population levels - no democracy. + letter.

**Council's Response and Reasoning**

Cabinet report agreed 21st December 2004 addresses the issue of whether account should be taken of the emerging Joint Structure Plan. This is further reinforced by the legal opinion from Mr Spence QC following GAG 5 legal representation. The capacity of existing services to accommodate the proposed development has already been comprehensively addressed in the Inspector's Report which refers to 'the (perceived) inadequacy of particular services in Ravenshead' (section 2.40 parags 7-9) including local schools and medical services. The Urban Capacity Study provides a rationale for windfall provision of housing completions across the Borough. There has been some double counting and the evidence from 2 years of

permissions is insufficient to justify a review at this stage. Current planning legislation enables sites to be promoted by developers through the local plan process and for the Inspector to consider the merits of those sites through the Local Plan Inquiry. Modifications to the Local Plan to include an alternative site are subject to a consultation exercise and this provides the opportunity for representations to be made in relation to the 'new' site. The current procedure is therefore analogous to that for objections to previous stages of the local plan. Following the end of the consultation period the Council have carefully considered all the representations submitted. On the issue of facilities for younger people this will be forwarded to the Parish Council so it can be addressed in the Parish Plan.

### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
005374	301568	Mrs P J Orton

### **Summary of Objection**

The Gedling Local Plan fails to take into any consideration a reduction in housing numbers in the new Joint Structure Plan. Gedling will need 1 000 less homes than at present. Unfair to allow a development which is clearly against local democratic wishes and with infrastructure of shops schools doctors and facilities for younger people being inadequate for present population levels - no democracy. + letter.

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

Cabinet report agreed 21st December 2004 addresses the issue of whether account should be taken of the emerging Joint Structure Plan. This is further reinforced by the legal opinion from Mr Spence QC following GAG 5 legal representation. The capacity of existing services to accommodate the proposed development has already been comprehensively addressed in the Inspector's Report which refers to 'the (perceived) inadequacy of particular services in Ravenshead' (section 2.40 parags 7-9) including local schools and medical services. The Urban Capacity Study provides a rationale for windfall provision of housing completions across the Borough. There has been some double counting and the evidence from 2 years of permissions is insufficient to justify a review at this stage. Current planning legislation enables sites to be promoted by developers through the local plan process and for the Inspector to consider the merits of those sites through the Local Plan Inquiry. Modifications to the Local Plan to include an alternative site are subject to a consultation exercise and this provides the opportunity for representations to be made in relation to the 'new' site. The current procedure is therefore analogous to that for objections to previous stages of the local plan. Following the end of the consultation period the Council have carefully considered all the representations submitted. On the issue of facilities for younger people this will be forwarded to the Parish Council so it can be addressed in the Parish Plan.

### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
005408	301733	Mrs M A Todd

**Summary of Objection**

Object to proposed housing development at Top Wighay: (a) this is Green Belt land and brownfield sites (which are available) should be used first. (b) The Council should adopt the lower housing figures set out in the Draft Joint Structure Plan.

**Council's Response and Reasoning**

Cabinet report agreed 21st December 2004 addresses the issue of whether account should be taken of the emerging Joint Structure Plan. This is further reinforced by the legal opinion from Mr Spence QC following GAG 5 legal representation. Previous drafts of the Local Plan have allocated brownfield sites for development and these sites have already come forward such that the majority of the allocations remaining in the Local Plan are now Greenfield (and cannot be released until the Local Plan is adopted). The urban capacity study considered opportunities for the development or redevelopment for employment and housing purposes of brownfield sites and other under-utilised land in the urban area.

**Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
005679	302269	Mr C Womble
005688	302287	Mr M J Womble
005689	302293	Mrs S Womble

**Summary of Objection**

The Gedling Local Plan fails to take into any consideration a reduction in housing numbers in the new Joint Structure Plan. Gedling will need 1 000 less homes than at present. It is required to do so both by the Inspector and PPG12.

**Council's Response and Reasoning**

Cabinet report agreed 21st December 2004 addresses the issue of whether account should be taken of the emerging Joint Structure Plan. This is further reinforced by the legal opinion from Mr Spence QC following GAG 5 legal representation.

**Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
005699	302327	Mr H Hughes

**Summary of Objection**

The Gedling Local Plan fails to take into any consideration a reduction in housing numbers in the new Joint Structure Plan. Gedling will need 1 000 less homes than at present. + letter.

Plenty of Grade II farmland - farm surplusses car boot sales caravan sites and horse loose boxes means land surplusses.

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

The Cabinet report agreed 21st December 2004 addresses the issue of whether account should be taken of the emerging Joint Structure Plan. This is further reinforced by the legal opinion from Mr Spence QC following GAG5 legal representation. The capacity of existing services to accommodate the proposed development has already been comprehensively addressed in the Inspector's Report which refers to 'the (perceived) inadequacy of particular services in Ravenshead' (section 2.40 parags 7-9) including local schools and medical services. The Urban Capacity Study provides a rationale for windfall provision of housing completions across the Borough. There has been some double counting and the evidence from 2 years of permissions is insufficient to justify a review at this stage. The reference to the land surplusses is noted but the Council's study on housing allocation is supported by the Inspector. See sections 2.34 (para 5) and 2.44 (para 4) of the Inspector's Report which refers to the fact that all sites has been identified in the Green Belt review sieve map.

### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
005742	302421	Mrs S M Manchester

### **Summary of Objection**

The Gedling Local Plan fails to take into any consideration a reduction in housing numbers in the new Joint Structure Plan. Gedling will need 1 000 less homes than at present. + letter.

Loss of Larks Kestrels Owls nesting and hunting grounds. Plus loss of their prey. Loss of dog walking land for elderly. Concern that there will be overuse and incorrect use of fields eg. horses and bikes. Developer should be made to erect high security fencing all around the site. There are too many houses for sale. If affordable housing were built when sold it would be sold at Ravenshead prices. Could build a 2 storey nursing home so our elderly can stay in their village. Only other option would be to build a proper park with woodland lane play areas.

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

The Cabinet report agreed 21st December 2004 addresses the issue of whether account should be taken of the emerging Joint Structure Plan. This is further reinforced by the legal opinion from Mr Spence QC following GAG5 legal representation. The capacity of existing services to accommodate the proposed development has already been comprehensively addressed in the Inspector's Report which refers to 'the (perceived) inadequacy of particular services in Ravenshead' (section 2.40 parags 7-9) including local schools and medical services. The Urban Capacity Study provides a rationale for windfall provision of housing completions across the Borough. There has been some double counting and the evidence from 2 years of permissions is insufficient to justify a review at this stage. The allocation is note a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation. The

detailed design of the development and the impact of it (e.g. need for security fencing and wildlife) will be considered in detail in the context of a planning application. The need for and type of affordable housing provided will be addressed at the planning application stage. The provision of housing for the elderly is addressed in section 2.40 (paras 17-19) of the Inspector's Report. New developments require open space within the site. However the site adjoins the leisure centre and playing fields.

#### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
005754	302486	Mrs W Slater

#### **Summary of Objection**

The Gedling Local Plan fails to take into any consideration a reduction in housing numbers in the new Joint Structure Plan. Gedling will need 1 000 less homes than at present. 2004 Joint Structure Plan was deposited after the Inspector's Inquiry. Gedling still uses the outdated 1996 Structure Plan. Gedling Borough Council and Inspector has failed to provide 'exceptional circumstances' to justify the removal of the land out of the Green Belt. The Inspector could not take full account the escalation of Backgarden Windfall house building taking place since then in Ravenshead. + letter.

#### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

Cabinet report agreed 21st December 2004 addresses the issue of whether account should be taken of the emerging Joint Structure Plan. This is further reinforced by the legal opinion from Mr Spence QC following GAG 5 legal representation. The principle of releasing Green Belt land to meet the development needs of the Borough was agreed in the Adopted 1996 Structure Plan Review the strategic framework for the Replacement Local Plan. The legal opinion from Mr Spence QC endorses this decision further. The Urban Capacity Study provides a rationale for windfall provision of housing completions across the Borough. There has been some double counting and the evidence from 2 years of permissions is insufficient to justify a review at this stage. The Inspector recommends the site South of Cornwater Fields should be safeguarded and that there is no over-riding need to allocate the site for residential development at this time. It will be treated as green belt for the plan period. Housing is not allocated and cannot be introduced until a sub-regional review of the green belt is completed by the Regional Assembly. The capacity of existing services to accommodate the proposed development has already been comprehensively addressed in the Inspector's Report which refers to 'the (perceived) inadequacy of particular services in Ravenshead' (section 2.40 parags 7-9) including local schools and medical services.

#### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
005772	302558	Mrs K Turner

### **Summary of Objection**

The Gedling Local Plan fails to take into any consideration a reduction in housing numbers in the new Joint Structure Plan. Gedling will need 1 000 less homes than at present. + letter.

Education services would be unacceptably stretched with extra children moving in at Primary and Secondary ages.

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

The principle of releasing Green Belt land to meet the development needs of the Borough was agreed in the Adopted 1996 Structure Plan Review the strategic framework for the Replacement Local Plan. The legal opinion from Mr Spence QC endorses this decision further. The Inspector recommends the site South of Cornwater Fields should be safeguarded and that there is no over-riding need to allocate the site for residential development at this time. It will be treated as green belt for the plan period. Housing is not allocated and cannot be introduced until a sub-regional review of the green belt is completed by the Regional Assembly. The capacity of existing services to accommodate the proposed development has already been comprehensively addressed in the Inspector's Report which refers to 'the (perceived) inadequacy of particular services in Ravenshead' (section 2.40 parags 7-9) including local schools and medical services. Ongoing discussions with Nottinghamshire County Council Education are occurring to ensure that the appropriate contributions are made to future education provision. The Urban Capacity Study provides a rationale for windfall provision of housing completions across the Borough. There has been some double counting and the evidence from 2 years of permissions is insufficient to justify a review at this stage.

### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
005775	302592	Mrs P A Evans
005778	302597	Mr D G Evans

### **Summary of Objection**

The Gedling Local Plan fails to take into any consideration a reduction in housing numbers in the new Joint Structure Plan. Gedling will need 1 000 less homes than at present. Information was not available to the Inspector at the time of the Inquiry. + letter.

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

The principle of releasing Green Belt land to meet the development needs of the Borough was agreed in the Adopted 1996 Structure Plan Review the strategic framework for the Replacement Local Plan. The legal opinion from Mr Spence QC endorses this decision further. The Inspector recommends the site South of Cornwater Fields should be safeguarded and that there is no over-riding need to allocate the site for residential development at this time. It will be treated as green

belt for the plan period. Housing is not allocated and cannot be introduced until a sub-regional review of the green belt is completed by the Regional Assembly. The capacity of existing services to accommodate the proposed development has already been comprehensively addressed in the Inspector's Report which refers to 'the (perceived) inadequacy of particular services in Ravenshead' (section 2.40 parags 7-9) including local schools and medical services. Ongoing discussions with Nottinghamshire County Council Education are occurring to ensure that the appropriate contributions are made to future education provision. The Urban Capacity Study provides a rationale for windfall provision of housing completions across the Borough. There has been some double counting and the evidence from 2 years of permissions is insufficient to justify a review at this stage. The Inspector in his report acknowledged that there were a number of objections to the allocation of this site for residential development when it was included in the First Deposit Plan and has taken them into account with his considerations.

### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
005784	302624	Dr R B Titman

### **Summary of Objection**

The Gedling Local Plan fails to take into consideration a reduction in housing numbers in the Joint Structure Plan and increased house building in the City of Nottingham. Gedling will need 1000 less houses.

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

This objection (that the Council have failed to take into account increased housebuilding in Nottingham City) is essentially requesting the Council to redraft the plan to take account of the emerging Joint Structure Plan. This cannot be done for the reasons set out in the Cabinet report agreed on 21st December 2004 which has since been endorsed by the Full Council and the Council's legal opinion outlined at the beginning of the report. Cabinet report agreed 21st December 2004 addresses the issue of whether account should be taken of the emerging Joint Structure Plan. This is further reinforced by the legal opinion from Mr Spence QC following GAG 5 legal representation.

### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
005886	302902	Mr I McHugh

### **Summary of Objection**

The Gedling Local Plan fails to take into any consideration a reduction in housing numbers in the new Joint Structure Plan. Gedling will need 1 000 less homes than at present. Inspector failing to take into consideration additional housing allocation

in Nottingham and effects of the construction of the subsequent Mansfield - Ashfield regeneration route and alteration in areas plans.

**Council’s Response and Reasoning**

This objection (that the Council have failed to take into account increased housebuilding in Nottingham City) is essentially requesting the Council to redraft the plan to take account of the emerging Joint Structure Plan. This cannot be done for the reasons set out in the Cabinet report agreed on 21st December 2004 which has since been endorsed by the Full Council and the Council's legal opinion outlined at the beginning of the report. Sites related to the MARR are beyond Gedling Borough and the Structure Plan deals with district figures.

**Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
005487	301842	Mr S P Lang

**Summary of Objection**

There is no requirement for an allocation of 595 dwellings at Top Wighay Farm site.

**Council’s Response and Reasoning**

This objection (that 595 houses at Top Wighay Farm are not required) is essentially requesting that the Council redraft the Plan to take account of the emerging Joint Structure Plan. This cannot be done for the reasons set out in the Cabinet report agreed on 21st December 2004 which has since been endorsed by the legal opinion outlined at the beginning of the report.

**Proposed Further Modification**

No change.



## **PM 2.2 H2 DISTRIBUTION OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT**

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
000074	300084	Mr M Corby
000224	300034	Mr M Herbert
000415	300031	Mr F Baker
001750	300085	Miss J Sturton
005024	300037	Mr A Krzesicki
005025	300038	Mrs S Harris
005026	300032	Mrs J P Jackson
005027	300033	Mrs B Llewellyn-Lindsay
005028	300035	Mr L M Howard
005029	300036	Mr M S Jackson
005030	300039	Mr B Needham
005031	300040	Mr S P Smith-Perkins
005039	300082	Mr T M Hill
005040	300083	Mr J Brodie
005625	302167	Ms J Hammond
005765	302536	John Chisholm (Clerk)

### **Summary of Objection**

The Gedling Local Plan fails to take into any consideration a reduction in housing numbers in the new Joint Structure Plan. Gedling will need 1 000 less homes than at present.

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

Cabinet report agreed 21st December 2004 addresses the issue of whether account should be taken of the emerging Joint Structure Plan. This is further reinforced by the legal opinion from Mr Spence QC following GAG 5 legal representation.

### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
000717	301991	Mrs K Haley

### **Summary of Representation**

The inclusion of a paragraph referring to developer contributions for primary and secondary provision is welcomed.

### **Response to Representation**

Your support for this Proposed Change is welcomed.

### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
000717	302007	Mrs K Haley

### **Summary of Objection**

In the table of site-specific details the windfall residential threshold for education contributions is stated as '0.4Ha/25dwgs'. The County Council would prefer this to be 10 dwellings due to the cumulative effect of smaller sites. The Borough Council have successfully secured a Section 106 agreement on a development of 10 dwellings in the past.

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

It is understood that a contribution towards education provision has been secured on one site in the Borough of 10 dwellings, under specific circumstances. As such, it is not considered appropriate to amend the Plan further to reduce the threshold from 25 to 10 dwellings. However, County Education may consult the Borough Council's weekly list of planning applications received and make a comment on applications on which they are not specifically consulted.

### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
000717	302020	Mrs K Haley

### **Summary of Objection**

The replacement text identifies that Plains Road / Arnold Lane (south) site can be accessed via Arnold Lane and Plains Road in a manner compatible with the Gedling Colliery / Chase Farm Access Road (GC/CF). This implies that this site can be undertaken independently of the GC/CF development. It has been shown that suitable access could be provided in conjunction with the GC/CF development but it is not thought feasible that it could be provided in advance of the improvements to the Arnold Lane / Mapperley Plains junction (to be provided as part of the GC/CF development). (This applies also to PM 2.59).

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

The County Council as Highway Authority confirmed by letter in March 2003 that they would have no objections to the inclusion of this site in the Local Plan subject to confirmation that Microprocessor Optimised Vehicle Actuation (MOVA) is installed as part of the junction improvement. Details will be required at the planning application stage.

### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
000721	302399	St Modwen Developments Ltd

### **Summary of Objection**

Although the Inspector felt that more detailed information should be included in Local Plan on developer contributions the table at 2-8 of the Modifications seems to cover

details of contributions on various sites some of which did not seem to be a point of issue in the Local Plan Inquiry. Reference to a health contribution from Park Road should be deleted. The site access/other transport issues rider for Park Road in 2-8 table requiring separate access for industrial allocation is in error since Highway Authority have accepted the existing access point to both housing and industrial allocated areas is acceptable. The footnote should be removed.

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

The table under PM2.2 identifies what issues will be taken into account with respect to each site. The appropriate bodies will be consulted at the time of a planning application and the latest advice taken into account which may or may not lead to a requirement for developer contributions. As such the table is expressed in general terms to indicate where the relevant bodies will need to be consulted. It is accepted that the County's position with regards to accessing the site has altered in the light of the recent planning application relating to the site. Whilst County Highways maintain their view that the preferred approach would be to have only the housing accessed from Park Road and the employment land served by a separate access onto Moor Road they have no objections in principle to a shared access as proposed by the application. As such, the footnote should be amended as suggested.

### **Proposed Further Modification**

Delete the last 6 words of the entry relating to Park Road for 'Site access/other transport issues in the table under paragraph 2.2 (ie the words '... with separate access for industrial allocation).

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
001325	302635	Mr I D Griffiths

### **Summary of Objection**

None of the sites were earmarked in the Revised Deposit Draft and therefore under PPG12 GBC should hold a further public inquiry if they now wish to include housing development on these sites. Some of the sites (eg Top Wighay Farm) have never appeared in a Deposit Plan for residential development and objections to them were not heard at the Public Inquiry.

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

The Top Wighay Farm housing allocation was taken into account by the Inspector into the Local Plan Inquiry and was subject to extensive debate. (IR2.52)

### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
001330	302574	Mr A Johnson

### **Summary of Objection**

CPRE objects to the statement that North of Victoria Park and Teal Close are dependent upon construction of A612 Southern Link Road There is, therefore, no

reason to await the construction of the whole length of A612 Southern Link Road to commence development.

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

The requirement for the development of the Teal Close site to await the construction of the A612 Southern Link Road has been requested by the County Council as highways authority. In any event the construction of the Southern Link Road is under the control of the County Council. Precise timings may change at the planning application stage.

### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
001330	302575	Mr A Johnson

### **Summary of Objection**

CPRE objects to revision of paragraphs 2.19 to 2.24 as proposed. There is no need to allocate land at Top Wighay Farm for housing as sufficient land can be found on other sites to meet either the structure plan guidelines or the dwelling provisions within the emerging structure plan guidelines. Therefore the wording contained within the Second Deposit Draft does not need to be changed.

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

This representation relates to the allocation of Top Wighay Farm. A response is provided on this matter under representations 302566 and 302576.

### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
001330	302576	Mr A Johnson

### **Summary of Objection**

CPRE objects to proposal to allocate Top Wighay Farm for housing. There is no need to allocate land at Top Wighay Farm for housing as sufficient land can be found on other sites to meet either the structure plan guidelines or the dwelling provisions within the emerging structure plan guidelines. CPRE notes that the Inspector chose to allocate land at Top Wighay as a last resort for the following reasons: 'More housing land is required to Gedling Colliery / Chase Farm being unlikely to be completed by 2011'. CPRE notes Inspector recommended that Gedling Colliery site should only be developed once the relief road has been constructed. CPRE believes this put unreasonable burden on developers and that development should be allowed to commence prior to construction of road. 'Replacement land needs to be found for allocations the Inspector was not recommending' - two of these allocations have been reinstated by the Council in its proposed modifications. 'Substantial areas of Safeguarded land are identified to protect the Green Belt after 2011' - this is no longer necessary due to Green Belt review being conducted in 2007 and reduced

housing numbers in the Joint Structure Plan. The Inspector commented that this site was not readily available. In paragraph 12 of his report his view was that 'what is most urgently needed is some readily available building land rather than more allocated land at a large site'.

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

It is noted that this representation is primarily the same as representation (302566) - which differs only in that it includes an additional paragraph. A response to the point that development at the Gedling Colliery site should be allowed to take place before construction of the Gedling Access Road is provided under the objector's specific representation on this matter. Whilst some of the sites that the Inspector was not recommending have been reinstated (in whole or part) by the Council there is still additional replacement land to be found and this is proposed at Top Wighay Farm.. The need for employment land at Top Wighay Farm is addressed under the objector's specific representation on this matter. The need for safeguarded land is addressed under the objector's representations on specific safeguarded sites. With regards to wildlife issues the Inspector has taken into account representations submitted by groups such as Notts Wildlife Trust and the existence of nature conservation designations affecting the site. In considering the amount of land to be allocated at Top Wighay Farm the Inspector notes at paragraph 12 of 2.52 that the area should be regarded as a 'safety valve'. Whether the Top Wighay site would be the first site to be taken out would depend on a range of considerations, including the need for annual monitoring reports in the Local Development Framework.

### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
005773	302586	Mr and Mrs A J Johnson

### **Summary of Objection**

There is no need to allocate the site for housing if the new housing requirements under the Joint Structure Plan are followed.

GBC have failed to provide 'exceptional circumstances' (as confirmed by legal opinion obtained by GAG5).

Many of the original objections submitted in 1999 remain unanswered. (eg relating to effects on flora/fauna, impact on SINC, impact on River Leen).

Flooding issues have not been properly addressed.

Sufficient land can be found on other sites to meet either the Structure Plan guidelines (with flexibility identified by the Inspector) or dwelling provision within emerging Structure Plan.

Inspector only allocated site as a last resort. Requirement that the Gedling Colliery site can be developed only once relief road has been constructed puts an unreasonable burden on developers. So, no development should take place at Top Wighay until proposed extension of NET has been completed. Inspector allocated Top Wighay to replace land that Inspector was not recommending - but two of these have been reinstated by GBC (Teal Close and North of Victoria Park).

Council have suggested that Top Wighay would be the first site to be taken out if the amount of land required is reduced.

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

It is noted that the issues raised in this objection are identical to those raised in representation 302582. The argument that the Local Plan should take into account the reduced housing requirement in the Joint Structure Plan is not accepted for the reasons set out in the detail of the report considered by Cabinet on 14th December 2004 and adjourned to 21st December 2004. This has been further reinforced by legal opinion from Mr Spence QC following GAG5 legal representation.

In terms of exceptional circumstances the principal of releasing green belt land to meet the development needs of the Borough was agreed in the Adopted Structure Plan Review the strategic framework for the Replacement Local Plan. With regards to flooding issues the Inspector notes that 'there is no suggestion of a flood risk at this site' (2.52 paragraph 10). Regarding the need for development at Top Wighay the various points made are addressed in turn:- the flexibility allowance is addressed under representation 302589. The Joint Structure Plan is addressed under representation 302589. With regards to the Gedling Colliery site (and the timing of the new Access Road) this matter was discussed in detail at the Local Plan Inquiry. On the basis of the evidence provided to him the Inspector concluded that there should be a presumption in the Local Plan against the occupation of any dwellings at the site before an access road is built. In reaching his conclusion the Inspector was aware of the length of the remaining Local Plan period. With regards to the timing of the proposed extension of the NET it should be noted that the Transport Assessment for Top Wighay Farm concluded that the integration of the NET into the site would be seen as an enhancement to the development of the site but was not a requirement. The existence of transport infrastructure constraints on the Gedling Colliery and Teal Close sites is part of the justification for the allocation of land at Top Wighay Farm which is free from constraints and can come forward at an early stage. This reflects the Inspector's conclusion that 'what is most urgently needed is some readily available building land'. He notes that the Top Wighay Farm site is immediately available for development. With regards to the amount of land to be allocated at Top Wighay the Inspector notes at paragraph 12 of 2.52 that the area should be regarded as a 'safety valve'. Whether the Top Wighay site would be the first site to be taken out would depend on a range of considerations. Including the need for annual monitoring reports in the Local Development Framework.

### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

## **PM 2.14 H2 DISTRIBUTION OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT**

### **SITE – NORTH OF PARK AVENUE, BURTON JOYCE**

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
005763	302529	Mrs J O'Neill

### **Summary of Representation**

Support proposed modification for deletion of Park Avenue Burton Joyce:- 1) Land is unsuitable for housing. 2) No need for so much additional housing in village.

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

Your support for this Proposed Modification is welcomed. However, the land is still to be removed from the Green Belt in accordance with the Inspectors' Recommendation.

### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

## **PM 2.17 H2 DISTRIBUTION OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT**

### **SITE – STOCKINGS FARM, ARNOLD**

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
001330	302573	Mr A Johnson

### **Summary of Objection**

CPRE objects to proposed change in housing density. The housing density has been reduced around the school. CPRE objects to this as schools are an integral part of the community and provide facilities for use not just during school time but out of school hours. Schools should be well related to locations they are designated to serve and in order to reduce the need to travel be located in higher density areas. CPRE therefore believes the number of dwellings to be constructed on this site should be increased back to 424 as shown in the second deposit.

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

The Inspector concluded that the Local Plan policy on density was sound and in accordance with government guidance. With regards to the increase of density near schools he considered that locations near schools may be ideal for family housing (which is likely to mean larger dwellings and lower densities). The Inspector also noted that journeys to school are a small proportion of all the trips generated by the average household and if short journeys to school are to be achieved only at the expense of longer journeys to work/shops etc. then this does not improve overall sustainability. No evidence has been provided by the objector to counteract these arguments.

### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

## **PM 2.22 H2 DISTRIBUTION OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT**

### **SITE – LINDEN GROVE**

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
000722	302659	Mrs K Martin

### **Summary of Objection**

Disappointed at Inspector's recommendation that land at Linden Grove be deleted. Whilst not proposing site be reinstated object to retention of site in the Green Belt. Propose that land be allocated as white land in common with approach adopted elsewhere (see table on page 2-64 of SDPM).

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

The Inspector's Report considers green belt issues relating to the Linden Grove site at some length. His clear conclusion is that the development of the site would further reduce the openness and effectiveness for a narrow but important gap between Nottingham and Burton Joyce. He therefore recommends that the site should remain in the green belt. No justification is provided by the objector as to why the site should be removed from the green belt and identified as safeguarded land contrary to the Inspector's recommendation.

### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
005763	302527	Mrs J O'Neill

### **Summary of Representation**

Linden Grove - Development will encroach into Green Belt and reduce open space between Burton Joyce and Gedling.

### **Response to Representation**

Your support for this Proposed Modification is welcomed.

### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

## **PM 2.23 H2 DISTRIBUTION OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT**

### **SITE – NORTH OF VICTORIA PARK**

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
000094	300001	Mr T Adams

### **Summary of Objection**

I support the inspector's recommendation and reject the council's response on the grounds that no account is taken of the impact of the development on wildlife close to the site.

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

The Outline Development Brief that has been prepared for the site (and which will be revised in light of the Proposed Modifications) sets out the broad principles of the



ecological enhancement scheme that has been agreed with the key environmental organisations.

**Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
000715	302927	Mrs S Gill

**Summary of Objection**

Note that Council wishes to maintain housing allocation on Land to the north of Victoria Park and provide a replacement playing field at Teal Close. New facility should be of an equivalent or better quality and of equivalent/ better quality than that to be lost. Proposed changes - This should be made clear in background text. - New playing field should be available for use before land north of Victoria Park is developed.

**Council's Response and Reasoning**

This issue is addressed by Policy R1 which requires replacement provision to be of the same or a higher standard. The timing of the replacement provision will be addressed through the Detailed Planning Brief to be prepared for the site.

**Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
000717	302022	Mrs K Haley

**Summary of Objection**

The Proposed modification fails to make the linkage to PM 2.24 and policy H5 to which this site is a part. A suitable reference is required. The occupancy restrictions required for the Teal Close site apply to the land North of Victoria Park.

**Council's Response and Reasoning**

It is noted that the objector accepts that the site is addressed under the new Policy H5 which relates to both Teal Close and North of Victoria Park. It is accepted that PM 2.23 does not directly refer to PM2.24 however the Council's Response and Reasoning does make reference to PM2.24.

**Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
001330	302572	Mr A Johnson

### **Summary of Objection**

CPRE objects to proposed change in housing density. The housing density has been reduced around the school. CPRE objects to this as schools are an integral part of the community and provide facilities for use not just during school time but out of school hours. Schools should be well related to locations they are designated to serve and in order to reduce the need to travel be located in higher density areas. CPRE therefore believes the number of dwellings to be constructed on this site should be increased back to 244 as shown in the second deposit.

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

The Inspector concluded that the Local Plan policy on density was sound and in accordance with government guidance. With regards to the increase of density near schools he considered that locations near schools may be ideal for family housing (which is likely to mean larger dwellings and lower densities). The Inspector also noted that journeys to school are a small proportion of all the trips generated by the average household and if short journeys to school are to be achieved only at the expense of longer journeys to work/shops etc then this does not improve overall sustainability. No evidence has been provided by the objector to counteract these arguments. With regards to the number of dwellings at Park Road Bestwood the Inspector notes that this site is affected by his recommendation (accepted by the Council) that the proximity of a school to a site should not be a reason for raising the density of development. The objector provides no other justification for not accepting the Inspector's recommendation.

### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

## **PM 2.24 H2 DISTRIBUTION OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT**

### **SITE – TEAL CLOSE**

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
000094	300002	Mr T Adams

### **Summary of Objection**

I support the inspector's recommendation and reject the Council's response on the grounds that no account is taken of the impact of the development on wildlife close to the site.

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

The Outline Development Brief that has been prepared for the site (and which will be revised in light of the Proposed Modifications) sets out the broad principles of the ecological enhancement scheme that has been agreed with the key environmental organisations.

### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
000715	302928	Mrs S Gill

**Summary of Objection**

Note that Council wishes to maintain housing allocation on Land to the north of Victoria Park and provide a replacement playing field at Teal Close. New facility should be of an equivalent or better quality and of equivalent/ better quality than that to be lost. Proposed changes - This should be made clear in background text. New playing field should be available for use before land north of Victoria Park is developed.

**Council's Response and Reasoning**

This issue is addressed by Policy R1 which requires replacement provision to be of the same or a higher standard. The timing of the replacement provision will be addressed through the Detailed Planning Brief to be prepared for the site.

**Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
000717	302008	Mrs K Haley

**Summary of Objection**

The 6th bullet point under 'The detailed planning brief will include:-' should state 'Contributions to primary and secondary school provision...' as it should be clear that 'contributions to school provision' is for both primary and secondary school provision.

**Council's Response and Reasoning**

Agree with this amendment, in the interests of clarity.

**Proposed Further Modification**

Amend 6<sup>th</sup> bullet point to refer to both primary and secondary school provision.

<b>Correspondent No</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
000717	302025	Mrs K Haley

**Summary of Objection**

The site will take access from the proposed link road which is being constructed as part of A612 Gedling Transport Improvement Scheme which will need to be open to traffic before any occupation of the housing or employment development takes place. The County Council objects to the proposed wording of Policy H5 and requires the wording to be amended to specifically restrict occupancy of this site until such time as the Gedling Access Road and associated junction improvements have been constructed and opened to traffic. It is suggested that a new sentence is added to read: 'The construction of the Gedling Access Road and associated

junction improvements shall be completed and opened to traffic before any of the dwellings are occupied or any of the employment development is brought into use'.

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

Both Gedling Colliery and land at Teal Close are dependent on major new road proposals. The Transport Assessments have been agreed generally for both sites. It is unreasonable to insist that both sites should be reliant on both new roads before either is developed.

### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
000717	302027	Mrs K Haley

### **Summary of Objection**

Although a considerable amount of transport assessment work has been undertaken at the previous stage of the Plan process the reduced scale of development now proposed means that access arrangements, off site traffic impacts and suitable measures for integration with public transport should be reassessed. Accordingly a revised Transport Assessment will need to be submitted and agreed by the Highway Authority at the planning application stage. The proposed wording of Policy H5 needs to be amended to reflect this requirement.

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

It is accepted that there will be a need to revise the Transport Assessment but it is viewed that this is reflected in Policy H6 and the supporting text and will be addressed in the development brief.

### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
000722	302657	Mrs K Martin

### **Summary of Objection**

STW supports PM2.24 and PM4.2 but minor comments on wording of the proposed policy. Policy requires agreement of a detailed planning brief prior to grant of planning consent. An equally appropriate route would be the preparation of an outline planning application accompanied by a Masterplan and other supporting documents (including an EIA) and this should be noted in the policy or supporting text. Proposals Map identifies land to the NE of the site as open space to serve the allocations and to separate housing from sewage treatment works. STW accept need for open space but object to inference that cordon sanitaire is needed around treatment works. Inference should be deleted. Text should clarify that 9ha of land is allocated for sports/ recreation use to accommodate relocation of existing facilities from the North Victoria Park allocation.

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

Your support for Proposed Modifications 2.24 and 4.2 is welcomed. With regards to your comments on the precise wording of the proposed policy: The preferred route is the agreement of a detailed planning brief prior to the grant of any planning consent in accordance with the approach for all other housing sites with a capacity of more than 50 dwellings (as set out under Policy H2). The reference in the lower case text to the need for separation between the proposed housing area from the existing sewage treatment works to the north of Stoke Lane has been included in the light of the Inspector's comments under the heading 'suitability of the site' under section 2.24 of his report. With regards to the request that the lower case text should refer to the relocation of existing facilities from the North of Victoria Park allocation it is accepted that this would assist clarity.

### **Proposed Further Modification**

Amend lower case text to refer to the relocation of existing facilities from the North of Victoria Park allocation.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
000722	302658	Mrs K Martin

### **Summary of Representation**

Support proposed modification to allocate land at Teal Close for housing contrary to Inspector's recommendations and agrees with the Council's reasoning and response.

### **Response to Representation**

Your support for this Proposed Modification is welcomed.

### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
001330	302570	Mr A Johnson

### **Summary of Objection**

CPRE objects to Teal Close being dependent upon the construction of A612 Southern Link Road. The proposal to await the construction of the A612 Southern Link Road puts an inappropriate constraint on this site which lies adjacent to Colwick Loop Road. CPRE therefore suggest that this site could be accessed from this road through the construction of less than 100 yards of the A612 Southern Link Road. There is therefore no reason to await the construction of the whole length of A612 Southern Link Road to commence development.

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

The requirement for the development of the Teal Close site to await the construction of the A612 Southern Link Road has been imposed by the County Council as highways authority. In any event the construction of the Southern Link Road is under the control of the County Council rather than the landowner/developer of the

Teal Close site such that it is not possible to require a particular stretch of the new road to be constructed in advance of the remainder.

**Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
001332	302549	Mr J Chisholm

**Summary of Objection**

Object to dependence of Teal Close upon construction of A612 southern link road (SLR) - Awaiting construction of A612 SLR puts inappropriate constraint on site adjacent to Colwick Loop Road. Site could be accessed by construction of less than 100 yards of A612 SLR therefore no reason to await construction of whole length.

**Council's Response and Reasoning**

The requirement for the development of the Teal Close site to await the construction of the A612 Southern Link Road has been imposed by the County Council as highways authority. In any event the construction of the Southern Link Road is under the control of the County Council rather than the landowner/developer of the Teal Close site such that it is not possible to require a particular stretch of the new road to be constructed in advance of the remainder.

**Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
001339	302668	Mr D Marsh

**Summary of Objection**

Teal Close - Council's Response and Reasoning refers to the need for detailed proposals to be supported by appropriately detailed flood risk assessment - consistent with Policy ENV38. Proposed change - Flood risk should be considered in the detailed planning brief - additional criteria "- An assessment of flood risk;" should be added.

**Council's Response and Reasoning**

The issue is already covered by Policy ENV38 and it is not considered appropriate to amend the policy relating to Teal Close further.

**Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
005713	302356	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**

Whilst it is accepted that the timescale for progress on the A612 Southern Link Road has slipped, there is no evidence that the road will not be completed in an appropriate time frame such that development of the Teal Close site can take place within the Local Plan period. Issues of contamination were considered by the Inspector. They are addressed in the Outline Development Brief that has been prepared for the (larger) site and will be reviewed through the Revised Development Brief to take account of the Proposed Modifications.

### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
005713	302360	Mr C Woodward

### **Summary of Objection**

Evidence of some housing in area suffering from damp which may be caused by the relatively high water table. More information about this issue is required before the proposals can proceed.

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

Damp can come from a number of sources. Proper construction should address the issue through a damp proof course. Change in ground levels and poor ventilation can also affect damp.

### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
005713	302362	Mr C Woodward

### **Summary of Objection**

Should the housing allocations at Teal Close be accepted, they should not be subject to the affordable housing policy. Other sites such as Gedling Colliery and Top Wighay can make up any shortfall of affordable housing.

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

The supporting text to Policy H16 (Affordable Housing) explains that a requirement for affordable housing will apply where there is evidence of need. The amount and type of need will therefore be given detailed consideration at the time of a planning application relating to the site.

**Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
005747	302448	Mrs Y Jones

**Summary of Representation**

The Local Plan Inspector concluded that Teal Close could not be developed due to flood risk - subsequently proven to be wrong.

**Response to Representation**

Your support for this Proposed Modification is welcomed.

**Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
005773	302585	Mr and Mrs A J Johnson

**Summary of Objection**

The proposal to await construction of A612 Southern Link Road puts inappropriate constraint on site adjacent to Colwick Loop Road. Suggest that site could be accessed by the construction of less than 100 yards of A612 Southern Link Road therefore no reason to await construction of whole length.

**Council's Response and Reasoning**

The requirement for the development of the Teal Close site to await the construction of the A612 Southern Link Road has been imposed by the County Council as highways authority. In any event the construction of the Southern Link Road is under the control of the County Council rather than the landowner/developer of the Teal Close site such that it is not possible to require a particular stretch of the new road to be constructed in advance of the remainder.

**Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

**PM 2.32 H2 DISTRIBUTION OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT**

**SITE – DARK LANE**

All of the following representations raised one or more of the issues listed below, albeit that the issue may have been expressed differently by a different correspondent. After the following list, each issue is summarised in turn and the Council's response and reasoning is provided for each issue.



<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
000018	300778	Mrs M Brackenbury
000035	301625	Mr P Burton
000099	300785	Mrs S Sellors
000100	300784	Mr P Sellors
000119	300779	Mr T Brackenbury
000140	302224	Mrs V Williams
000185	300155	Mrs M Howes
000551	300230	Mrs C Chamberlain
000648	300553	Mrs I Walker
000649	302612	Mr R Walker
000717	302015	Mrs K Haley
000998	301983	Mr G Withers
000998	301984	Mr G Withers
001324	302511	Mr J Fletcher
001641	300593	Mr K Horton
001718	300596	Mrs S Wood
001718	302519	Mrs S Wood
001719	302047	Mr C Peck
001734	301626	Mr D Smith
001734	302817	Mr D Smith
002711	302795	Mrs D A Wilson
003959	302521	Mr N Burrows
003975	300589	Mrs P Nyblen
004271	302766	Mrs B A Gretton
004277	302765	Mr J M Gretton
004633	300551	Miss M A Teasel
005020	300006	Mrs E Pierce
005021	300007	Ms S Price
005022	300008	Dr B G Ferguson
005034	300058	Mr A W Wilkes
005036	300073	Mr T Smith
005037	300074	Mr T S Turner
005038	300075	Mrs C A Mellors
005041	300098	Mrs A Martin
005080	300361	Mrs P Culley
005081	300362	Mr & Mrs G F Read
005104	300541	Mrs A E Smitten
005107	300552	Mrs R H Broomhead
005108	300554	Mrs A Atkin
005112	300577	Mrs K L Freeman
005113	300578	Mrs R S Shaw
005114	300579	Mrs J L Patterson
005115	300580	Mr S B Imms
005116	300581	Mrs A Fowler
005117	300582	Mrs J Murray
005118	300583	Mrs S Webster
005119	300584	Mrs G Cregan
005120	300585	Mr G M Rowlinson
005121	300586	Mrs J Anscombe

005122	300587	Mrs N Ingham
005123	300588	Ms L Majewski
005124	300590	Mrs S Bennett
005125	300591	Mrs K Navarro
005126	300592	Mrs U Brown
005127	300594	Mrs J Woodward
005128	300595	Mr & Mrs J R Crawford
005129	300597	Mr & Mrs C & J Fisher
005130	300598	Mr K Wood
005131	300599	Mrs M Bayles
005132	300600	Miss H Lawlor
005133	300601	Mr I Pilkington
005134	300602	Mr P Astill
005135	300603	Mrs C Brosnan
005136	300604	Mrs L Latham
005137	300605	Mrs S Meads
005138	300606	Mr D Meads
005139	300607	Mrs B Snodin
005140	300608	Mr D Houlden
005141	300609	Mr S Herbert
005142	300610	Mr B Moore
005143	300611	Mrs L Smith
005144	300612	Mrs J E Swinscoe
005145	300613	Mrs M Judd
005146	300614	Mr P Covington
005147	300615	Mrs C Matthews
005148	300616	Mrs S Smith
005149	300617	Mrs A M Lee
005173	300740	Mrs D Walter
005174	300741	Mr K Walter
005178	300754	Mrs E A Grimshaw
005179	300755	Mrs C E Luscombe
005180	300756	Dr J Unell
005183	300766	Dr I S Unell
005184	300767	Mr R Laverick
005187	300780	Mr J D Perry
005188	300781	Mr P G Stevenson
005189	300782	Miss R Sinclair
005190	300783	Mrs J Greaves
005190	302387	Mrs J Greaves
005201	300876	Ms L Jordan
005223	300982	Mr A Greaves
005223	302385	Mr A Greaves
005238	301032	Mrs J Teape
005239	301033	Miss E M Lee
005261	301139	Mrs G J Parr
005268	301175	Mr D Sellors
005269	301176	Mrs C M Sellors
005280	301202	Mrs P Lea
005281	301203	Mrs A Richards

005282	301204	Mrs H Beardsley
005358	301538	Ms V J Powell
005359	301539	Mr J H Evans
005385	301624	Mr & Mrs P & E Stone
005385	302381	Mr & Mrs P & E Stone
005580	302045	Mrs P Hipkiss
005582	302052	Mr M W Sisson
005584	302054	Mrs J Moore
005669	302239	Mr D Swinscoe
005674	302251	Mrs E S Patterson
005676	302252	Mr K Patterson
005680	302262	Mrs J M Smith
005681	302264	Mr D G Smith
005682	302267	Miss A L Smith
005685	302275	Mrs J Howard
005698	302320	Mrs A Evans
005700	302329	Mr & Mrs J & P Thompson
005701	302332	Mrs J Thompson
005702	302335	Mr W B Wright
005703	302339	Mrs A Wood
005705	302341	Mrs P Miller
005707	302345	Mrs V Burns
005708	302348	Mr C W Rowland
005709	302350	Mr K I Dean
005710	302351	Mr C Williams
005711	302354	Mrs R A Reynolds
005712	302355	Miss L Nicholas
005714	302357	Mrs D Thorpe
005715	302358	Mrs L Barnes
005716	302361	Ms C Nixon
005717	302367	Mr M C Anderson
005718	302370	Mr A Gilmour
005719	302371	Mr J Truman
005720	302373	Miss L Kell
005721	302374	Mrs N Scotton
005722	302375	Mr P Snuggs
005723	302378	Miss B Allman
005724	302379	Mr P Allman
005726	302384	Mrs M Moon
005727	302386	Mrs S Evans
005729	302390	Mr W B Hopkin
005731	302393	Mr N Quilty
005732	302397	Mrs E Quilty
005733	302398	Mr F C Taylor
005734	302401	Mrs S E Marriott
005735	302404	Mrs J M Taylor
005736	302408	Miss K Ford
005738	302411	Miss D R Butler
005744	302427	Mr P A Cocking
005745	302430	Mrs J Jones

005759	302518	Mr V Hajigeorgiou
005760	302528	Mr E Kolasa
005766	302537	Mrs P Singleton
005768	302544	Miss J Gilmour
005769	302548	Mr P Thompson
005785	302627	Mrs L A Bunn
005829	302762	Mr J G Turrill
005831	302770	Miss R Wood
005832	302774	Mr L Hazeldine
005834	302776	Mrs C Reilly
005835	302778	Miss R Rosenkranz
005836	302780	Mrs I Dodson
005837	302782	Mr I C Dodson
005840	302787	Mr S French
005841	302789	Mrs A Martin
005842	302791	B R Fawthrop
005843	302793	Mr S M Russell
005844	302794	Mrs L R Russell
005845	302796	Mrs A P Pregon
005846	302797	Mrs C M Smith
005847	302798	Mrs P Gregg
005848	302799	Mrs M Cairns
005849	302800	Mr A J Breffitt
005852	302814	Mr A Richards
005853	302816	Mrs J Dimmock
005854	302818	Mrs B A Hankin
005856	302819	Mr M Hankin
005857	302821	Mrs F A Parker
005858	302822	Mrs J Todd
005859	302823	Mrs J Gaine
005860	302824	Mrs R Lee
005861	302825	Mrs L Cook
005863	302826	Mr J B Wood
005864	302828	Miss J Morton
005865	302830	Mrs D Shaw
005866	302832	Mrs E M Atkinson
005867	302834	Mr R Snodin
005868	302836	Mr M Watson
005870	302838	Mrs T Jones
005871	302841	Mrs J Challand
005872	302852	Mrs C Hirst
005876	302854	Mrs K Jones
005877	302856	Mrs A M Sleigh

### **Summary of Objection (process)**

The site has not appeared in previous versions of the Local Plan and so it cannot be agreed without Public Inquiry. As the weight of public opinion was not expressed during 2003 Inquiry, no issue can be regarded as having been comprehensively addressed and no hearing of objections has been given. Developers have been given an unreasonable advantage in being able to present unopposed reasons for

development. The recent public meeting showed democratic overwhelming view of residents against development - decision made in favour of development is unjust.

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

Current planning legislation enables sites to be promoted by developers through the local plan process and for the Inspector to consider the merits of those sites through the Local Plan Inquiry. Modifications to the local plan to include an alternative site are subject to a consultation exercise and this provides the opportunity for representations to be made in relation to the 'new' site. Officers recommended this site in 2000 but Councillors overturned that recommendation. This led to some representations supporting the site's retention in the green belt. These covered most of the objections presented elsewhere in this document and were considered by the Inspector. The wording of objections is material not the quantity. The Borough Council itself did not object to Dark Lane at the Inquiry the Independent councillor scheduled to do so sadly passed away beforehand. The current procedure is therefore analogous to that for objections to previous stages of the local plan. Following the end of the consultation period the Council have carefully considered all the representations submitted.

### **Summary of Objection (Green Belt)**

Gedling Borough Council have not provided 'exceptional circumstances' as required by the Green Belt policy PPG2 to justify the removal of this site from the Green Belt.

The site is on Green Belt land which should be a last resort when all other sites of lesser significance have been fully developed - in Calverton they clearly have not been.

The new green belt boundary proposed by this development is not defensible - unprotected on the western edge.

Development would be perceived as an incursion into open countryside and not as infill.

Development is situated on rising ground close to historic centre of village - would be highly visible from Main Street and spoil views from Green Belt paths around it.

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

The principle of releasing Green Belt land to meet the development needs of the Borough was agreed in the Adopted 1996 Structure Plan Review the strategic framework for the Replacement Local Plan. The legal opinion from Mr Spence QC endorses this decision further.

The Inspector considered a number of sites in Calverton (in addition to the allocation at Flatts Lane) and his recommendation was that the site at Dark Lane was the most appropriate for allocation (IR 2.32). The few remaining brownfield sites have been considered by the recent Urban Capacity Study. Nearby Calverton Colliery was considered inappropriate by both the Council and the Inspector. Following extensive debate over the rate of deliverability of dwellings on the Gedling Colliery site the Inspector concluded (IR2.62) that it would be reasonable and realistic to assume that

only 700 dwellings are likely to be completed by 2011. The Borough Council has accepted this recommendation. In addition the progress on this site has been delayed by the owners who are aware they are behind the project plan presented at the Local Plan Inquiry.

The Inspector at the Local Plan Inquiry concluded (IR2.32) that the impact of the development of the Dark Lane site on the Green Belt the landscape the immediate surrounds and the village as a whole are all acceptable. The need to release Green Belt land was endorsed in the 1996 Structure Plan. It will provide a more permanent boundary. There are no proposed sites safeguarded for development to the west so they are secure as Green Belt.

The development is below the ridge line to the south to reduce its visibility from Calverton. Dark Lane itself will be screened by extra native planting.

### **Summary of Objection (Highways/Access)**

Access roads to and from proposed site are already reaching un-managable proportions. Heavy lorries through Calverton are making Main Street hazardous. Georges Lane/Calverton Road is currently a nightmare and other roads into village are not much better. The additional traffic for approximately 100 houses could lead to 200 additional cars – there have already been two near misses with children and vehicles. Existing blind corners.

Dark Lane is without an obvious access. It is virtually land locked. Access not appropriate either onto Main Street or via Renals Way. Proposed access onto Main Street at a point where traffic is already heavy (due to the proximity of a junior school, the petrol station opposite and the household recycling site) will create an additional hazard. It's already difficult to cross Main Street. New junction will be placed between two most vulnerable groups in community - elderly and children. On-street parking on Main Street reduces visibility. Visibility on/from access road. Effect of increased traffic especially in view of proximity of St Wilfrids School and local shops with children crossing an already very busy road. Between Renals Way and proposed exit is a Primary and Junior School entrance which already is far too dangerous for children crossing.

Consent should be obtained from the Emergency Services - as there are grave doubts that the access is viable in the event of an emergency on the site.

Renals Way is barely able to cope with existing traffic and its junction with Main Street will cause numerous accidents if there is any further increase. Renals Way was never constructed to deal with continuous flow of heavy vehicles and would not cope. Parking on Renals Way is a major hazard. Increasing traffic is not justifiable especially in respect of emergency vehicle access and egress. Renals Way currently has enough traffic on it and we were told at consultation of Local Plan 3 years ago by councillors from planning dept that no more vehicles could go on Renals Way. Narrow Road. On-street parking on both sides of Renals Way.

Suggest traffic lights at the end of Renals Way and Main Street.

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

Two potential designs to provide safe access are considered satisfactory by the Highways Agency. These will have regard to visibility traffic and road safety issues affecting school children and other pedestrians. The developer contributions based on the Interim Transport Planning Statement (I.T.P.S.) prepared by the City and County Councils could be used for improved safety measures if planning permission is granted.

The emergency services will be consulted as part of the planning brief for the site.

Notts CC recommend a link between the allocated site access and Renals Way to overcome the fact both housing areas would exceed the maximum number of houses permissible from a cul de sac. But the Borough Council propose only narrow emergency access to prevent loss of healthy trees. This will prevent normal traffic accessing Renals Way from the development.

### **Summary of Objection (Built Environment)**

Access onto Main Street would not be possible with reference to current guidelines (regarding visibility splays) without loss of character due to the demolition of historic buildings (inconveniently placed, rather too opaque and contrary to junction visibility standards). It is vital to preserve the conservation area around Dark Lane.

Loss of cohesive collection of historic buildings - No.115 Main Street is a typical cluster of buildings in a working village. Demolition of part of this cluster will destroy the integrity of the group and its rationale. Loss of continuity of village landscape - this area suffers from lack of inclusion in a conservation area. Further degrading either by demolition of historic buildings or alteration to the road will destroy visual continuity.

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

The development is outside the existing Conservation Areas. English Heritage have rejected an application to list buildings at 115 Main Street (at the site entrance). The preferred visibility and access designs minimise building loss and the Planning Brief for the site can address the remaining frontage by specifying the form and design of any altered and/or replacement buildings.

### **Summary of Objection (Trees)**

The development would lead to the loss of established oak and ash trees at the end of Renals Way. The historic oak trees are subject to TPOs and should remain so.

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

The emergency access will avoid the Tree Preservation Order (TPO) oaks. Their status was critically reviewed as a result of objections.

### **Summary of Objection (School)**

Building work near school - noise dust danger and heavy traffic.

An increase in school children will jeopardise the quality of education St Wilfrids is about to offer. In other areas in the county schools are closing because they do not have enough children attending.

Primary school has noted a significant rise in accidents recently even with existing traffic flows.

There has already been an accident injuring a school child where a primary school path exits into Renals Way.

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

Any disturbance or nuisance arising from this would be dealt with under separate legislation. Construction works would inevitably generate some disturbance but this is not sufficient reason to justify a refusal of planning permission.

Notts CC Education state contributions will be required for improving primary and secondary education buildings in Calverton.

### **Summary of Objection (Flooding/Drainage)**

The present drainage system (involving foul water and sewerage) is inadequate and acknowledged as an ongoing problem by GBC and Severn Trent. These issues were not considered by the Inspector. Old sewers and over-capacity drains.

Main Street is subject to serious periodic flooding associated with heavy rainfall. All roads from new developments (Renals Way and Smithy View) converge onto Main Street in the area subject to flooding. At times of heavy rainfall, the surface water drainage system has continued to be ineffective resulting in flood water converging on the area. Main Street was flooded during the storm six years ago - the sewers overflowed and presented unacceptable hazard to public health. Latest flooding event occurred Thursday 6 January 2005.

This proposed development would increase the frequency and severity of flooding to businesses, residential properties and a primary school entrance.

The existing natural drainage on the proposed building land will be lost resulting in drain-off onto Main Street which presently suffers flash floods. Concrete does not absorb rain water.

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

Severn Trent Water have no objections, but envisage that some off site work is required including attenuation to manage peak discharge. Also Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDS) to absorb run-off and create habitats will be required. Consultation will continue with Severn Trent, the Environment Agency and the developer at the planning application stage.

### **Summary of Objection (Services)**

Services in Calverton are already overburdened. Concern expressed regarding impact on health service resources (which are already operating beyond capacity). Police force is already stretched beyond breaking point. The development will exacerbate existing problems. Existing facilities are being eroded or closing because of lack of funding and attention or are being overburdened.



### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

More residents may assist the viability of the leisure centre. Police under-provision is not a planning matter. Developer contributions to address service requirements stemming from the development will be needed. Calvertons' ranking as an 'inset' village suitable for limited development was upheld by the Inspector. Gedling Primary Care Trust confirm developer contributions will be required at the planning application stage to expand existing healthcare provision. Notts CC Education state contributions will be required for improving primary and secondary education buildings in Calverton.

In assessing applications for new development, the Borough Council consider the need for the provision of community facilities arising from the proposal. Conditions will be imposed planning obligations or legal agreements will be sought in order to secure appropriate community facilities or financial contributions.

### **Summary of Objection (Agricultural Land)**

Loss of Grade 2 agricultural land.

Disregard for PPG7 - Dark Lane contains high grade agricultural land so should be protected as a valuable resource.

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

The Inspector believed loss of agricultural land had to be considered if no other sites were available.

### **Summary of Objection (Conservation/Wildlife)**

The development will result in the loss/destruction of bird and wild animal habitat including the Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) no. 2/367 in appendix II.

In accordance with PPG9 and EC Habitats Directive (sections 4.8 and 4.9) the precautionary principle should guide every land use decision. GBC is deviating too much from its own Technical guidance.

The field boundaries and Dark Lane in particular contain English Elm (*Ulmus procera*) on which the scarce butterfly Whiteletter Hairstreak (*Strymonidia w-album*) is totally dependent. This butterfly lives in small colonies at this location and would not survive hedge trimming, tree removal or urbanisation in general. Translocation of the species is not possible. This site should not be released for development but rather upgraded to SINC status.

Dark Lane, Keen Well and field are ancient sites which date from Saxon Times at least. Threat to sensitive site - Keen Well and the Spring are unique to the village as the last remaining visible well and spring. The Well has myths and legends attached to it. Therefore the whole area on the south side of Calverton is of historic importance and should not be built on and left as green belt agricultural land. There is little left of this ancient village. Ancient Dark Lane would be breached in 2 places.

Destruction of ancient hedgerow for access road.

The area is invaluable open space for many.

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

The site is not formally protected as a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) notwithstanding the recent review of SINC's carried out in 2004. Most of the site is either arable or fallow land. Hedges and wooded Dark Lane are to be thickened and enhanced with native species. Wetland at Keenwell will be protected. There will be consultation with English Nature and Notts. Biological and Geological Records Centre over mitigation and habitat creation measures. As such, wildlife issues are not a reason to preclude the development of the site.

The line of Dark Lane not affected by development. It will not be blocked or re-routed. Dark Lane itself will be screened by extra native planting. Notts CC Archaeological Officer states that they hold no evidence for any archaeological interest affected by the proposal but an evaluation would be required at the planning application stage.

The Keenwell is outside the allocated site but a development brief can ensure the layout respects both this feature and the adjacent spring, using additional planting where appropriate. The Inspector into the Local Plan Inquiry concluded (IR2.32) that the impact of the development of the Dark Lane site on the Green Belt, the landscape, the immediate surrounds and the village as a whole are all acceptable. The development is below the ridge line to the south to reduce its visibility from Calverton.

### **Summary of Objection (Footpaths)**

Loss of footpaths linking the village, school, wood and park.

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

The public footpath between school and playing field will cross the access road and safety measures will be installed to ensure it can be crossed safely. No footpaths cross the development site itself and the Dark Lane path is unaffected except by the emergency access which will be designed to give a minimum impact.

### **Summary of Objection (Need)**

The additional 110 dwellings are not needed. New Structure Plan/ Regional Planning Guidance do not require proposed allocation of 110 dwellings. The Gedling Local Plan overlooks the reduction in housing numbers in the new Joint Structure Plan. Gedling will need 1 000 less homes than at present. Removal of Green Belt sites will pre-empt the strategic Assembly Review of 2007. The latest version of the Gedling Local Plan takes more land out of Green Belt than the first version in 1997 despite a proven reduction in new homes required. Gedling Colliery should deliver more houses before 2011 than currently shown in the modified plan. Brownfield sites should be built on before any Greenfield sites.

There are already properties for sale, empty properties (including Langridge's houses on Renals Way) and properties boarded up. The village has seen the Cloverfields development, the refuge site etc.

Falling birth rates - housing market has slowed considerably recently due to a lack of demand.

Calverton does not need further affordable housing - already has sufficient with the Council and pit estates and the Calverton caravan park plus new builds going ahead on Flatts Lane. Houses are not needed because of the Flatts Lane allocation.

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

The allocation was recommended by the Inspector into the Local Plan Inquiry (IR 2.32). The Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) review has to take account of latest household projections and they are currently 18 to 19% above the annualised rate for the approved RSS. Cabinet report agreed 21st December 2004 addresses the issue of whether account should be taken of the emerging Joint Structure Plan. This is further reinforced by the legal opinion from Mr Spence QC following GAG 5 legal representation. The Local Plan Inquiry Inspector clarifies that the use of safeguarded land policy will not pre-empt future green belt reviews (2.63 paras 19-22). In response to the comment that the Proposed Modifications take more land out of the Green Belt than the first version of the Local Plan this is technically true. However as safeguarded land is to be treated as green belt for the lifetime of the Local Plan then the Revised Deposit as amended by the Proposed Modifications releases less land for development than the Consultative Draft plan 1998. Following extensive debate over the rate of deliverability of dwellings on the Gedling Colliery/Chase Farm site the Inspector concluded (IR2.62) that it would be reasonable and realistic to assume that only 700 dwellings are likely to be completed by 2011. The Borough Council has accepted this recommendation. In addition the progress on this site has been delayed by the owners who are aware they are behind the project plan presented at the Local Plan Inquiry. The Inspector considered a number of sites in Calverton (in addition to the allocation at Flatts Lane) and his recommendation was that the site at Dark Lane was the most appropriate for allocation (IR 2.32). The few remaining brownfield sites have been considered by the recent Urban Capacity Study. Nearby Calverton Colliery was considered inappropriate by both the Council and the Inspector. But both agreed only 700 of the 1120 dwellings would be completed by 2011 at Gedling Colliery.

Housebuilders are unlikely to continue building rates if properties do not sell. Gedling Borough Council guidelines are for 20% affordable houses. The South Nottinghamshire Affordable Housing Study is used by the Borough Council to assess the need for affordable housing. This has been accepted by other Local Plan Inspectors as a sound basis for Local Plan policies.

The Inspector considered a number of sites in Calverton (in addition to the allocation at Flatts Lane) and his recommendation was that the site at Dark Lane was the most appropriate for allocation (IR 2.32).

### **Summary of Representation**

Langridge Homes Ltd supports the Council's proposed modification to allocate land at Dark Lane for about 100 dwellings. The Inspector notes the site is a sustainable location being close to Calverton village centre where there are a wide range of services including public transport available. The impacts upon the Green Belt and surrounding landscape are considered acceptable. Site access arrangements from Main Street have been agreed with the Highway Authority (County Council). There are no infrastructure constraints. Local concerns about impact upon surface water drainage and Keenwell (just outside the site) can be addressed through design process.

### **Response to Representation**

Your support for this Proposed Modification is welcomed.

### **Summary of Representation**

Wish to raise the following points in support of proposed Dark Lane housing development:- Ideal choice of site to fulfil necessary development requirements. Long period already for arguments to be analyzed. Existing problems such as flooding sewerage access and traffic could be resolved through detailed planning application process. Development will remove pressure to develop more sensitive sites.

### **Response to Representation**

Your support for this Proposed Modification is welcomed.

### **Summary of Objection**

The County Council does not object in principle to this allocation but an area which may be included in the allocation is designated as a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation - Grassland (Horse Grazed) Calverton SINC (Ref No 5/334). This site should be excluded from the allocation or the supporting text to H2 should be amended to include a statement that SINC will be retained within the development. This site should also be identified on Proposals Map.

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

Paragraph 1.77 of the supporting text of the Revised Deposit Local Plan already confirms that SINC's will be shown on the Adopted Local Plan Proposals Map. It should be noted that SINC 5/334 lies some way outside of the Dark Lane allocation and there is therefore no need to exclude the SINC from the allocation. The impact of development on the nearby SINC's will be addressed through the Development Brief to be prepared for the site.

## Other Issues

### **Summary of Objection**

County Council should consider building a new 'Town' at Newton where infrastructure is already in place - empty houses and good road access ie everything we haven't got.

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

RAF Newton is outside the Borough the future of this site is being addressed through the emerging Rushcliffe Local Plan.

### **Summary of Objection**

Undermining the quality of life of residents of 11 12 14 and 15 Smithy View and value of their properties.

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

The effect on the value of properties is not a planning consideration. The housing market is governed by other factors, for example interest rates and mortgage availability.

### **Summary of Objection**

If development goes ahead then the Council should ensure that the access road from Main Street be constructed before building work commences, so that construction traffic does not use Renals Way/Keenwell.

Renals Way residents had to put up with disruption over 3 years when Keenwell Pastures was further developed. The new development would create much more disruption.

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

The main access will be from Main Street not Renals Way. This can be enforced through a planning condition if planning permission is granted.

### **Summary of Objection**

Land ownership - a SIM search with land registry reveals that the land is unregistered and does not belong to developer.

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

The Borough Council has been advised by the current owner of the site that a development agreement is under consideration.

**Summary of Objection**

Sustainability - lead to increase in traffic making long commuter journeys into work in Nottingham.

**Council's Response and Reasoning**

Calverton has one of the best improved bus routes in the County.

**Summary of Objection**

Inaccuracies of plans - plans used were inaccurate.

**Council's Response and Reasoning**

Sufficient information has been provided to assess the principle of the allocation.

**Summary of Objection**

Need for a policy to ensure a wildlife 'buffer' zone around development sites. It is unfair that smaller villages are protected from development. The Inspector's Report from the early 1980s planning appeal has not been considered.

**Council's Response and Reasoning**

Detailed wildlife issues will be considered at the planning application stage. The "share" of development around the Borough is addressed in the Inspector's Report. The 1980 planning appeal was determined in a completely different strategic context.

**Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

**PM 2.34 H2 DISTRIBUTION OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT**

**SITE – NEW FARM**

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
001057	302093	Mrs H Lawson
001145	302091	Mr D Lawson
001956	301665	Mrs B Hill
001976	302613	Ms T Thomas
002011	301492	Mr T Hill
002039	301149	Mr G Webster
002040	301148	Mrs J Webster
002046	302145	C Knight
002047	302639	Ms A Farrow
002048	302636	Mr S Hopkins
002169	301192	Mrs D Hallett
002170	301491	Ms J Scott
002173	302231	Ms D Humphries
002186	302270	Ms A Stringer

002187	302271	Mrs S Stringer
002190	302098	Mrs H Cater
002191	302099	Mr P Cater
002231	302140	Mr R Vaughan-Newton
002295	301529	Mrs W Wright
002417	301307	Mrs J Thompson
002464	302124	Mrs A Hall
002465	302127	Miss N Hall
002485	301464	Ms V Barker
002486	301458	Mr M Barker
002515	300292	Mr S Adams
002516	300291	Ms M Adams
002519	302136	Ms V Ford
002541	301187	Mr D Rudd
002543	301198	Mr E Towle
002551	302064	Ms J Martin
002659	302377	Mr R Lake
002830	302628	Mr J Sharp
002884	302279	Ms P Runnalls
002885	302278	T Pitman
002903	302094	Mr P Latter
002905	302096	Mrs T Latter
002906	302631	Mr D Sharp
003013	302663	Mr D Crowson
003015	302664	Ms B Crowson
003017	302276	R Pearson
003018	302277	Mrs V Pearson
003230	302141	Mrs C Branch
003239	301510	Mrs P Roberts
003275	301507	Mrs M Kirk
003326	301138	Mrs M Thomas
003329	302334	Mr D Goatham
003416	301511	D Roberts
003460	301527	Mrs V Padwick
003464	301528	Rev D Padwick
003783	302331	Mrs J Green
003785	302330	Mr K Green
005278	301200	Mrs P Pitt
005279	301201	Mr K Pitt
005310	301310	Mrs E B Abbey
005601	302102	Mr E Shaw
005602	302104	Miss L Walters
005604	302106	Mrs J Stanley
005608	302116	Mr J C Stanley
005613	302131	Mr J F Haslam
005661	302221	Mr M D Smalley
005662	302222	Mrs M Smalley
005683	302272	Mr P Whitehead
005684	302274	Mrs H Bradbury
005697	302322	Mrs H Hogg

005774	302593	Ms S Clivery
005787	302645	Mr P Salisbury
005798	302697	Mr N Douse

### **Summary of Representation**

New Farm should remain within the Green Belt. The unresolved problem of transport/access to New Farm puts the principle of development there in doubt. Additional traffic on Mansfield Road between Leapool Island and Daybrook would be unmanageable and create safety issues.

### **Response to Representation**

Your support for this Proposed Modification is welcomed.

### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
001324	302513	Mr J Fletcher

### **Summary of Objection**

Langridge Homes Ltd supports Inspector's Recommendation that all land at New Farm identified by the Council's sieve map analysis should be designated as Safeguarded Land and therefore disagrees with the Council's decision to make no change to the land's Green Belt status:- a) Since the Public Inquiry (2003) no progress has been made with the proposed Gedling Colliery/ Chase Farm housing allocation recommended by the Inspector for 700 dwellings to be built by 2011. The complexities of the scheme regarding the need for the construction of the Gedling Access Road before houses can be occupied mean that there is a risk that fewer than 700 houses will be built. b) Population and household projections based on the 2001 Census are available indicating a need to allocate about 20% more land for houses across the region. While these have not been tested at a Public Inquiry they reinforce the PPG2 guidance that Green Belt boundaries should endure beyond the plan period. Generally the Borough Council has adopted this approach but it has failed to include the major urban edge site which satisfies the PPG3 sequential test criteria. c) The transport arguments for not accepting the Inspector's Recommendation do not stand up. The proposed new access roads from Leapool Island (north) and Bestwood Lodge Drive (south) would enable buses to pass through the site from the proposed Leapool Park and Ride avoiding potential bottlenecks along Mansfield Road (Arch Hill). d) While Severn-Trent the Environment Agency and the Borough Council have successfully overcome potential flood risks to the Teal Close (Netherfield) development there is no certainty that this site can be delivered during the plan period due to delays in implementing the A612 major integrated transport scheme and uncertainties about Severn-Trent's operational requirements.

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

This representation disagrees with the Council's decision not to accept the Inspector's Recommendation to identify land at New Farm for a number of reasons. These reasons are addressed in turn. Regarding the number of dwellings likely to



come forward within the Plan period at Gedling Colliery this matter is addressed under representation 302522. With regards to the issue of safeguarded land the Proposed Modifications identify a similar order of safeguarded land to that recommended by the Inspector and the sites identified still include land adjoining the urban area (at Teal Close and at Top Wighay Farm). In response to the transport arguments the Council maintains it's view that it is not considered likely that highways issues will be resolved within the current Plan period. No evidence to the contrary has been provided by the Objector. - Notwithstanding that progress on implementing the A612 major integrated transport scheme has been delayed there is no evidence that the Teal Close and North of Victoria Park housing allocations cannot be brought forward within the Plan period.

### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
001940	302571	FPD Savills

### **Summary of Objection**

On behalf of Nottingham High School for Girls / Girls Day School Trust we object to the Council's disagreement with the Inspector's Report concerning the need to retain 'White land'. The reasons being: (1) there are delays in the implementation of the Gedling Colliery / Chase Farm allocation (2) the new household projections for the region show a significant increase in the region of 20% (3) allocation as White Land will enable further work to be carried out to resolve the transport / access problems.

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

With regards to the number of dwellings units that will be completed by 2011 the Local Plan (through PM 2.52) provides for any demonstrable shortage of housing land that may be caused by the slow delivery at Gedling Colliery/Chase Farm. The Inspector provides a clear justification for identifying safeguarded land at Top Wighay Farm as the first area of search for compensatory housing land. With regards to the regional household formation projections the Proposed Modifications identify a similar order of safeguarded land to that recommended by the Inspector. In response to the transport arguments the Council maintains it's view that it is not considered to likely that highways issues will be resolved within the current Plan period. No evidence to the contrary has been provided by the Objector.

### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
001968	302700	Mrs C Moore
001977	302619	Mr G Thomas
002005	302060	Mrs C Thornton
002009	302056	Mr B MacDonald
002018	301486	Mrs E Waters

002045	302144	E Knight
002068	301477	Mrs B Hearson
002069	301480	Mr G Hearson
002071	301306	Mr B Rose
002168	301468	Mrs M Cumberland
002174	302233	Mr D Humphries
002182	302641	A Roberts
002192	301034	Mrs J Knight
002193	301035	Mr M Knight
002230	302139	Ms K Vaughan-Newton
002242	301178	Mrs B Ward
002243	301177	Mr R Ward
002256	301195	Mrs T Miller
002496	301520	Mr F Osborne
002498	301521	Mrs C Osborne
002505	302135	V Fritchley
002510	302634	Mr A Burnell
002511	302633	Mrs A Burnell
002535	302120	Mrs S Clarke
002536	302122	Mr T Clarke
002589	302372	Mrs K Lake
002822	302626	Mr P King
002857	302681	B Roberts
002883	302667	I Roberts
002955	302623	B King
002991	302088	M Campbell
003000	302333	Ms J Tallents
003002	302336	C Smith
003003	302142	Mr I Copestake
003005	302143	Ms D Copestake
003023	301518	Mr D Hoe
003024	301517	Mrs J Hoe
003026	301519	Ms S Hoe
003027	301516	Ms A Hoe
003172	302359	Mrs G Kassell
003180	302080	Mr G Hill
003182	302078	Mrs A Hill
003183	301009	Ms J Vaughan
003185	301008	Mr P Vaughan
003189	302694	Mr T Roberts
003327	301308	Mr C Whiting
003328	301309	Mrs J Whiting
003331	301504	Mr J Macgregor
003333	301493	Mrs A Macgregor
003334	301197	Ms C Johnson
003343	301471	M Sinclair
003345	301407	Ms J Newlyn
003355	302160	Mr J Knight
003383	301193	Ms K Bedford
003411	301481	Ms A Sawyer

003474	301474	H Sinclair
003565	301194	Baron Bedford
005277	301196	Mr K M Johnson
005308	301304	Mrs M Taylor
005309	301305	Mr H B Taylor
005354	301525	Mrs C Brooksbank
005355	301526	Mr S Brooksbank
005587	302068	Mrs H Hutton
005589	302069	Mr P Hutton
005590	302075	Mr R G Shaw
005592	302083	Mr B Campbell
005611	302129	Mrs B D Haslam
005686	302280	Mr A P Garner
005704	302347	Mr J. Kassell
005776	302598	Revd. J Hardy
005780	302607	Mrs J Hardy
005851	302815	Mr D Bingham

### **Summary of Representation**

Support Council's decision to disagree with Inspector's recommendation and that New Farm should remain as green belt.

### **Response to Representation**

Your support for this Proposed Modification is welcomed.

### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

## **PM 2.35 H2 DISTRIBUTION OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT**

### **SITE – HOWBECK ROAD**

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
001937	302569	Mr N Foster

### **Summary of Representation**

On behalf of Mr N Foster we support the Inspector and Gedling BC in their recommendation to reinstate the Howbeck Rd housing allocation.

### **Response to Representation**

Your support for this Proposed Modification is welcomed.

### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

## **PM 2.40 H2 DISTRIBUTION OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT**

### **SITE – SOUTH OF REGINA CRESCENT, RAVENSHEAD**

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
000043	302851	Mr G Turner

#### **Summary of Objection**

Raise objection not considered in 2003 Public Inquiry about planned development south of Regina Crescent. Large increase in housing stock within Nottingham City should be considered, therefore reduced housing requirements in emerging Joint Structure Plan (2003/4) should be taken into account. + letters.

#### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

This objection (that the Council have failed to take into account increased housebuilding in Nottingham City) is essentially requesting the Council to redraft the plan to take account of the emerging Joint Structure Plan. This cannot be done for the reasons set out in the Cabinet report agreed on 21st December 2004 which has since been endorsed by the Full Council and the Council's legal opinion outlined at the beginning of the report. Current planning legislation enables sites to be promoted by developers through the local plan process and for the Inspector to consider the merits of those sites through the Local Plan Inquiry. There were a large number of objections to the allocation of this site for residential development when it was included in the First Deposit. The Inspector to the Local Plan Inquiry took into account these representations. The principle of releasing Green Belt land to meet the development needs of the Borough was agreed in the Adopted 1996 Structure Plan Review, the strategic framework for the Replacement Local Plan. The Borough Council undertakes annual housing land availability and completion and reconciliation returns for the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister in accordance with the "plan monitor and manage" approach to housing requirements defined in Planning Policy Guidance Note (PPG) 3, March 2000. Similarly, the Borough Council Housing Services Department is required to undertake regular assessments of housing needs though this is carried out on a Borough-wide basis and recent indicators point to the need for affordable housing primarily for young people and first time buyers. The capacity of existing services to accommodate the proposed development has already been comprehensively addressed in the Inspector's Report which refers to 'the (perceived) inadequacy of particular services in Ravenshead' (section 2.40 parags 7-9), including local schools and medical services. The design and layout of the proposed development will be controlled by the development brief for the site and scrutinised at the planning application stage.

#### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
000317	302496	Mr M Scotton
000318	302468	Dr J Longman

### **Summary of Objection**

Gedling Borough Council would be negligent / irresponsible to permit housing development south of Regina Crescent in view of the data now available via the Joint Structure Plan. There are already plans to develop several thousand more properties within the city negating the need to develop within the county.

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

This objection (that the Council have failed to take into account increased housebuilding in Nottingham City) is essentially requesting the Council to redraft the plan to take account of the emerging Joint Structure Plan. This cannot be done for the reasons set out in the Cabinet report agreed on 21st December 2004, which has since been endorsed by the Full Council and the Council's legal opinion outlined at the beginning of the report.

### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
000362	300003	Mr P Jones

### **Summary of Objection**

I object to the Inspector's decision to allocate land south of Regina Crescent for residential development. This is Green Belt land and there are plenty of brownfield sites available elsewhere. Any development would increase the burden on schools, shops, health centre and roads which Ravenshead cannot sustain and our property values would go down. Also note there is a gas main across this site and you cannot build on a gas main!

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

The principle of releasing Green Belt land to meet the development needs of the Borough was agreed in the Adopted 1996 Structure Plan Review, the strategic framework for the Replacement Local Plan. Previous drafts of the Local Plan have allocated brownfield sites for development and these sites have already come forward such that the majority of the allocations remaining in the Local Plan are now Greenfield (and cannot be released until the Local Plan is adopted). The urban capacity study considered opportunities for the development or redevelopment for employment and housing purposes of brownfield sites and other under-utilised land in the urban area. The capacity of existing services to accommodate the proposed development has already been comprehensively addressed in the Inspector's Report which refers to 'the (perceived) inadequacy of particular services in Ravenshead' (section 2.40 paras 7-9) including local schools and medical services. The impact on the local road network will be comprehensively assessed as part of the submission of the planning application. Loss of property value is not a planning consideration. The utility companies will be consulted on a planning application and

will advise as to the appropriate course of action with respect to development in proximity to a gas main.

**Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
000463	302506	Mr I Shaw
000467	302943	Mrs M Bolstridge
000478	302935	Mrs S Camm
000545	302959	Mrs G Hammond
000574	302505	Mrs S Shaw
000671	302898	Mrs O Fifoot
001065	302862	Mr & Mrs R Thompson
001747	302958	Mr P Summerfield
001752	302316	Mr J Unwin
003912	302950	Mrs A Parker
005042	300099	Mr G Woods
005232	302432	Mrs C Haskew
005299	302899	Mr B M Camm
005300	302934	Mr W Camm
005576	302964	Ms C Neeson
005675	302939	Mr K Sercombe
005747	302449	Mrs Y Jones
005762	302525	Mr & Mrs D Parsons
005762	302651	Mr & Mrs D Parsons
005884	302894	Mr S Subramaniam
005896	302937	Mrs R Subramaniam
005898	302945	Mrs T Foster
005899	302946	Mrs M E Newman
005900	302949	Mr & Mrs M & S E Fretwell
005901	302951	Mr P Walters
005902	302952	Mr R Forster
005903	302954	Mrs J Greenhalgh
005904	302960	Mr J and Ms S Clarke

**Summary of Objection**

Raise the following objections not considered in the 2003 Local Plan Inquiry:-

- The 2003/4 Joint Structure Plan was deposited 1 month after the end of the Inquiry and has progressed sufficiently, so the lower recommendation on housing figures should be considered.
- The Borough Council is continuing to use the out-of-date Structure Plan - significant increase in housing allocations within Nottingham City, thereby reducing Gedling Borough Council housing targets.
- 40 dwellings/ ha density 3-storey properties are not keeping with the character and nature of the surrounding area - First Deposit Draft Local Plan proposed housing allocation for 68 dwellings, whereas this has now been raised to 140 dwellings - development of this scale/ density will adversely impact upon

Ravenshead's Special Character Area (average density 12 dwellings/ ha and 7/ha in Regina Crescent).

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

Cabinet report agreed 21st December 2004 addresses the issue of whether account should be taken of the emerging Joint Structure Plan. This is further reinforced by the legal opinion from Mr Spence QC following GAG 5 legal representation. The Inspector states at paragraph 20 of section 2.40 of his report that higher density would increase diversity in the village's housing stock and this will imply less expensive dwellings than most of the village. This meets the Government's aim of creating mixed communities as set out in PPG 3 (March 2000).

The design and layout of the development will be considered in the development brief for the site and at the planning application stage. In considering applications for new development the Borough Council will have regard to the need for the provision of community facilities arising from the proposal. Conditions will be imposed; planning obligations or legal agreements will be sought, in order to secure appropriate community facilities or financial contributions, reasonably related to the scale and kind of development proposed.

Any potential impact on the Special Character Area will be assessed in the development brief for the site and at the planning application stage.

### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
000717	302017	Mrs K Haley

### **Summary of Objection**

The County Council does not object in principle to this allocation, but an area which may be included in the allocation is designated as a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation - Trumpers Park Wood SINC (Ref No 2/356). This site should be excluded from the allocation or the supporting text amended, to include a statement that SINC will be retained within the development. This site should also be identified on the Proposals Map.

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

The SINC designation does not affect the allocation.

### **Proposed Further Modification**

SINC is to be shown on the Proposals Map, along with other (updated) 2004 SINC survey data.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
003858	302649	Mr G Shephard

### **Summary of Objection**

Development of land at Cornwater Fields will breach most of criteria in PPS1 (Feb 2005). The pronouncements of government ministers were made subsequent to the

Inspector's report, which should demand a rethink by both the Inspector and the Council.

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

The recent statement by Keith Hill underpins the government objectives described in the new Planning Policy Statement (PPS) 1, "Delivering Sustainable Development" (February 2005). Within this, criteria exist concerning both the protection and enhancement of the environment, but also the need to "bring forward sufficient land of a suitable quality in appropriate locations to meet the expected needs for housing" (paragraph 27 (iv)). In order to fulfil criteria for sustainable development, high quality design is critical to ensure attractive, usable, durable and adaptable places (PPS1, paras 33-35). An acceptable design for any scheme is therefore essential for any proposed development at Cornwater Fields in order to satisfy the criteria defined in PPS1.

### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
005049	300149	Mr W G Morgan

### **Summary of Objection**

Housing not required South of Regina Crescent in Ravenshead as escalating windfall development within Ravenshead Village can now be expected to exceed the 140 dwellings proposed for this site by 2011. + standard letter with reference to emerging JSP.

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

The Urban Capacity Study provides a rationale for windfall provision of housing completions across the Borough. There has been some double counting and the evidence from 2 years of permissions is insufficient to justify a review at this stage. Cabinet report agreed 21st December 2004 addresses the issue of whether account should be taken of the emerging Joint Structure Plan. This is further reinforced by the legal opinion from Mr Spence QC following GAG 5 legal representation. The principle of releasing Green Belt land to meet the development needs of the Borough was agreed in the Adopted 1996 Structure Plan Review, the strategic framework for the Replacement Local Plan. The capacity of existing services to accommodate the proposed development has already been comprehensively addressed in the Inspector's Report, which refers to 'the (perceived) inadequacy of particular services in Ravenshead' (section 2.40, parags 7-9), including local schools and medical services.

### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
005786	302629	Mr P W Nixon



### **Summary of Objection**

Object to the Inspector's statement that some higher density housing should increase diversity in Ravenshead's housing stock and statement that adequacy of existing services is not decisive in his allocation of site for development. Need for retirement properties, sheltered accommodation, a nursing home/ community facility. The doubling of the capacity of the site from 2000 First Deposit Plan is unacceptable. Joint Structure Plan has now reached a stage where its recommendations for lower housing requirements should be considered, but GBC continues to use outdated 1996 Structure Plan.

No 'exceptional circumstances' have been provided for taking land out of the green belt. Inspector would not take account of escalating windfall/backgarden infill developments which will contribute to more than our fair share of new sites up to 2011 (and possibly 2021) from within the village boundaries.

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

The Inspector states at paragraph 20 of section 2.40 of his report that higher density would increase diversity in the village's housing stock and this will imply less expensive dwellings than most of the village. This meets the Government's aim of creating mixed communities as set out in PPG3 (March 2000). The capacity of existing services to accommodate the proposed development has already been comprehensively addressed in the Inspector's Report which refers to 'the (perceived) inadequacy of particular services in Ravenshead (section 2.40 paras 7-9). including local schools and medical services. Reference to the need for housing for the elderly is addressed in section 2.40 of the Inspector's Report (paras 17-19). Cabinet report agreed 21st December 2004 addresses the issue of whether account should be taken of the emerging Joint Structure Plan. This is further reinforced by the legal opinion from Mr Spence QC following GAG5 legal representation. The principle of releasing Green Belt land to meet the development needs of the Borough was agreed in the Adopted 1996 Structure Plan Review the strategic framework for the Replacement Local Plan. The legal opinion from Mr Spence QC endorses this decision further. The Urban Capacity Study provides a rationale for windfall provision of housing completions across the Borough. There has been some double counting and the evidence from 2 years of permissions is insufficient to justify a review at this stage.

### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
005789	302677	Mr J A Chisholm

### **Summary of Objection**

Allocation based on Inspector's conclusion that "there is a compelling need to find more housing land in the Borough as a whole" –

- Housing requirement in new Joint Structure Plan makes it unnecessary to allocate any land south of Regina Crescent for housing.
- Inspector accepts Ravenshead is not in a public transport corridor.

- Deficiencies in housing range available in Ravenshead can be addressed in forthcoming Local Development Framework.
  - No strategic/ local justification for allocation at present time.
- + GAG Rep 1

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

Cabinet report agreed 21st December 2004 addresses the issue of whether account should be taken of the emerging Joint Structure Plan. This is further reinforced by the legal opinion from Mr Spence QC following GAG5 legal representation. Reference to the transport corridor is addressed in the Inspector's Report, PM 2.40 paragraphs 10 and 11.

### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
005862	302827	Mr J Freeman

### **Summary of Objection**

Cheap (euphemism 'affordable') housing at high density is out of keeping with the village. Local Plan still uses out-dated 1996 Structure Plan. Exceptional circumstances do not exist to justify taking green belt land. Backgarden and windfall development contribute more than a fair share of new housing and render further development unnecessary. Further erosion of local services and amenities by increased population so people will suffer (even die at overcrowded road junctions) as a result. + letter.

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

The Inspector states at paragraph 20 of section 2.40 of his report that higher density would increase diversity in the village's housing stock and this will imply less expensive dwellings than most of the village. This meets the Government's aim of creating mixed communities as set out in PPG3 (March 2000). Cabinet report agreed 21st December 2004 addresses the issue of whether account should be taken of the emerging Joint Structure Plan. This is further reinforced by the legal opinion from Mr Spence QC following GAG5 legal representation. The principle of releasing Green Belt land to meet the development needs of the Borough was agreed in the Adopted 1996 Structure Plan Review, the strategic framework for the Replacement Local Plan. The legal opinion from Mr Spence QC endorses this decision further. The Urban Capacity Study provides a rationale for windfall provision of housing completions across the Borough. There has been some double counting and the evidence from 2 years of permission is insufficient to justify a review at this stage. The capacity of existing services to accommodate the proposed development has already been comprehensively addressed in the Inspector's Report which refers to 'the (perceived) inadequacy of particular services in Ravenshead' (section 2.40 parags 7-9), including local schools and medical services.

### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

**2.41 H2 DISTRIBUTION OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT**

**SITE – SOUTH OF CORNWATER FIELDS**

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
000007	301674	Mrs P Andrews
	301675	
000008	301593	Mr B Ashton
	301594	
000043	301356	Mr G Turner
	301357	
000053	300683	Mr K Adams
	300684	
	300685	
000074	300089	Mr M Corby
	300090	
000081	300969	Councillor B J Carver
	300970	
000090	300633	Mr I Crowe
	300634	
000111	300503	Councillor J Lonergan
	300504	
	300505	
000173	301106	Mr J Kendrick
	301107	
000188	301015	Mr A Browne
	301016	
000220	302966	Mr P Watkins
000224	300024	Mr M Herbert
	300045	
000262	300949	Mr R Potter
	300950	
	300951	
000263	300258	Mr F Gascoigne
000277	301340	Mr & Mrs J Cooke
	301341	
000278	300538	Mrs E Hewitt
	300539	
000300	300101	Mr A Holmes
	300102	
000317	300304	Mr M Scotton
000318	300277	Dr J Longman
	300278	
	300279	
000323	300426	Mr L Butt
	300427	
000326	300212	Mrs A Newman

	300213	
000337	301376	Mr A Price
000344	302365	Mr A Knox
	302366	
000345	300335	Mrs J Shooter
	300336	
000354	301123	Mr A Khosla
	301124	
	301125	
000364	300758	Mr R Buckley
	300759	
000369	301151	Ms C Justice
	301152	
000373	301017	Mrs K Browne
	301018	
000376	300530	Mr J Cooke
	300531	
000381	302380	Mrs H Knox
000414	300179	Mrs J Bailey
	300180	
000415	300021	Mr F Baker
	300042	
000418	301352	Mr J Oscroft
	301353	
000425	300396	A Evans
	300397	
000445	302883	Mr J Rose
	302888	
000446	301384	Dr & Mrs P C Risdall
	301385	
000463	301167	Mr I Shaw
000467	300492	Mrs M Bolstridge
	300493	
	300494	
000478	301271	Mrs S Camm
	301272	
000479	300327	Mrs M Pickup
	300328	
	300329	
000487	302618	Mrs G Congdon
000495	301297	Mr J Hunt
000531	300392	Mr D Chamberlain
	300393	
000544	301657	Mr D Hammond
	301658	
000545	301653	Mrs G Hammond
	301654	
000564	301242	Mr I Talbot
000567	301231	Mrs C Talbot
	301232	

000574	301169	Mrs S Shaw
000674	300934	Mr K Briddon
	300935	
000690	301363	Mr R Pragnell
000690	301364	Mr R Pragnell
000691	300761	Mrs V Dixon
000696	301446	Mr L Green
	301447	
	301448	
001015	301617	Mrs K Holdsworth
	301618	
001032	301083	Mr J Pykett
	301084	
001054	301131	Mr M Haskew
	301132	
001061	301609	Mrs G Lowe
	301610	
001065	302855	Mr & Mrs R Thompson
	302858	
001136	300815	Mr J Walton
	300816	
001156	301613	Mr C Lowe
	301614	
001198	302833	Mrs H Orlandich
	302835	
001330	302568	Mr A Johnson
001332	302547	Mr J Chisholm
001743	300438	Mr S Eves
	300439	
001744	302860	Mrs L Sutcliffe
001749	300550	Mr & Mrs Aldred
001750	300081	Miss J Sturton
	300086	
	300091	
001752	302319	Mr J Unwin
	302321	
001755	300358	Mr C Abrahams
	300359	
001758	300844	Mrs A Pollard
	300845	
	300846	
001760	300410	Mrs D Gill
	300411	
001761	300829	Mrs P Parr
001762	300567	Mr M Fisher
	300568	
	300569	
003844	301421	Mrs E Wileman
	301422	
003858	300518	Mr G Shephard

003859	300519 300236 300237	Mrs B Todd
003872	300514	Mrs A Lonergan
003872	300515	Mrs A Lonergan
003916	302337 302338	Mrs H Hibbert
005024	300018 300027 300048	Mr A Krzesicki
005025	300028 300049	Mrs S Harris
005026	300022 300043	Mrs J P Jackson
005027	300023 300044	Mrs B Llewellyn-Lindsay
005028	300025 300046	Mr L M Howard
005029	300026 300047	Mr M S Jackson
005030	300029 300050	Mr B Needham
005031	300030 300041	Mr S P Smith-Perkins
005032	300053 300054	Mrs S Howard
005033	300056 300061	Mrs J Hill
005035	300060 300062	Mr I Shields
005039	300087 300092	Mr T M Hill
005040	300088 300093	Mr J Brodie
005043	300110 300111	Mr & Mrs B Burton
005044	300112 300114 300118	Mrs M A Robinson
005045	300126 300127	Mr M Baxter
005046	300132 300133	Mrs P Baxter
005047	300138 300139	Mr C J Powell
005048	300147 300148	Mrs A Powell
005049	300152 300153	Mr W G Morgan
005050	300159	Mr A R Foggo

	300160	
	300161	
005051	300166	Mrs M E Foggo
	300167	
005051	300172	Mrs M E Foggo
005052	300184	Mr H N Jones
	300185	
	300186	
005053	300191	Mr G Farr
	300192	
005054	300194	Mr D B Reay
	300195	
	300196	
005055	300205	Mrs H Foster
	300206	
005056	300209	Mr D Foster
	300210	
005057	300219	Ms M Stealey
	300220	
005058	300222	Mrs N Eves
	300223	
005059	300227	Mrs M McConville
	300228	
005060	300232	Mrs D Thompson
	300234	
005061	300240	Mrs D M Townroe
	300241	
005062	300244	Mr I Rowe
	300248	
	300249	
005063	300255	Mrs S Rowe
	300256	
005064	300260	Mr R Clark
	300262	
005067	300265	Mrs J Clark
	300267	
005068	300270	Ms S Daykin Farr
	300271	
005069	300275	Mrs C M Clarke
	300276	
005070	300284	Mr & Mrs P & M Himsworth
	300285	
	300286	
005071	300294	Mrs I Stealey
	300295	
005072	300298	Mr J Britten
	300299	
005073	300308	Mr T Daykin
	300309	
005074	300312	Mrs L Daykin

005075	300313 300318 300319	Mr K Pickup
005076	300320 300339	Miss S A Morgan
005077	300340 300342	Mr R M Riley
005078	300345 300347	Mrs H D Matthews
005079	300348 300354	Mrs L M Whiston
005082	300355 300364	Mrs N McCullough
005083	300365 300368	Mrs J M Newton
005084	300369 300372	Mrs J A Abrahams
005085	300373 300376	Mr I C Bailey
005086	300377 300380	Mr B N Newton
005087	300381 300384	Mrs G Evans
005088	300385 300388	Mrs B Chamberlain
005089	300389 300402	Mrs K Brookes
005090	300403 300404 300417	Mr A J Walker
005091	300418 300419 300423	Mr J E Greasley
005092	300424 301118 300430	Mrs K E Butt
005093	300431 300434	Mrs D A Moore
005094	300435 300442	Mr F A Burrow
005095	300443 300448	Mrs A J Ward
005096	300449 300450 300456	Mr P N Rowden
005097	300457 300462	Mr J Cooling
005098	300463 300464 300472	Mrs L J Cooling



	300473	
	300474	
005099	300482	Mr P Newman
	300483	
005099	300484	Mr P Newman
005100	300500	Mrs D Noble
	300501	
005101	300522	Mrs V B Pritchard
	300523	
005102	300526	Mrs M Cooke
	300527	
005103	300534	Mrs K J Newton
	300535	
005105	300543	Mrs L Cook
	300544	
005106	300547	Mr G W Cook
	300548	
005109	300556	Dr I A Jan
	300557	
005110	300560	Mrs C A Jan
	300561	
005111	300574	Mr C J Cain
	300575	
005152	300621	Mrs M Rhind
	300622	
005153	300625	Mr B J Waterfield
	300626	
005154	300629	Mrs V Waterfield
	300630	
005155	300640	Mr K Redfern
	300641	
	300642	
005156	300649	Mrs K Redfern
	300650	
	300651	
005157	300657	Mr A Morrey
	300658	
005158	300663	Mr D McGeever
	300664	
	300665	
005159	300673	Mrs V McGeever
	300674	
	300675	
005160	300689	Mr A J Morton
	300691	
005161	300693	Mrs P Van Grondelle
	300694	
	300695	
005162	300703	Mrs V J Willson-Lloyd
	300704	

005163	300707	Mr M A Willson-Lloyd
	300708	
005164	300711	Mr B Stevens
	300712	
005165	300775	Miss J E Plowright
	300776	
005166	300716	Mr B Robinson
	300717	
005167	300720	Mr D Hooton
	300721	
005168	300723	Mr A H Macdiarmid
	300724	
005169	300728	Mrs M B Rowlston
	300729	
005170	300732	Mr C D Newton
	300733	
005171	300735	Mrs M Aimson
005172	300737	Miss L Burton
	300738	
005175	300743	Mr G E Yallup
	300744	
005176	300747	Mrs S Peatfield
	300748	
005177	300751	Mr J B Peatfield
	300752	
005181	300763	Mr D P Dixon
005182	300765	Mr J Barnes
005185	300769	Mrs M Yallup
	300770	
005186	300773	Mrs J Coates
005191	300787	Mr S J Pidding
	300788	
	300790	
005192	300792	Miss P F Butler
	300793	
005193	300796	Mrs P A Collin
	300797	
005194	300802	Mr R W Collin
	300803	
	300804	
005195	300811	Mrs V A Walton
	300812	
005196	300821	Mrs P Whalley
	300822	
	300823	
005197	300834	Dr V Pollard
	300835	
	300836	
005198	300853	Mr G Flatters
	300854	

005199	300856 300860 300861 303125	Mrs D Horton
005200	300869 300870 300871 303122	Mr R Horton
005202	300878 300879	Mrs C James
005203	300881 300882 300883	Mrs S J Potter
005204	300886 300887	Mrs J M Marvelly
005205	300890 300891	Mr W J M Marvelly
005207	300896 300897	Mr J G D Moore
005208	300900 300901	Mrs C A Yeo
005209	300904 300905	Mr D A Yeo
005210	300909 300910	Mr C H Mason
005212	300916 300920	Mr M Wilcox
005213	300923 300927 300928	Mrs L K Wilcox
005214	300930 300931	Mr J W Morgan
005215	300938 300939	Mrs K Briddon
005216	300942 300943	Mrs C Fearn
005217	300945	Mr G E Nash
005218	300953 300954	Mrs B J Osborn
005219	300957 300958	Mr J Osborn
005220	300961 300962	Mrs J Burkitt
005221	300965 300966	Mr S Burkitt
005222	300975 300976 300977	Mr D J Baker
005225	300985 300986	Mrs A Wilson

005226	300989	Mr I Wilson
	300990	
005227	300993	Mr C Read
	300994	
005228	300998	Mr D W Hammond
	300999	
005231	301005	Ms A B Robinson
	301006	
005232	301011	Mrs C Haskew
	301012	
005233	301021	Mr A J Browne
	301098	
005240	301037	Mrs J Crowe
	301038	
005241	301041	Mrs M Baggon
	301042	
005244	301047	Dr L A Kubik
	301048	
005245	301051	Mrs M B Kubik
	301052	
005246	301057	Mr E G Aspley
	301058	
005247	301060	Mrs S C Peacock
005248	301061	Mr M G Peacock
005249	301063	Mrs D Read
	301064	
005250	301067	Mrs R Nash
	301068	
005252	301075	Mrs A Flatters
	301080	
	301081	
005253	301087	Mrs D Pykett
	301088	
005254	301091	Mr K Scott
	301092	
005255	301095	Mrs S Scott
	301096	
005257	301102	Mrs R Kendrick
	301103	
005258	301110	Mr J Daynes
	301111	
005259	301114	Miss H V Foggo
	301115	
005260	301135	Miss J Haskew
	301136	
005264	301155	Mrs E Smith
	301156	
005265	301159	Mr G Smith
	301160	
005266	301163	Mr J R Hannaford

	301164	
005267	301172	Mr & Mrs J B & S White
	301173	
005272	301181	Mr H C Moodie
005272	301182	Mr H C Moodie
005273	301184	Mr C Cooke
	301185	
005290	301219	Dr M Breach
	301220	
005291	301223	Mrs L C Breach
	301224	
005292	301227	Mr I Watson
	301228	
005293	301235	Mr M J Ford
	301236	
005294	301239	Mrs M A Ford
	301240	
005295	301247	Mrs E Price
	301248	
005296	301251	Mr & Mrs N C Leafe
	301252	
005297	301255	Mr J Gerrard
	301256	
005298	301261	Mr J M Godber
	301262	
	301263	
005299	301267	Mr B M Camm
	301268	
005300	301275	Mr W Camm
	301276	
005301	301278	Mr M Klymko
005302	301280	Mr F Draper
	301281	
005303	301284	Mrs S Draper
	301285	
005304	301288	Mrs J Wharton
	301289	
005305	301292	Mrs J Adcock
	301293	
005306	301300	Mr J M Wharton
	301301	
005307	301303	Mrs L Klymko
005322	301336	Mrs D E Canty
	301337	
005323	301344	Mr G Dunn
	301345	
005324	301347	Mrs P A Oscroft
	301349	
005325	301359	Mrs E A Cooke
	301361	

005326	301366	Mrs E Price
005327	301369	Mr A Risdall
	301370	
005328	301373	Mrs G Pragnell
005328	301374	Mrs G Pragnell
005330	301380	Mr A M Breach
	301381	
005331	301388	Mrs C A Belcher
	301389	
005332	301392	Mrs D R Richmond
	301393	
005333	301396	Mrs M H O Ogrizovic
	301397	
	301398	
005335	301405	Mr G F Wainwright
005336	301406	Mrs V J Wainwright
005337	301409	Mr A E Hutchinson
	301410	
005338	301413	Mrs A D Singh
	301414	
005339	301417	Mr K Singh
	301418	
005340	301425	Miss J Wileman
	301426	
005341	301429	Mr I Walton
	301430	
005342	301436	Mrs R G Green
	301437	
	301438	
005343	301453	Miss M Hutchinson
	301454	
005344	301457	Mr B H Elliott
	301459	
005345	301462	Mrs E C Elliott
	301463	
005346	301467	Mrs D Ramscar
	301469	
005347	301473	Mrs O Cooper
	301475	
005348	301483	Mr R Evans
	301484	
	301485	
005349	301497	Mrs R Evans
	301498	
	301499	
005350	301506	Mrs V A Moody
	301508	
005351	301513	Mr I R Moody
	301514	
005369	301552	Mr J Robson

005371	301553 301559 301560	Mrs P A Bister
005373	301565	Mr D W Orton
005373	301566	Mr D W Orton
005374	301569 301570	Mrs P J Orton
005375	301572	Mrs J Richards
005376	301573 301577	Mr A Turner
005377	301578 301581	Mrs P A Andrews
005378	301582 301585	Miss K L Bailey
005379	301586 301589	Mr B M Andrews
005380	301590 301597	Mr R Foulds
005381	301598 301601	Mrs S Foulds
005382	301602 301605	Mrs S J Hall
005386	301606 301628	Mrs G Dodd
005387	301629 301632	Mr B Dodd
005388	301633 301638	Mrs K A Coleman
005389	301639 301640 301649	Mr M V Coleman
005390	301650 301651 301662	Mr B Richmond
005391	301663 301667 301668	Mrs B A Leslie-Green
005392	301671	Miss M Martin
005393	301672	Mrs N Martin
005394	301678 301679	Mr S Marsh
005429	303111	Mrs D Eastment
005430	303110	Mrs L Woodcock
005434	303095	Mr M English
005444	303112	Mr M Eastment
005445	303113	Miss R Eastment
005470	301816	Mrs S Carnill
005477	301826	Mrs C Twells
005478	301827	Mr K A Dowling
005479	301831	Mrs D White

005480	301834	Mrs K Marshall
005481	303099	Mrs J E Upton
005485	303098	Mr E Sas
005486	303097	Miss C Gravill
005487	303089	Mr S P Lang
005496	303102	Mrs A Wild
005499	303100	Mrs M Bingham
005514	303103	Ms D G Whitley
005517	301899	Mr M Hatcher
005557	303105	Ms M Smith
005560	303106	Mrs S Scrimshaw
005600	303124	Mr J D English
005603	303093	Mrs J English
005610	303101	Miss S Allen
005612	303096	Mr P Coleman
005615	303094	Miss E English
005616	303092	Miss M Hall
005648	302214	Mrs J Cooke
	302215	
005665	302226	Mrs M Simms
	302227	
005666	302230	Mrs D M Sayward
	302232	
005667	302235	Mrs M C Malpas
	302236	
005670	302242	Mrs M Andrews
	302244	
005671	302245	Mr L Sayward
	302247	
005675	302273	Mr K Sercombe
	302283	
005678	302258	Mrs C Wright
005679	302263	Mr C Womble
	302265	
005688	302291	Mr M J Womble
	302292	
005689	302295	Mrs S Womble
	302296	
005690	302311	Mr D.Booth
005691	302301	Mr D G D Stewart
	302302	
005692	302305	Mr D W Stewart
	302306	
005693	302310	Mrs J L Castledine
	302312	
005695	302317	Mrs M Booth
005699	302349	Mr H Hughes
	302352	
005706	302342	Mr & Mrs J Gretton
	302346	



005725	302391	Mrs N Ricketts
	302409	
005737	302412	Mrs P Davey
	302413	
005739	302417	Mr M Davey
	302418	
005740	302431	Mr S Andrews
	302438	
005742	302422	Mrs S M Manchester
	302423	
005743	302426	Mr J Manchester
	302428	
005750	302457	Mr K H Effingham
	302458	
005752	302463	Mr & Mrs G Rogers
	302469	
005753	302489	Mr J D Watson
	302491	
	302492	
005756	302504	Mrs M Beardshaw
	302512	
005765	302539	John Chisholm (Clerk)
005767	302538	Mrs S M Cross
	302540	
005770	302552	Mr D A Cross
	302553	
005772	302559	Mrs K Turner
005775	302594	Mrs P A Evans
	302595	
005778	302599	Mr D G Evans
	302600	
005779	302604	Mrs A Ankenbauer
	302605	
005781	302609	Mr R Ankenbauer
	302610	
005782	302615	Mrs P A Brown
	302616	
005796	303091	Mr G A Gilbert
005799	303090	Miss S Gilbert
005814	302723	Mr & Mrs P & L Osborne
	302724	
005815	302726	Mrs C Wyles
	302729	
005817	302744	Mrs C McGriskin
	302749	
005818	302736	Mr R Wyles
	302738	
005820	302751	Mr S Clay
	302752	
005827	302767	Mrs A Hurt

	302768	
	302769	
005830	302779	Mr P McGriskin
	302781	
005833	302803	Mr J Hurt
	302804	
	302805	
005838	302786	Mr B McGriskin
	302790	
005850	302811	Mr V Orlandich
	302813	
005869	302839	Mrs V A Jones
	302840	
005873	302844	Mr D Grenham
	302845	
005874	302847	Mr C L Moore
	302848	
005878	302863	Mr A Sutcliffe
005879	302867	Mr P Warren
	302868	
	302869	
005880	302875	Mrs K Clay
	302876	
005881	302880	Mrs J Jackson
	302881	
005882	302885	Mr K Jackson
	302886	
005883	302890	Mr and Mrs J Rollinson
	302891	
005886	302903	Mr I McHugh
	302904	
005904	302962	Mr J & Ms S Clarke
005996	303104	Mrs B Doohan
005997	303107	Mrs E M Peake
005998	303108	Dr S York
005999	303109	Mrs N Hickling
	303121	
006000	303114	Mr R White
006001	303115	Mrs S Severn
006002	303116	Mrs J Webster
006003	303117	Miss A J Wardell
006004	303118	Miss C Hamilton
006005	303119	Mrs T Curtis
006006	303120	Mrs S Paulson

### **Summary of Objection**

Gedling Borough Council has no further housing requirements until 2021. Land South of Cornwater Fields in Ravenshead should not be taken out of the Green Belt as a safeguarded area for possible future development.

Given the allocation of land south of Cornwater Fields as safeguarded land, there is a potential for 280 houses to be built on Green Field land in Ravenshead. Gedling Borough Council has not properly considered the environmental and sustainability problems that this would have on the Ravenshead community.

Gedling Borough Council has failed to provide 'exceptional circumstances' as required by Green Belt policies (PPG2) to justify the removal of land South of Cornwater Fields (and any other of the sites) from the Green Belt as safeguarded land for possible housing or employment uses.

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

The Inspector recommends the site South of Cornwater Fields should be safeguarded and that there is no over-riding need to allocate the site for residential development at this time. It will be treated as green belt for the plan period. Housing is not allocated and cannot be introduced until a sub regional review of the green belt is completed by the Regional Assembly. The Inspector confirmed the housing allocation and the rest of this objection raises concern over the strategic housing provision which is covered in the duly made objections relating to a reduction of 1000 dwellings.

The Inspector has considered environmental and sustainability issues relating to development in Ravenshead in section 2.40 para 11 of his report. In addition the Environmental Assessment of the Local Plan establishes environmental measures.

The principle of releasing Green Belt land to meet the development needs of the Borough was agreed in the Adopted 1996 Structure Plan Review, the strategic framework for the Replacement Local Plan. The legal opinion from Mr Spence QC endorses this decision further.

### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
005199	302942	Mrs D Horton
005200	302941	Mr R Horton

### **Summary of Objection**

Housing not required South of Cornwater Fields in Ravenshead as escalating windfall development within Ravenshead Village can now be expected to exceed 140 dwellings proposed for this site by 2011.

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

The Inspector recommends the site South of Cornwater Fields should be safeguarded and that there is no over-riding need to allocate the site for residential development at this time. It will be treated as green belt for the plan period. Housing is not allocated and cannot be introduced until a sub-regional review of the green belt is completed by the Regional Assembly. The Urban Capacity Study provides a rationale for windfall provision of housing completions across the Borough. There

has been some double counting and the evidence from 2 years of permissions is insufficient to justify a review at this stage.

**Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
005747	302447	Mrs Y Jones

**Summary of Objection**

Joint Structure Plan and Panel Report were not considered by the Inspector, the Borough Council should take these on board.

**Council's Response and Reasoning**

Cabinet report agreed 21st December 2004 addresses the issue of whether account should be taken of the emerging Joint Structure Plan. This is further reinforced by the legal opinion from Mr Spence QC following GAG5 legal representation.

**Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
005784	302625	Dr R B Titman

**Summary of Objection**

GBC has failed to provide exceptional circumstances to justify changing the land south of Cornwater Fields from green belt to safeguarded land status. Significant infilling has occurred and is still occurring which will meet any new housing allocation. Infilling and recent developments on Newstead Hospital and Harlow Wood sites have contributed to putting pressure on the amenities of Ravenshead - car parks (which have no room for expansion) at shopping centre and Health Centre are inadequate to meet current need. Can be difficult even now to obtain an appointment at the Health Centre. If the Regina Crescent site is approved there will be even less need for additional housing in Ravenshead, so no need to put further Green Belt land at risk.

**Council's Response and Reasoning**

The principle of releasing Green Belt land to meet the development needs of the Borough was agreed in the Adopted 1996 Structure Plan Review, the strategic framework for the Replacement Local Plan. The legal opinion from Mr Spence QC endorses this decision further. The Urban Capacity Study provides a rationale for windfall provision of housing completions across the Borough. There has been some double counting and the evidence from 2 years of permissions is insufficient to justify a review at this stage. The capacity of existing services to accommodate the proposed development has already been comprehensively addressed in the Inspector's Report which refers to 'the (perceived) inadequacy of particular services in Ravenshead' (section 2.40 parags 7-9) including local schools and medical services. The Inspector recommends the site South of Cornwater Fields should be

safeguarded and that there is no over-riding need to allocate the site for residential development at this time. It will be treated as green belt for the plan period. Housing is not allocated and cannot be introduced until a sub-regional review of the green belt is completed by the Regional Assembly.

#### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
005819	302742	Mr I Griffiths

#### **Summary of Objection**

Residential development has not been in any of the deposit plans and objections to it have not been considered.

#### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

The site was allocated in the First Deposit Plan and all the objectors to both this Plan and the Revised Deposit Plan were considered at the Public Inquiry in 2003.

#### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
005884	302897	Mr S Subramaniam
005896	302936	Mrs R Subramaniam

#### **Summary of Objection**

Object to proposed modification to designate safeguarded land –

- 1) 2004 Joint Structure Plan deposited 1 month after Inspector's Inquiry has now reached a stage where its recommendations on lower housing requirements should be considered. However, Gedling Borough Council are still using outdated 1996 Structure Plan.
- 2) No need to take land out of Green Belt as "safeguarded land" to address any pressing future local building need.

#### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

Cabinet report agreed 21st December 2004 addresses the issue of whether account should be taken of the emerging Joint Structure Plan. This is further reinforced by the legal opinion from Mr Spence QC following GAG 5 legal representation. The Inspector has recommended (IR 2.63) that safeguarded land should be identified and the justification for this is clearly set out in his report. PPG 2 which remains extant provides the justification.

#### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
005901	302956	Mr P Walters

**Summary of Objection**

Object to white land. No idea what land will be used for so no input from people of Ravenshead.

**Council's Response and Reasoning**

The Inspector has recommended (IR 2.63) that safeguarded land should be identified and the justification for this is clearly set out in his report. PPG 2 which remains extant provides the justification.

**Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

**2.44 H2 DISTRIBUTION OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT**

**SITE – MAPPERLEY GOLF COURSE**

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
000715	302929	Mrs S Gill

**Summary of Representation**

Mapperley Golf Course - Support protection from development.

**Response to Representation**

Your support for this Proposed Modification is welcomed.

**Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
001330	302567	Mr A Johnson

**Summary of Objection**

CPRE objects to allocation of Mapperley Golf Course as Safeguarded Land. The Inspector stated that 'there needs to be enough Safeguarded Land to avoid the need for another ewview of the Green Belt in 2011 or when the Local Plan is next reviewed'. CPRE believes that had the Inspector been aware of the reduced housing numbers in the Joint Structure Plan he would not have safeguarded any land at all. In 2007 there will be a strategic review of the Green Belt. This review will cover the whole of the Derby / Nottingham green belt not just the element within Gedling. There is great concern that allocating significant amounts of safeguarded land in Gedling will prejudice this review. The Panel Report of JSP stated that "in the light of the forthcoming strategic review of the green belt we do not believe that there is currently a need for safeguarded land to be identified through the plan". So why does the Borough Council take a contradictory view?

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

In response to the three issues raised:-

With regards to the amount of safeguarded land, the Inspector's view was that there should be more land rather than less, so that it would be harder to erode it piecemeal without a full-scale review notwithstanding the figures contained in the emerging Joint Structure Plan.

The Inspector clarified (at 2.63 paragraphs 19-22 of his report), that the use of safeguarded land policy will not pre-empt future green belt reviews. The wording of the policy recommended by the Inspector is intended to ensure that the identification of safeguarded land does not prejudice a future review of the Nottingham /Derby green belt. The Inspector emphasises that it would be wrong for this consideration to influence his decision.

When the emerging Local Plan is reviewed, this will be in the context of the Joint Structure Plan. The need or otherwise for safeguarded land can be reassessed at that time. It would be inappropriate to only take on board one part of the Joint Structure Plan and in any event the Plan has not yet been adopted.

### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

## **2.45 H2 DISTRIBUTION OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT**

### **SITE – LAND NORTH OF PAPPLEWICK LANE**

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
005679	302260	Mr C Womble
005688	302288	Mr M J Womble

### **Summary of Objection**

Object to proposed allocation of 595 dwellings as there is no requirement for these houses. The Gedling Local Plan fails to take into account lower housing requirements as identified by Joint Structure Plan. PPG12 and Inspector recommended that the Plan be amended to take account the emerging Structure Plan. If 1996 Structure Plan is followed then there should be no development at Top Wighay. Developments are required on designated transports corridors. GBC accepted "this site is not located within a transport corridor [Report to GBC Development Committee Local Plan First Review 23.10.1997]. The development will result in coalescence of Hucknall with Newstead and Linby. Gedling Borough Council has failed to provide 'exceptional circumstances' as required by Green Belt policies to justify the removal of the site from Green Belt for housing use. The Inspector failed to consider the detrimental effects such traffic will cause. His report was based on report prepared by owners of Top Wighay Farm site and he failed to seek independent expert advice. The Inspector thereby misdirected himself when arriving at his conclusions regarding traffic. Proposed modifications does not preserve Green Belt or aid its permanence - contrary to PPG2. No phasing policies within Plan to ensure brownfield sites are developed before Green Belt.

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

This objection (that 595 houses at Top Wighay Farm are not required) is essentially requesting the Council to redraft the plan to take account of the emerging Joint Structure Plan. This cannot be done for the reasons set out in the Cabinet report agreed on 21st December 2004 which has since been endorsed by the legal opinion outlined at the beginning of the report. The Development Committee Report of October 1997 when referring to the site not being located within a transport corridor continues by noting the opportunity to create a new public transport link by extending the proposed NET combined with the urban fringe location provides a suitable location for development. The Transport Assessment for the site was not prepared at the time of the Committee Report but was available for scrutiny at the Local Plan Inquiry where it was agreed by Gedling and Nottinghamshire County Council that the site is within the public transport corridor which was not disputed by the Local Plan Inspector. The Inspector noted (IR2.52) that the Top Wighay Farm site is relatively 'contained' visually and that it is in a wide Green Belt tract such that the coalescence of settlements would not result from development in this location. The principle of releasing Green Belt land to meet the development needs of the Borough was agreed in the Adopted 1996 Structure Plan Review the strategic framework for the Replacement Local Plan. The legal opinion from Mr Spence QC endorses this decision further. A revised Transport Assessment will need to be submitted and agreed by the Highway Authority at the planning application stage. In addition contributions will be required towards integrated transport measures in the A611 Hucknall corridor in accordance with the ITPS on 'Integrated Transport Measures and Developers' Contributions' May 2002. This will also need to be agreed at the planning application stage. The Inspector has recommended (IR 2.63) that safeguarded land should be identified and the justification for this is clearly set out in his report. PPG 2 which remains extant provides the justification. Previous drafts of the Local Plan have allocated brownfield sites for development and these sites have already come forward such that the majority of the allocations remaining in the Local Plan are now Greenfield (and cannot be released until the Local Plan is adopted). The urban capacity study considered opportunities for the development or redevelopment for employment and housing purposes of brownfield sites and other under-utilised land in the urban area.

### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

## **PM 2.51 H2 DISTRIBUTION OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT**

### **SITE – THE SPINNEY, BESTWOOD**

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
001324	302520	Mr J Fletcher

### **Summary of Representation**

Langridge Homes Ltd supports proposed modification identifying Safeguarded Land at The Spinney Bestwood:-



- The site is relatively contained and would not have a harmful effect on the wider countryside or sensitive open gaps.
- Small site, would not impose unacceptable burdens on local services or road network and is close to local bus services.
- If the site were allocated for development, there are unlikely to be environmental or infrastructure constraints.

### **Response to Representation**

Your support for this Proposed Modification is welcomed.

### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
005839	302784	Miss L Keely
005887	302912	Mr A Chapman
005889	302914	Miss S Austin
005890	302916	Mr T Keely

### **Summary of Objection**

The Gedling Local Plan fails to take into any consideration a reduction in housing numbers in the new Joint Structure Plan. Gedling will need 1 000 less homes than at present. The Gedling Local Plan fails to take into account increased house building in the City of Nottingham. No additional housing requirement until after 2021. The decision to remove a number of sites from the Green Belt now will pre-empt the strategic review of the Green Belt to be carried out by the Regional Assembly in 2007. The area of land at The Spinney has not defensible boundary making further development encroachment hard to defend.

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

Cabinet report agreed 21st December 2004 addresses the issue of whether account should be taken of the emerging Joint Structure Plan. This is further reinforced by the legal opinion from Mr Spence QC following GAG5 legal representation. This objection (that the Council have failed to take into account increased housebuilding in Nottingham City) is essential requesting the Council redraft the plan to take account of the emerging Joint Structure Plan. This cannot be done for the reasons set out in the Cabinet Report agreed on 21st December 2004 which has since been endorsed by Full Council and the Council's legal opinion outlined at the beginning of the report. The Local Plan Inquiry Inspector clarifies that the use of safeguarded land policy will not pre-empt future green belt reviews (2.63 paras 19-22). The Inspector notes that the site is relatively contained and would not have a very harmful impact on the wider countryside or any sensitive open gaps (paragraph 7 of section 2.51). In any event, the release of any additional land for development could only take place following the completion of a sub-regional review of the green belt by the Regional Assembly.

### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

**PM 2.52 H2 DISTRIBUTION OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT**

**SITE - TOP WIGHAY FARM**

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
000111	300511	Councillor J Lonergan
000328	302453	Mr J Bettridge
000354	301126	Mr A Khosla
000467	300495	Mrs M Bolstridge
000479	300326	Mrs M Pickup
000696	301445	Mr L Green
001325	302640	Mr I D Griffiths
001665	302134	Mr J Archer
001667	302451	Mrs C Bettridge
001672	301852	Mr J Cain
001700	302454	Mrs J Smith
001701	302455	Mr F Smith
001704	302445	Mr M Stanley
001750	300080	Miss J Sturton
001758	300847	Mrs A Pollard
001762	300566	Mr M Fisher
003848	302148	Mrs J Gaudern
003936	302166	Mrs A Davenport
004578	302443	Mrs P M Hall
005024	300014	Mr A Krzesicki
005044	300121	Mrs M A Robinson
005050	300162	Mr A R Foggo
005051	300168	Mrs M E Foggo
005054	300197	Mr D B Reay
005062	300250	Mr I Rowe
005065	300263	Mr G Gospel
005066	300264	Mrs L Gospel
005070	300287	Mr & Mrs P & M Himsworth
005089	300405	Mrs K Brookes
005090	300416	Mr A J Walker
005095	300451	Mrs A J Ward
005097	300465	Mr J Cooling
005098	300475	Mrs L J Cooling
005099	300485	Mr P Newman
005150	300618	Mrs P D Newcombe
005151	300619	Mrs J J Jukes
005155	300639	Mr K Redfern
005156	300652	Mrs K Redfern
005158	300666	Mr D McGeever
005159	300676	Mrs V McGeever
005194	300805	Mr R W Collin
005196	300824	Mrs P Whalley
005197	300837	Dr V Pollard

005199	300858	Mrs D Horton
005200	300872	Mr R Horton
005222	300978	Mr D J Baker
005232	302434	Mrs C Haskew
005235	301026	Mrs H J Walker
005252	301076	Mrs A Flatters
005256	301100	Mr R Pickering
005274	301189	Mr & Mrs A & E Johnson
005275	301190	Miss A James
005276	301191	Mr D James
005284	301206	Mrs E A Davis
005289	301217	Colonel P S Davis
005312	301316	Mrs C Spencer
005317	302514	Mr M Dermody
005333	301399	Mrs M H O Ogrizovic
005342	301435	Mrs R G Green
005348	301487	Mr R Evans
005349	301500	Mrs R Evans
005352	301522	Mr I Winton
005353	301524	Mrs S Winton
005360	301542	Mrs S Clark
005361	301543	Mrs J Wasilewski
005362	301544	Mr J E Stirland
005363	301545	Mr L M Blakemore
005365	301547	Mr W G Blakemore
005366	301548	Mr J Hillier
005367	301549	Mrs S Blakemore
005370	301556	Mr J Lighthart
005398	301687	Mr A Litman
005406	301937	Mrs G C Myford
005422	301727	Mrs S Lewis
005427	301736	Mrs C Collins
005428	301738	Mrs S Minns
005429	301743	Mrs D Eastment
005430	301744	Mrs L Woodcock
005434	302483	Mr M English
005435	301971	Mr R Brothwell
005436	301760	T & J Carlisle
005438	302084	Mrs J Robinson
005444	301774	Mr M Eastment
005445	301776	Miss R Eastment
005447	301779	Mrs M Astington
005450	301782	Mrs R Smith
005452	301786	Mr N Fowler
005454	301788	Mr F M Chambers
005457	301795	Mrs R Chambers
005460	301798	Mrs B M Barnsdall
005470	301817	Mrs S Carnill
005477	301825	Mrs C Twells
005478	301828	Mr K A Dowling

005479	301830	Mrs D White
005480	301833	Mrs K Marshall
005481	301835	Mrs J E Upton
005485	301840	Mr E Sas
005486	301841	Miss C Gravill
005488	301845	Miss P Richardson
005489	301849	Miss S E Jordan
005490	301850	Mr W Prewett
005491	301851	Mrs H B Prewett
005492	301853	Mrs M Cain
005493	301854	Mr R Kirkham
005494	301855	Mrs P Kirkham
005496	301858	Mrs A Wild
005497	301861	Mr D Ashley
005498	301864	Mrs J Dyer
005499	301866	Mrs M Bingham
005500	301869	Miss L Strange
005501	301872	Mrs M Allen
005504	301877	Mrs C M Ridley
005505	301878	Mrs J M Hornsby
005506	301879	Mrs B M Curnow
005509	301882	Mrs P Wright
005512	301887	Mrs N Secretan
005514	301890	Ms D G Whitley
005517	301896	Mr M Hatcher
005519	301898	Miss L Mullane
005520	301900	Mrs L Parker
005521	301904	Ms C Wright
005522	301902	Mrs A M Archer
005523	301903	Mrs L.M. Hatcher
005527	301908	Miss S Strauther
005530	301914	Mrs F Hewitt
005532	301916	Miss J Hook
005533	301917	Mr J H Mellors
005535	301920	Mrs D Simpson
005539	301927	Mrs J Wright
005540	301928	Mrs S Timson
005545	301933	Mr T E Hill
005546	301934	Mrs B Alford
005549	301938	Mr M J Brown
005550	301939	Mrs J Ratcliffe
005551	301942	Mrs L Ridley
005553	301945	Mrs W Jennison
005554	301946	Mrs J Maddock
005555	301947	Mrs I M Astill
005556	301948	Mrs T S Mercer
005557	301949	Ms M Smith
005558	301950	Mrs K Clark
005560	301953	Mrs S Scrimshaw
005568	302441	Mr J Casey

005571	301973	Mrs S Litman
005573	302446	Mr J Porter
005577	302026	Mrs P Newton
005578	302035	Mr D Chambers
005579	302042	Mrs M Chambers
005581	302051	Miss H Newton
005585	302067	Mr R Benfield
005586	302066	Mrs C Benfield
005588	302070	Mrs L Newton
005591	302076	Mr C Newton
005600	302100	Mr J D English
005603	302103	Mrs J English
005605	302108	Mr J W Jacques
005606	302109	Mr D B Gaskell
005607	302110	Ms K M Beresford
005609	302126	Mrs J Smith
005610	302480	Miss S Allen
005612	302130	Mr P Coleman
005614	302133	Mr M Cotton
005615	302435	Miss E English
005616	302146	Miss M Hall
005617	302149	Mr D Mitchell
005618	302150	Mrs M J Kimpton
005619	302151	Mrs K Moss
005621	302157	Mrs C Young
005622	302158	Mr B Young
005623	302159	Mrs J Mardell
005626	302163	Mr P Thein
005627	302164	Mrs P Thein
005628	302165	Mr J E Mardell
005629	302168	Mrs M Archer
005630	302170	Mr J Smith
005636	302181	Mr P Lathrope
005650	302205	Mr B Wasilewski
005653	302204	Mrs C Y Edge
005654	302206	Mrs A M Cotton
005656	302213	Mrs W Evans
005660	302220	Ms J Watkins
005677	302254	Mrs D Duke
005728	302389	Mr T J Barker
005741	302436	Mr I Goss-Taylor
005746	302444	Mrs C M Strawson
005748	302450	Mr S Smith
005749	302452	Baron L J George
005751	302460	Miss H E Scott
005753	302488	Mr J D Watson
005758	302515	Mr & Mrs A & M Fry
005783	302621	Mr J B Duke
005795	302692	Mr I J Allen
005796	302693	Mr G A Gilbert

005799	302698	Miss S Gilbert
005801	302712	Mrs S Cooper
005803	302703	Miss H Owen
005804	302704	Mrs L Owen
005805	302705	Mr M Owen
005806	302706	Mr R Holmes
005807	302707	Miss V Holmes
005808	302708	Mr B Zinn
005809	302709	Mrs J A Zinn
005810	302710	Mrs J Wensley
005811	302711	Mr D G Wensley
005813	302722	John Chisholm
005816	302733	Anne Chisholm
005824	302748	Mr C J Madge
005826	302756	Miss R Madge
005827	302764	Mrs A Hurt
005833	302806	Mr J Hurt
005879	302870	Mr P Warren
005906	302967	Mr J Madge

### **Summary of Objection**

The proposed building of 595 dwellings at Top Wighay would result in the unacceptable disappearance by coalescence of Linby and Newstead Villages into the town of Hucknall. It will have a detrimental impact on Linby and Newstead Local Nature Reserve due to disturbance and pollution. This will be unnecessary if Gedling Borough Council takes account of then new Structure Plan provisions. No requirement in Gedling for housing until 2021. Brownfield sites are available in the Gedling area. These houses will cause congestion on Hucknall roads.

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

This objection (that 595 houses at Top Wighay Farm are not required) is essentially requesting the Council to redraft the plan to take account of the emerging Joint Structure Plan. This cannot be done for the reasons set out in the Cabinet report agreed on 21st December 2004 which has since been endorsed by the legal opinion outlined at the beginning of the report. The Inspector noted (IR2.52) that the Top Wighay Farm site is relatively 'contained' visually and that it is in a wide Green Belt tract such that the coalescence of settlements would not result from development in this location.

Notts Wildlife Trust objected to the Top Wighay Farm site and the Inspector takes their objection into account at sections 2.52 and 4.8 in his report (specifically rep no. 3314 and from that cross reference to rep no. 3184). The impact on flora, fauna and their associated habitats will be considered at the detailed design stage. The Borough Council will consult English Nature (with regards to Local Nature Reserves) and the Nottinghamshire Biological and Geological Records Centre (with regards to Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation) where development may have an impact and will take into account any comments and the provision of appropriate mitigation measures will be considered. It should be noted that SINC designation does not preclude all development.

Previous drafts of the Local Plan have allocated brownfield sites for development and these sites have already come forward such that the majority of the allocations

remaining in the Local Plan are now Greenfield (and cannot be released until the Local Plan is adopted). The urban capacity study considered opportunities for the development or redevelopment for employment and housing purposes of brownfield sites and other under-utilised land in the urban area.

#### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
000717	302004	Mrs K Haley

#### **Summary of Representation**

The provision for 595 dwellings, 9 hectares of employment land, a park and ride facility and other ancillary development at Top Wighay Farm is supported.

#### **Response to Representation**

Your support for this Proposed Modification is welcomed.

#### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
000717	302009	Mrs K Haley

#### **Summary of Objection**

Developer contributions for secondary school provision will also be required on this site. This requirement should therefore be reflected in the policy.

#### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

Accept Education Authority's advice and propose amendment to policy accordingly.

#### **Proposed Further Modification**

Add reference to secondary school provision on this site.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
000717	302016	Mrs K Haley

#### **Summary of Objection**

The 8th bullet point in the additional policy H6 should be amended to highlight not just the protection of Joe's Wood SINC and Top Wighay Farm Drive SINC but also the Wighay Farm Grassland SINC (Ref No 5/977). This site should also be identified on the Proposals Map.

#### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

Paragraph 1.77 of the supporting text of the Revised Deposit Local Plan already confirms that SINC's will be shown on the Adopted Local Plan Proposals Map. The

impact of development on the SINCs will be addressed through the Development Brief to be prepared for the site.

**Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
000717	302028	Mrs K Haley

**Summary of Objection**

Although a considerable amount of transport assessment work has been undertaken at the previous stage of the Plan process the reduced scale of development now proposed means that access arrangements off site traffic impacts and suitable measures for integration with public transport will need to be reassessed. Accordingly a revised Transport Assessment will need to be submitted and agreed by the Highway Authority at the planning application stage. The proposed wording of Policy H6 needs to be amended to reflect this requirement.

**Council's Response and Reasoning**

It is accepted that there will be a need to revise the Transport Assessment but it is viewed that this is reflected in Policy H6 and the supporting text and will be addressed in the development brief.

**Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
000717	302030	Mrs K Haley

**Summary of Objection**

Contributions will be required towards integrated transport measures in A611 Hucknall corridor in accordance with the ITPS on 'Integrated Transport Measures and Developers' Contributions' May 2002. These will need to be agreed at the planning application stage. Wording to reflect this requirement will need to be added to Policy H6.

**Council's Response and Reasoning**

This is reflected in the expanded Policy C2 on Community Facilities for New Development. However, it is intended to clarify the lower case text for Policy H6 Top Wighay Farm with the following addition "Contributions will be required towards integrated transport measures in the A611 Hucknall corridor in accordance with the ITPS on 'Integrated Transport Measures and Developers' Contributions' May 2002. These will need to be agreed at the planning application stage, as will the precise package of measures to cater for cycling, walking and public transport journeys." This clarification will also be consistent with the text relating to the Teal Close site.



### **Proposed Further Modification**

Clarify the lower case text for Policy H6 Top Wighay Farm with the following addition. “Contributions will be required towards integrated transport measures in the A611 Hucknall corridor in accordance with the ITPS on ‘Integrated Transport Measures and Developers’ Contributions’ May 2002. These will need to be agreed at the planning application stage, as will the precise package of measures to cater for cycling, walking and public transport journeys.”

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
001158	302494	Mr D Buckland

### **Summary of Objection**

The content of two proposed paragraphs of reasoned justification is supported but objection is raised on grounds that the second paragraph (referring to Top Wighay Farm as first reserve for additional development) should be included as the final paragraph of Policy H6.

### **Council’s Response and Reasoning**

It is not accepted that the policy should be amended as suggested. The issue is already addressed by the supporting text.

### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
001330	302566	Mr A Johnson

### **Summary of Objection**

CPRE objects to proposal to allocate Top Wighay Farm for housing. There is no need to allocate land at Top Wighay Farm for housing as sufficient land can be found on other sites to meet either the structure plan guidelines or the dwelling provisions within the emerging structure plan guidelines. CPRE notes that the Inspector chose to allocate land at Top Wighay as a last resort for the following reasons: 'More housing land is required due to Gedling Colliery / Chase Farm being unlikely to be completed by 2011'. CPRE notes the Inspector recommended that Gedling Colliery site should only be developed once relief road has been constructed. CPRE believes this put unreasonable burden on developers and that development should be allowed to commence prior to construction of road. 'Replacement land needs to be found for allocations the Inspector was not recommending' - two of these allocations have been reinstated by the Council in its proposed modifications. 'Substantial areas of Safeguarded land are identified to protect the Green Belt after 2011' - this is no longer necessary due to Green Belt review being conducted in 2007 and reduced housing numbers in the Joint Structure Plan. The Inspector commented that this site was not readily available. In paragraph 12 of his report his view was that 'what is most urgently needed is some readily available building land rather than more allocated land at a large site'. CPRE notes that transport infrastructure constraints are being placed upon both the Gedling Colliery and Teal Close sites. CPRE

suggests a similar constraint in relation to sustainable transport links should be included on the Top Wighay site.

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

It is noted that this representation is primarily the same as representation 302567, which differs only in that it omits the final paragraph. A response to the point that development at the Gedling Colliery site should be allowed to take place before construction of the Gedling Access Road is provided under the objector's specific representation on this matter. Whilst some of the sites that the Inspector was not recommending have been reinstated (in whole or part) by the Council there is still additional replacement land to be found and this is proposed at Top Wighay Farm.. The need for employment land at Top Wighay Farm is addressed under the objector's specific representation on this matter. The need for safeguarded land is addressed under the objector's representations on specific safeguarded sites. With regards to wildlife issues Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust objected to this site and the Inspector takes their objection into account at sections 2.52 and 4.8 in his report (specifically rep no. 3314 and from that cross reference to rep no. 3184). The impact on flora fauna and their associated habitats will be considered at the detailed design stage. The Borough Council will consult English Nature (with regards to Local Nature Reserves) and the Nottinghamshire Biological and Geological Records Centre (with regards to Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation) where development may have an impact and will take into account any comments and the provision of appropriate mitigation measures will be considered. It should be noted that SINC designation does not preclude all development. In considering the amount of land to be allocated at Top Wighay Farm the Inspector notes at paragraph 12 of 2.52 that the area should be regarded as a 'safety valve'. The Borough Council do accept that the amount of land to be allocated on green field sites should be minimised but in any event whether the Top Wighay site would be the first site to be taken out would depend on a range of considerations. The final comment that transport infrastructure constraints are placed upon both the Gedling Colliery and Teal Close sites is part of the justification for the allocation of land at Top Wighay Farm which is free from constraints and can come forward at an early stage. This reflects the Inspector's conclusion that 'what is most urgently needed is some readily available building land'. He notes that the Top Wighay Farm site is immediately available for development although acknowledges that it would take some time to plan and implement a large development. This argument is therefore strengthened by the reduction in size of the site as proposed through the Proposed Modifications.

### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
001332	302550	Mr J Chisholm

### **Summary of Objection**

Objections include –

- a) No need for housing due to new housing figures in Joint Structure Plan.
- b) No exceptional circumstances demonstrated to remove site from green belt as confirmed by legal opinion obtained by GAG5.

- c) Housing did not appear in deposit versions of plan - only in consultation document in 1998 and many of the objections in 1999 have not been included by the Inspector including:- effect on flora and fauna; effect on SINCS; impact on River Leen and impact on existing facilities. Details highlighted in summary from original evidence submitted as an Appendix to this representation.
- d) No need to allocate Top Wighay Farm for housing as sufficient land can be found on other sites to meet either Structure Plan guidelines or dwelling provisions with emerging Structure Plan. No development should take place at Top Wighay Farm until proposed extension of NET to site has been put in place. By reinstating Teal Close and North of Victoria Park, Top Wighay Farm development site should be removed as first priority.

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

In response to the representations:-

- a) This objection that 595 houses at Top Wighay Farm are not required is essentially requesting the Council to redraft the plan to take account of the emerging Joint Structure Plan. This cannot be done for the reasons set out in the Cabinet report agreed on 21st December 2004, which has since been endorsed by the legal opinion outlined at the beginning of the report.
- b) The principle of releasing Green Belt land to meet the development needs of the Borough was agreed in the Adopted 1996 Structure Plan Review the strategic framework for the Replacement Local Plan.
- c) The Notts Wildlife Trust objected to the Top Wighay Farm site and the Inspector takes their objection into account at sections 2.52 and 4.8 in his report (specifically rep no. 3314 and from that cross reference to rep no. 3184). The impact on flora, fauna and their associated habitats will be considered at the detailed design stage. The Borough Council will consult English Nature (with regards to Local Nature Reserves) and the Nottinghamshire Biological and Geological Records Centre (with regards to Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation) where development may have an impact and will take into account any comments and the provision of appropriate mitigation measures will be considered. It should be noted that SINC designation does not preclude all development. The EA did not submit an objection concerning the River Leen. Legal opinion from Mr Spence QC endorses this decision further.
- d) Cabinet report agreed 21st December 2004 addresses the issue of whether account should be taken of the emerging Joint Structure Plan. This is further reinforced by the legal opinion from Mr Spence QC following GAG 5 legal representation. The Local Plan Inspector recommended the inclusion of an expanded developers' contributions policy and a specific policy for Top Wighay Farm is proposed which will ensure that the development brief for the site will specify when and where supporting services will be provided. Following extensive debate over the rate of deliverability of dwellings at Gedling Colliery the Inspector concluded (IR2.62) that it would be reasonable and realistic to assume that only 700 dwellings are likely to be completed by 2011. The Borough Council has accepted this recommendation. In addition the progress on this site has been delayed by the owners who are aware they are behind the project plan presented at the Local Plan Inquiry. It should be noted that the Transport Assessment for Top Wighay Farm concluded that the integration of the NET into the site would be seen as an enhancement to the development of the site but was not a requirement. The inclusion of an allocation

at Teal Close/North of Victoria Park has already been taken account of as confirmed by a reduced allocation being proposed at Top Wighay Farm from 955 dwellings as recommended by the Inspector to 595 dwellings.

### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
001335	302661	Mr A L Smith

### **Summary of Objection**

Proposed 595 dwellings housing allocation, Top Wighay Farm - At odds with Joint Structure Plan (JSP) housing provision based on period to 2021 in conformity with RPG8 for the East Midlands. Most recent housing requirement from JSP Proposed Modifications document indicates a reduction in Gedling housing requirement in excess of 595 dwellings identified at Top Wighay Farm.

1. GBC submitted to EIP Panel (June/ July 2004) evidence that a reduction of around 1000 dwellings in emerging Local Plan would be required so no reason to allocate land at Top Wighay. Inspector's Report (para 13) states in respect of JSP EIP that GBC would be able to seek a modification inquiry or early review of the Local Plan.
2. Inspector's Report paragraph 12 and Gedling Borough Council recognise Top Wighay Farm is least sustainable of proposed housing allocations. Any potential reduction in housing land allocation would impact on the need to allocate Top Wighay Farm before any other site.
3. Similar situation has arisen in respect of Forest of Dean Local Plan Review proposed modification - Government Office required District Council to adjust housing and employment figures. Deletion of TWF housing site would follow plan, monitor and manage approach advocated in PPG3 (para 8) resisting release of land that will not be needed before 2021 - this specific issue could be fully reconsidered with Local Development Framework. Objection to specific development proposal can await its inclusion in a future plan - site was only identified as safeguarded land in first deposit plan.
4. Only at SDPM stage has specific land allocation been proposed but the opportunity for this to be fully debated has not been allowed. Proposal is not in accordance with Inspector's Recommendations, there has been no opportunity for interested parties to have comments considered, therefore should be subject to new Inquiry.

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

The argument that the Local Plan should take into account the reduced housing in the Joint Structure Plan is not accepted for reasons set out in the detail of the report considered by Cabinet on 14th December 2004 and adjourned to 21st December 2004. This has been further reinforced by legal opinion from Mr Spence QC following GAG5 legal representation. In terms of housing requirements until 2021 the Regional Spatial Strategy has to take account of the latest household projections and they are currently 18-19% above the annualised rate for the approved Regional Spatial Strategy.

1. Gedling Borough Council's representations to JSP Panel highlights concerns about the City Council's 'share' of housing provision. In terms of maintaining a supply of housing, paragraph 34 of PPG3 highlights the importance of sufficient sites to accommodate at least the first five years of housing development proposed in the plan.
2. The need for an urgent injection of readily available building land is highlighted by the Local Plan Inquiry Inspector. The size of the allocation at Top Wighay Farm has been reduced to 595 dwellings with 9 ha of employment land reflecting additional allocations in the Borough. The proposed employment land at Top Wighay Farm will help create a balanced mix of uses in the area with the potential for reducing the need for long distance commuting. This enhances the sustainability of the location.
3. The decision to continue with the Local Plan based on the Adopted Structure Plan is consistent with legal advice and advice from the Structure Plan authorities and the Government Office. In addition it is significant to note a recent successful High Court challenge made by Martin Grant Homes and Taylor Woodrow against Wealden District Council on their decision to stop work on their statutory local plan review. That Council had decided in May 2004 to cease work on producing their statutory Local Plan and instead to proceed to a non-statutory local plan in order to move more quickly to the new planning system of producing a Local Development Framework. The High Court quashed the decision of Wealden to abandon its emerging draft local plan.
4. Employment land at Top Wighay Farm was proposed in the First Deposit Plan and objections and representations were taken into account and debated at the Local Plan Inquiry. In addition, the housing allocation and white land issue were also taken into account by the Inspector and were subject to proper consideration at the Local Plan Inquiry.

#### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
001335	302662	Mr A L Smith

#### **Summary of Objection**

Mixed use development – Top Wighay Farm - Proposed that in line with objections requiring deletion of housing and employment land allocations all other associated land use proposals should be deleted from Local Plan.

#### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

The allocation was recommended by the Inspector into the Local Plan Inquiry (IR2.52). The Inspector concluded that the Local Plan should also include a policy to guide and control development disposition and density of the various land uses to achieve an integrated mixed-use development.

#### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
001339	302669	Mr D Marsh

### **Summary of Objection**

Top Wighay Farm - Proposed allocation covers extensive area; although not at risk of fluvial flooding a detailed application will need to be supported by a flood risk assessment for surface water management consistent with Policy ENV38 - Flooding. Surface water management should be considered in detailed planning brief to establish that proposals are acceptable in principle.  
Proposed change to Top Wighay Farm policy - Additional criteria - "Sustainable surface water management".

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

Surface water management is addressed in Policy ENV38 Flooding with specific reference to sustainable drainage systems in paragraph 1.85. All policies of the plan need to be read together so it is not considered that there is a need for an additional criteria in the Top Wighay Farm policy.

### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
005313	301317	Mrs B Severn
005316	301320	Mr J Dean
005421	301813	Mr W Lewis

### **Summary of Objection**

This latest version of the Gedling Local Plan takes more land out of Green Belt than the first version in 1997. Gedling Borough Council has failed to provide 'exceptional circumstances' as required by Green Belt policies to justify the removal of these sites from Green Belt for either housing or employment uses.

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

In response to the comment that the Proposed Modifications take more land out of the Green Belt than the first version of the Local Plan this is technically true. However as safeguarded land is to be treated as green belt for the lifetime of the Local Plan then the Revised Deposit as amended by the Proposed Modifications releases less land for development than the Consultative Draft plan 1998. The principle of releasing Green Belt land to meet the development needs of the Borough was agreed in the Adopted 1996 Structure Plan Review, the strategic framework for the Replacement Local Plan. The legal opinion from Mr Spence QC endorses this decision further.

### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
005315	301319	Mrs J Dean

### **Summary of Objection**

Object to all the proposals at Top Wighay Farm. People living on Wighay Road much prefer to wake up in mornings and see green fields. Lovely to see nature at its best. I don't want to wake up in the mornings and look out of window and see concrete blocks and at night time car park lights blazing away. Value of houses will drop because who would want to buy a house facing concrete block?

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

The Inspector noted (IR2.52) that the impact the development of the Top Wighay Farm site would have on the landscape would not be unduly obtrusive or harmful if adequate landscaping measures are incorporated in the development. As noted by the Inspector (IR2.52) the Top Wighay Farm site is not a special wildlife habitat and its noteworthy features in this respect can be protected as part of any development.

### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
005625	302169	Ms J Hammond

### **Summary of Objection**

Object to proposed allocation of 595 dwellings. Benefits of mixed use site are unproven. Allocation of part of site for employment does not justify the release of other part for housing and vice versa and does not justify exceptional circumstances required under PPG2 to remove land from Green Belt. Object to fact that north and east at Top Wighay is to be considered at first reserve for development in event that Gedling Colliery / Chase Farm and other housing development do not progress as quickly as anticipated.

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

This objection (that 595 houses at Top Wighay Farm are not required) is essentially requesting the Council to redraft the plan to take account of the emerging Joint Structure Plan. This cannot be done for the reasons set out in the Cabinet report agreed on 21st December 2004 which has since been endorsed by the legal opinion outlined at the beginning of the report. The Local Plan Inspector in 2.137 paragraph 9 qualifies the need to create a balanced mix of uses in the area with the potential to reduce the need for long distance commuting enhancing the sustainability of the location. The principle of releasing Green Belt land to meet the development needs of the Borough was agreed in the Adopted 1996 Structure Plan Review the strategic framework for the Replacement Local Plan. The legal opinion from Mr Spence QC endorses this decision further. The Inspector has recommended (IR 2.63) that safeguarded land should be identified and the justification for this is clearly set out in his report. PPG 2 which remains extant provides the justification. The Inspector considered that safeguarded land at Top Wighay Farm should be the first and best land to be considered.

### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
005631	302177	Mr S Walker

### **Summary of Objection**

Object to proposed allocation of 595 dwellings as no requirement if 2003 figures are taken into account. This allocation has not been subject to a Planning Inquiry because it was removed by GBC before the Inquiry took place resulting in objections being withdrawn.

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

This objection (that 595 houses at Top Wighay Farm are not required) is essentially requesting the Council to redraft the plan to take account of the emerging Joint Structure Plan. This cannot be done for the reasons set out in the Cabinet report agreed on 21st December 2004 which has since been endorsed by the legal opinion outlined at the beginning of the report. The correct procedure has been followed throughout the Local Plan process in accordance with guidance contained within the Town and Country Planning (Development Plan) (England) Regulations 1999. The Inspector into the Local Plan Inquiry did take into account objections and arguments with respect to Top Wighay Farm as the site appeared in the Deposit Draft Local Plan in 2000 for employment and safeguarded land, after the earlier Consultative Draft showed major development at the site.

### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
005664	302240	Mr J K Townsend

### **Summary of Objection**

Joint Structure Plan requires fewer houses to be provided than 1996 Structure Plan. Increased burden of additional housing development upon Hucknall services when combined with other proposed developments around the town. 2004 plan for housing does not require number of houses compared to 1996 figures. Numerous brownfield sites available - these should be explored fully before Green Belt. GBC is ignoring government guidance on Green Belt sites. GBC Council did not give Public Inquiry for those in favour of keeping Green Belt land. Losing identity of individual villages as they would be joined together. Why employment land is required in this area as many brownfield sites are available within the Borough. New housing will add extra burden - traffic problems, local schools are already full, local services such as doctors and dentists require prior appointments weeks in advance.

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

This objection (that 595 houses at Top Wighay Farm are not required) is essentially requesting the Council to redraft the plan to take account of the emerging Joint Structure Plan. This cannot be done for the reasons set out in the Cabinet report agreed on 21st December 2004 which has since been endorsed by the legal opinion outlined at the beginning of the report. The Local Plan Inspector recommended the



inclusion of an expanded developers' contributions policy and a specific policy for Top Wighay Farm is proposed which will ensure that the development brief for the site will specify when and where supporting services will be provided. Previous drafts of the Local Plan have allocated brownfield sites for development and these sites have already come forward such that the majority of the allocations remaining in the Local Plan are now Greenfield (and cannot be released until the Local Plan is adopted). The urban capacity study considered opportunities for the development or redevelopment for employment and housing purposes of brownfield sites and other under-utilised land in the urban area. The principle of releasing Green Belt land to meet the development needs of the Borough was agreed in the Adopted 1996 Structure Plan Review the strategic framework for the Replacement Local Plan. The legal opinion from Mr Spence QC endorses this decision further. The site appeared in the Deposit Draft Local Plan 2000 for 24.5ha employment land and the rest safeguarded. The Inspector for the Local Plan Inquiry took these objections and arguments into this allocation into account. The Inspector noted (IR2.52) that the Top Wighay Farm site is relatively 'contained' visually and that it is in a wide Green Belt tract such that the coalescence of settlements would not result from development in this location. The strategic justification for employment land needs is set out in the Structure Plan and the emerging Joint Structure Plan increases the amount of employment land needed after the local plan period.

#### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
005689	302294	Mrs S Womble

#### **Summary of Objection**

Object to proposed allocation of 595 dwellings as no requirement. Gedling Borough Council has failed to provide 'exceptional circumstance' as required by Green Belt policies to justify the removal of the site for housing use. Inspector failed to consider detrimental effect traffic will cause.

#### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

This objection (that 595 houses at Top Wighay Farm are not required) is essentially requesting the Council to redraft the plan to take account of the emerging Joint Structure Plan. This cannot be done for the reasons set out in the Cabinet report agreed on 21st December 2004 which has since been endorsed by the legal opinion outlined at the beginning of the report. The principle of releasing Green Belt land to meet the development needs of the Borough was agreed in the Adopted 1996 Structure Plan Review the strategic framework for the Replacement Local Plan. The legal opinion from Mr Spence QC endorses this decision further. The Inspector states in IR 2.52, paragraph 8 that the Transport Assessment is largely agreed by the Highway and Planning Authorities.

#### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b> 005765	<b>Representation No.</b> 302542	<b>Correspondent Name</b> John Chisholm (Clerk)
------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--

**Summary of Objection**

Newstead Parish Council objects to proposed 595 dwellings at Top Wighay Farm:-  
The argument that the houses are needed to support the proposed employment land and benefits of mixed use development are unproven as in the case of the Broxtowe Local Plan. Allocation of part of the site for employment uses does not justify the release of the other part for housing and vice versa and does not come close to justifying exceptional circumstances required by PPG2 to remove land from the Green Belt.

**Council's Response and Reasoning**

This objection (that 595 houses at Top Wighay Farm are not required) is essentially requesting the Council to redraft the plan to take account of the emerging Joint Structure Plan. This cannot be done for the reasons set out in the Cabinet report agreed on 21st December 2004 which has since been endorsed by the legal opinion outlined at the beginning of the report. The Local Plan Inspector in 2.137 paragraph 9 qualifies the need to create a balanced mix of uses in the area with the potential to reduce the need for long distance commuting enhancing the sustainability of the location. The principle of releasing Green Belt land to meet the development needs of the Borough was agreed in the Adopted 1996 Structure Plan Review the strategic framework for the Replacement Local Plan. The legal opinion from Mr Spence QC endorses this decision further.

**Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b> 005773	<b>Representation No.</b> 302582	<b>Correspondent Name</b> Mr and Mrs A J Johnson
------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	---

**Summary of Objection**

There is no need to allocate the site for housing if the new housing requirements under the Joint Structure Plan are followed.

GBC have failed to provide 'exceptional circumstances' (as confirmed by legal opinion obtained by GAG5).

Many of the original objections submitted in 1999 remain unanswered. (eg relating to effects on flora/fauna, impact on SINC, impact on River Leen).

Flooding issues have not been properly addressed.

Sufficient land can be found on other sites to meet either the Structure Plan guidelines (with flexibility identified by the Inspector) or dwelling provision within emerging Structure Plan.

Inspector only allocated site as a last resort. Requirement that the Gedling Colliery site can be developed only once relief road has been constructed puts an unreasonable burden on developers. So, no development should take place at Top Wighay until proposed extension of NET has been completed. Inspector allocated Top Wighay to replace land that Inspector was not recommending - but two of these have been reinstated by GBC (Teal Close and North of Victoria Park).

Council have suggested that Top Wighay would be the first site to be taken out if the amount of land required is reduced.

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

It is noted that the issues raised in this objection are identical to those raised under representation 302586. The argument that the Local Plan should take into account the reduced housing requirement in the Joint Structure Plan is not accepted for the reasons set out in the detail of the report considered by Cabinet on 14th December 2004 and adjourned to 21st December 2004. This has been further reinforced by legal opinion from Mr Spence QC following GAG5 legal representation. In terms of exceptional circumstances the principal of releasing green belt land to meet the development needs of the Borough was agreed in the Adopted Structure Plan Review the strategic framework for the Replacement Local Plan. With regards to wildlife issues Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust objected to this site and the Inspector takes their objection into account at sections 2.52 and 4.8 in his report (specifically rep no. 3314 and from that cross reference to rep no. 3184). The impact on flora fauna and their associated habitats will be considered at the detailed design stage. The Borough Council will consult English Nature (with regards to Local Nature Reserves) and the Nottinghamshire Biological and Geological Records Centre (with regards to Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation) where development may have an impact and will take into account any comments and the provision of appropriate mitigation measures will be considered. It should be noted that SINC designation does not preclude all development. With regards to flooding issues the Inspector notes that 'there is no suggestion of a flood risk at this site' (2.52 paragraph 10). Regarding the need for development at Top Wighay the various points made are addressed in turn:-

The flexibility allowance is addressed under representation 302589.

The Joint Structure Plan is addressed under representation 302589.

With regards to the Gedling Colliery site (and the timing of the new Access Road) this matter was discussed in detail at the Local Plan Inquiry. On the basis of the evidence provided to him the Inspector concluded that there should be a presumption in the Local Plan against the occupation of any dwellings at the site before an access road is built. In reaching his conclusion the Inspector was aware of the length of the remaining Local Plan period.

With regards to the timing of the proposed extension of the NET, the site is not dependent upon it, but the existence of transport infrastructure constraints on the Gedling Colliery and Teal Close sites is part of the justification for the allocation of land at Top Wighay Farm which is free from constraints and can come forward at an early stage. This reflects the Inspector's conclusion that 'what is most urgently needed is some readily available building land'. He notes that the Top Wighay Farm site is immediately available for development.

With regards to the amount of land to be allocated at Top Wighay the Inspector notes at paragraph 12 of 2.52 that the area should be regarded as a 'safety valve'. The Borough Council do not accept that the amount of land to be allocated on green field sites should be reduced and in any event whether the Top Wighay site would be the first site to be taken out would depend on a range of considerations.

### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b> 005789	<b>Representation No.</b> 302682	<b>Correspondent Name</b> Mr J A Chisholm
------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--

### **Summary of Objection**

Inspector does not adequately justify selection of Top Wighay Farm as a sustainable site for 595 dwellings.

1. Inspector's Report paragraph 9 (page 2-137) put forward proposed employment allocation as a justification for housing and vice versa. Circular reasoning does not come close to establishing exceptional circumstances.
2. Benefits of mixed use development do not apply regardless of scale and location of the development or the balance between uses and their phasing - note Broxtowe LPI where Inspector did not accept benefits of mixed use development.
3. 2.52 para 5 - Inspector infers that all parts of Green Belt are of equal merit - this flies in face of PPG2.
4. GBC were in no position to oppose proposals on transport or landscape grounds, objectors did not have opportunity to present views on highways and accessibility at Inquiry because of inclusion of site in informal draft LP.
5. If deletion of TWF cannot be accepted then phasing policy 3/5 in JSP endorsed with EIP Panel modifications should apply. Wrong to regard TWF as first reserve for additional housing for long term development needs.

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

1. The principle of releasing Green Belt land to meet the development needs of the Borough was agreed in the Adopted 1996 Structure Plan Review the strategic framework for the Replacement Local Plan. The legal opinion from Mr Spence QC endorses this decision further. The Inspector has recommended (IR 2.63) that safeguarded land should be identified and the justification for this is clearly set out in his report. PPG 2 which remains extant provides the justification. The Regional Spatial Strategy has to take account of latest household projections and they are currently 18 to 19% above the annualised rate for the approved RSS.
2. The Local Plan Inspector in 2.137 paragraph 9 qualifies the need to create a balanced mix of uses in the area with the potential to reduce the need for long distance commuting enhancing the sustainability of the location.
3. Development sites were identified initially through a 'sieve analysis' which identified constraints such as ridgelines, Mature Landscape Areas and therefore green belt was not viewed as being of equal weight. This approach was endorsed by the Local Plan Inspector.
4. 2.52, paragraph 6 of the Inspector's Report comprehensively considers landscape issues, stating that, although it is in the countryside, the site is said to be relatively "contained" visually. Regarding transport provision, it is intended to clarify the lower case text for Policy H6 Top Wighay Farm with the following addition, "Contributions will be required towards integrated transport measures in the A611 Hucknall corridor in accordance with the ITPS on 'Integrated Transport Measures and Developers' Contributions' May 2002. These will need to be agreed at the planning application stage, as will the precise package of measures to cater for cycling walking and public transport journeys." This clarification will also be consistent with the text relating to the Teal Close site.

5. The Inspector to the Local Plan inquiry saw no place for a phasing policy. Large development sites which have substantial infrastructure requirements tend to phase themselves and the Inspector noted in 2.73 paragraph 7 that any attempt to phase development between the adoption of the Local Plan and 2011 could have untoward consequences by restricting the supply of housing land.
6. The Inspector has recommended (IR 2.63) that safeguarded land should be identified and the justification for this is clearly set out in his report. PPG 2, which remains extant, provides the justification. The safeguarded land proposed at Top Wighay Farm is regarded as the first area of search for compensatory housing land in accordance with the Inspector's considerations in 2.52 paragraph 12 of the Inspector's report.

### **Proposed Further Modification**

Add additional text as set out in Council's response and reasoning (para 4) above.

## **PM 2.58 H2 DISTRIBUTION OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT**

### **SITE – MAPPERLEY PLAINS (NORTH OF) ARNOLD LANE**

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
000717	302014	Mrs K Haley

### **Summary of Objection**

The County Council does not object in principle to the identification of this site as safeguarded land but any future development will result in loss of much of the Gedling Colliery Site and Dismantled Railway SINC (Ref No.5/211) and it should be ensured that areas of interest can be incorporated into any future development wherever possible in areas of public open space.

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

Paragraph 1.77 of the supporting text of the Revised Deposit Local Plan already confirms that SINC's will be shown on the Adopted Local Plan Proposals Map. The impact of development on the SINC's will be addressed through the Development Brief to be prepared for the site. The Council does not accept that much of the SINC will be lost.

### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
001330	302565	Mr A Johnson

### **Summary of Objection**

CPRE objects to allocation of Mapperley plans / (north of) Arnold Lane as Safeguarded Land. The Inspector stated that 'there needs to be enough Safeguarded Land to avoid the need for another review of the Green Belt in 2011 or when the Local Plan is next reviewed'. CPRE believes that had the Inspector been

aware of the reduced housing numbers in the Joint Structure Plan he would not have safeguarded any land at all. In 2007 there will be a strategic review of the Green Belt. This review will cover the whole of the Derby / Nottingham green belt, not just the element within Gedling. There is great concern that allocating significant amounts of safeguarded land in Gedling will prejudice this review. The Panel Report of JSP stated that "in the light of the forthcoming strategic review of the green belt we do not believe that there is currently a need for safeguarded land to be identified through the plan". So why does the Borough Council take a contradictory view?

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

In response to the three issues raised:- With regards to the amount of safeguarded land, the Inspector's view was that there should be more land rather than less, so that it would be harder to erode it piecemeal without a full-scale review, notwithstanding the figures contained in the emerging Joint Structure Plan. The Inspector clarified (at 2.63 paragraphs 19-22 of his report), that the use of safeguarded land policy will not pre-empt future green belt reviews. The wording of the policy recommended by the Inspector is intended to ensure that the identification of safeguarded land does not prejudice a future review of the Nottingham /Derby green belt. The Inspector emphasises that it would be wrong for this consideration to influence his decision. When the emerging Local Plan is reviewed this will be in the context of the Joint Structure Plan or the Regional Spatial Strategy. The need or otherwise for safeguarded land can be reassessed at that time. It would be inappropriate to only take on board one part of the Joint Structure Plan and in any event, the Plan has not yet been adopted.

### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

## **PM 2.59 H2 DISTRIBUTION OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT**

### **SITE - PLAINS ROAD / (SOUTH OF) ARNOLD LANE**

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
000717	302034	Mrs K Haley

### **Summary of Objection**

PM 2.59 reinstates the housing allocation at Plains Road / Arnold Lane (south) site. The Inspector's recommendation is that 'policy H2 should be modified to reflect the requirements that this site's development would have to meet (such as special access requirements ...). PM 2.2 identifies that this site can be accessed via Arnold Lane and Plains Road in a manner compatible with the Gedling Colliery / Chase Farm Access Road. This implies that this site can be undertaken independently of the Gedling Colliery / Chase Farm development. It has been shown that suitable access could be provided in conjunction with the GC/CF development but it is not thought feasible that it could be provided in advance of the improvements to the Arnold Lane / Mapperley Plains junction (to be provided as part of the GC/CF development). Further details will need to be submitted at the planning application stage to show how access can be satisfactorily provided if the site is to be developed

independently of the GC/CF proposals and associated modifications to the Arnold Lane / Plains Road junction.

#### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

The County Council as Highway Authority confirmed by letter in March 2003 that they would have no objections to the inclusion of this site in the Local Plan subject to confirmation that Microprocessor Optimised Vehicle Actuation (MOVA) is installed as part of the junction improvement. Details will be required at the planning application stage.

#### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

### **PM 2.61 H2 DISTRIBUTION OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT**

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
000717	301988	Mrs K Haley

#### **Summary of Representation**

The proposed modification provides for a level of housing that accords with the requirement of the 1996 Structure Plan.

#### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

Your support for this Proposed Modification is welcomed.

#### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
000998	301985	Mr G Withers

#### **Summary of Objection**

Of the 3030 dwellings over 70% are on greenfield sites which is clearly not in accordance with planning guidances. Furthermore with the population forecast to decline by some 7% between 1996 and 2021 who will inhabit these properties?

#### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

Previous drafts of the Local Plan have allocated brownfield sites for development and these sites have already come forward such that the majority of the allocations remaining in the Local Plan are now Greenfield (and cannot be released until the Local Plan is adopted). The urban capacity study considered opportunities for the development or redevelopment for employment and housing purposes of brownfield sites and other under-utilised land in the urban area. Over the last three years brownfield sites have accounted for over 90% of housing development and this rate will not continue in the future. The Regional Spatial Strategy has to take account of latest household projections and they are currently 18 to 19% above the annualised rate for the approved RSS. The need for housing is not simply population driven. It

is based upon household formation and migration, amongst other things. The Inspector's Report deals with the housing requirement in section 2.1 of his report.

**Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
001330	302578	Mr A Johnson

**Summary of Objection**

CPRE objects to inclusion of Top Wighay Farm in the table and the lowering of number of dwellings proposed at Park Road Stockings Farm and North of Victoria Park. In light of objections previously mentioned, CPRE believes that the figures in the table should be as follows: Ashwater Drive / Spring Lane (140), Newstead Sports Ground (80), Gedling Colliery / Chase Farm (700), Park Road Bestwood (224), Stockings Farm (424), Wood Lane (40), Chartwell Grove (40), Flatts Lane, Calverton (90), Teal Close (195), North of Victoria Park (244), Dark Lane, Calverton (110), Howbeck Road (50), Plains Road/ Arnold Lane (south) (80), Regina Crescent, Ravenshead (140) Total = 2557. The above is 257 dwellings greater than the figures CPRE believe that the Borough should follow to be within the flexibility provided by the Inspector and around 1 000 dwellings greater than required under the emerging structure plan. There is therefore room to remove further sites from the above list.

**Council's Response and Reasoning**

A response to the issues raised is addressed under the separate representations 302566 (relating to Top Wighay Farm), 302561 (Park Road, Bestwood) and 302579 (flexibility allowance).

**Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

**PM 2.62 H3 LAND AT FORMER GEDLING COLLIERY AND CHASE FARM**

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
000053	300686	Mr K Adams
000111	300512	Councillor J Lonergan
000317	300303	Mr M Scotton
000326	300216	Mrs A Newman
000354	301127	Mr A Khosla
000467	300496	Mrs M Bolstridge
000479	300325	Mrs M Pickup
000696	301444	Mr L Green
000707	301697	Mr K Clark
000988	301696	Mrs J Clark
001750	300078	Miss J Sturton
001758	300848	Mrs A Pollard
001762	300565	Mr M Fisher



005024	300016	Mr A Krzesicki
005025	300015	Mrs S Harris
005044	300120	Mrs M A Robinson
005050	300163	Mr A R Foggo
005051	300169	Mrs M E Foggo
005052	300187	Mr H N Jones
005054	300198	Mr D B Reay
005062	300251	Mr I Rowe
005070	300288	Mr & Mrs P & M Himsworth
005075	300321	Mr K Pickup
005089	300406	Mrs K Brookes
005090	300415	Mr A J Walker
005095	300452	Mrs A J Ward
005097	300466	Mr J Cooling
005098	300476	Mrs L J Cooling
005099	300486	Mr P Newman
005155	300638	Mr K Redfern
005156	300653	Mrs K Redfern
005158	300667	Mr D McGeever
005159	300677	Mrs V McGeever
005161	300696	Mrs P Van Grondelle
005191	300789	Mr S J Pidding
005194	300806	Mr R W Collin
005196	300825	Mrs P Whalley
005197	300838	Dr V Pollard
005199	300859	Mrs D Horton
005200	300873	Mr R Horton
005212	300917	Mr M Wilcox
005213	300924	Mrs L K Wilcox
005222	300979	Mr D J Baker
005224	300983	Mrs P Morton
005234	301023	Mr K J Morton
005252	301077	Mrs A Flatters
005276	301699	Mr D James
005285	301207	Mr C Gerrard
005286	301208	Mr P Richardson
005287	301681	Mrs B Powell
005298	301265	Mr J M Godber
005311	301311	Mr C J Shaw
005312	301315	Mrs C Spencer
005333	301400	Mrs M H O Ogrizovic
005342	301434	Mrs R G Green
005348	301488	Mr R Evans
005349	301501	Mrs R Evans
005370	301555	Mr J Lighthart
005388	301641	Mrs K A Coleman
005389	301652	Mr M V Coleman
005396	301683	Mr D Conidi
005399	301688	Mr P Brealey
005401	301693	Mr S A Nicholls

005402	301694	Mrs R Nicholls
005403	301695	Mrs M Hull
005404	301698	Ms K Raynor
005407	301702	Mr I Andrews
005408	301703	Mrs M A Todd
005409	301704	Mrs D Townsend
005410	301705	Mr R Guest
005411	301706	Mrs C Guest
005412	301707	Mrs C E Tyack
005413	301708	Mr R Spencer
005414	301709	Mr T Savage
005415	301710	Mr J Bolesworth
005429	301742	Mrs D Eastment
005430	301745	Mrs L Woodcock
005431	301746	Mr I Smith
005435	301970	Mr R Brothwell
005437	301761	Rev Canon K H Turner
005444	301775	Mr M Eastment
005455	301789	Mrs A J Turner
005458	301796	Mr P Smith
005459	301797	Mr A Tudino
005462	301803	Mrs J Y Dale
005502	301873	Mrs S Johnson
005507	301880	Mr R J Copson
005511	301886	Mr N Secretan
005521	301901	Ms C Wright
005526	301907	Mr P Strauther
005531	301915	Miss M R Jones
005534	301919	Mrs S C Ecob
005537	301923	Mrs D Ball
005548	301936	Dr H P Rose
005561	301956	Mrs K P Davies-Eyres
005563	301962	Mrs S Coleman
005564	301963	Mrs N English
005565	301964	Mr L M Ward
005566	301965	Mrs H Ward
005567	301966	Mrs P M Mellor
005569	301968	Mr D Coleman
005570	301969	Mr J Coleman
005583	302053	Mrs S P Lord
005600	302138	Mr J D English
005605	302477	Mr J W Jacques
005606	302115	Mr D B Gaskell
005607	302123	Ms K M Beresford
005619	302152	Mrs K Moss
005646	302198	Dr V Foot
005673	302250	Mrs D Sheppard
005751	302464	Miss H E Scott
005753	302487	Mr J D Watson
005800	302699	Mr M Smith

005801	302701	Mrs S Cooper
005802	302702	Mr R Cooper
005813	302721	John Chisholm
005816	302734	Anne Chisholm
005822	302746	Miss J Field
005827	302763	Mrs A Hurt
005833	302808	Mr J Hurt
005839	302785	Miss L Keely
005879	302871	Mr P Warren
005887	302909	Mr A Chapman
005889	302915	Miss S Austin
005890	302917	Miss L Keely

### **Summary of Objection**

Gedling Colliery should deliver more houses before 2011 than currently shown in the modified plan. Brownfield sites should be built on before any Greenfield sites development for housing.

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

Following extensive debate over the rate of deliverability of dwellings on the site the Inspector concluded (IR2.62) that it would be reasonable and realistic to assume that only 700 dwellings are likely to be completed by 2011. The Borough Council has accepted this recommendation. In addition progress on this site has been delayed by the owners who are aware they are behind the project plan presented at the Local Plan Inquiry.

Previous drafts of the Local Plan have allocated brownfield sites for development and these sites have already come forward such that the majority of the allocations remaining in the Local Plan are now greenfield (and cannot be released until the Local Plan is adopted). The urban capacity study considered opportunities for the development or redevelopment for employment and housing purposes of brownfield sites and other underutilised land in the urban area.

### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
001090	300352	Mr A Rowe

### **Summary of Objection**

Object to the extension of allocated housing area to include land at Glebe Farm, (paragraph 71 of Inspector Report quoted here). Inspector's view is that the housing allocation should be extended to include Glebe Farm. While his recommendation indicates that land removed from the Green Belt but not allocated for development should be designated as safeguard land - this was not the case at Glebe Farm. Object to designation of land at Glebe Farm as Safeguarded land. The land should be included as part of the allocation for residential development as an extension to the Gedling Colliery / Chase Farm area.

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

The Proposed Modifications result in land in the vicinity of Glebe Farm to the north of the line of the Gedling Access road identified as safeguarded land and protected as Mature Landscape Area whereas the land at Glebe Farm within the Gedling Access Road is included within the Gedling Colliery/Chase Farm housing allocation and is not affected by Mature Landscape Area.

### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
000715	302930	Mrs S Gill

### **Summary of Representation**

H3 (a) (vi) - Sport England supports inclusion of 'and sports pitches' in this criterion.

### **Response to Representation**

Your support for this Proposed Modification is welcomed.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
001324	302522	Mr J Fletcher

### **Summary of Objection**

Langridge Homes Ltd does not object to principle of allocating land at Gedling Colliery/ Chase Farm and supports retention of site in in Local Plan with a capacity of 1120 dwellings:-

- Differs from Inspector's Recommendation/ proposed modifications on numbers of dwellings completed by 2011.
- Lack of progress since 2003 Local Plan Inquiry; a more realistic target for completions by 2011 will be around 300-400 less than proposed modification - Policies H2/ H3 should be amended accordingly.
- New Farm. Redhill should be identified as Safeguarded Land to provide flexibility and a possible alternative site when the Local Plan is reviewed.

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

Your support for the principle of allocating the Gedling Colliery site is noted. With regards to the number of dwelling units that will be completed by 2011, the Local Plan (through Proposed Modification 2.52) provides for any demonstrable shortage of housing land that may be caused by slow delivery at Gedling Colliery/Chase Farm. The Inspector provides a clear justification for identifying safeguarded land at Top Wighay Farm as the first area of search for compensatory housing land. The Council's response to the New Farm site is provided under representation 302513.

### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
001330	302563	Mr A Johnson

### **Summary of Objection**

CPRE objects to allocation of Glebe Farm and Spring Lane/ Lambley Lane as Safeguarded Land. The Inspector stated that 'there needs to be enough Safeguarded Land to avoid the need for another review of the Green Belt in 2011 or when the Local Plan is next reviewed'. CPRE believes that had the Inspector been aware of the reduced housing numbers in the Joint Structure Plan he would not have safeguarded any land at all. In 2007 there will be a strategic review of the Green Belt. This review will cover the whole of the Derby / Nottingham green belt not just the element within Gedling. There is great concern that allocating significant amounts of safeguarded land in Gedling will prejudice this review. The Panel Report of JSP stated that "in the light of the forthcoming strategic review of the green belt we do not believe that there is currently a need for safeguarded land to be identified through the plan". So why does the Borough Council take a contradictory view?

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

In response to the three issues raised:-With regards to the amount of safeguarded land the Inspector's view was that there should be more land rather than less so that it would be harder to erode it piecemeal without a full-scale review, notwithstanding the figures contained in the emerging Joint Structure Plan. The Inspector clarified (at 2.63 paragraphs 19-22 of his report), that the use of safeguarded land policy will not pre-empt future green belt reviews. The wording of the policy recommended by the Inspector is intended to ensure that the identification of safeguarded land does not prejudice a future review of the Nottingham /Derby green belt. The Inspector emphasises that it would be wrong for this consideration to influence his decision. The Gedling Local Plan will be monitored and land allocations/policies will be reviewed in the Local Development Framework. The need or otherwise for safeguarded land can be reassessed at that time. It would be inappropriate to only take on board one part of the Joint Structure Plan and in any event the Plan has not yet been adopted.

### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
001330	302564	Mr A Johnson

### **Summary of Objection**

CPRE objects to the need to complete the access road before any dwellings are occupied or employment land is brought into use. One of the real issues with this plan is that there are only a further six years until the end of the plan period. This clause puts an unreasonable constraint on this site.

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

The requirement for the development of the Gedling Colliery site to await the construction of the Gedling Access Road was debated in detail at the Local Plan Inquiry. On the basis of the evidence provided to him the Inspector concluded that

there should be a presumption in the Local Plan against the occupation of any dwellings at the site before an access road is built. In reaching his conclusion the Inspector was aware of the length of the remaining Local Plan period.

### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
005821	302745	Mrs K J Field

### **Summary of Objection**

Gedling Colliery should deliver more houses before 2011 than currently shown in the modified plan. Brownfield sites should be built on before any Greenfield sites development for housing. Lose division between Linby and Hucknall. Impact on wildlife. Other options are available eg Gedling Colliery and Teal Close. Increased traffic through village. Employment land is available locally at Sherwood Business park. Unlikely that tram line will be extended. Development is unnecessary.

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

Following extensive debate over the rate of deliverability of dwellings on the site the Inspector concluded (IR2.62) that it would be reasonable and realistic to assume that only 700 dwellings are likely to be completed by 2011. The Borough Council has accepted this recommendation. In addition progress on this site has been delayed by the owners who are aware they are behind the project plan presented at the Local Plan Inquiry. Previous drafts of the Local Plan have allocated brownfield sites for development and these sites have already come forward such that the majority of the allocations remaining in the Local Plan are now greenfield (and cannot be released until the Local Plan is adopted). The urban capacity study considered opportunities for the development or redevelopment for employment and housing purposes of brownfield sites and other underutilised land in the urban area. The issue of coalescence between the site and other settlements is addressed in the Inspector's report. Sherwood Business Park is outside the Borough and cannot be addressed in the Plan. The site is not dependent upon the tram.

### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
000717	302010	Mrs K Haley

### **Summary of Objection**

Developer contributions for secondary school provision will also be required on this site. This requirement should therefore be reflected in the policy.

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

Accept the comments of the Education Authority.

**Proposed Further Modification**

Include reference to all schools provision under developer contributions for policy.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
000717	302011	Mrs K Haley

**Summary of Objection**

The County Council does not object to this allocation in principle, but as much if not most of the Gedling Colliery Site and Dismantled Railway SINC (Ref No.5/211) will be lost as a result of housing development and associated roads it should be ensured that areas of interest can be incorporated into the development wherever possible in areas of public open space. This should be explicitly mentioned in clause (a)(vii) of policy H3.

**Council's Response and Reasoning**

Paragraph 1.77 of the lower case text of the Revised Deposit Local Plan already confirms that SINC's will be shown on the adopted Local Plan proposals map. The impact of development on the SINC's will be addressed through the Development Brief for the site.

**Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
000717	302036	Mrs K Haley

**Summary of Objection**

Although a considerable amount of transport assessment work has been undertaken at the previous stage of the Plan process the increased scale of development now proposed means that access arrangements off site traffic impacts and suitable measures for integration with public transport will need to be reassessed. Accordingly a revised Transport Assessment will need to be submitted and agreed by the Highway Authority at the planning application stage. The proposed wording of Policy H6 needs to be amended to reflect this requirement.

**Council's Response and Reasoning**

Scale of development has not increased and as the Inspector confirms in 2.62 of his report paragraphs 26 –27 the new access road will mean that the existing road network would not have to carry additional traffic. An updated Transport Assessment will be required at the planning application stage.

**Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
000717	302037	Mrs K Haley

### **Summary of Objection**

PM 2.62 3a requires 'the construction of the access road to be completed before any of the dwelling are occupied'. Whilst this is a welcome and necessary prerequisite this requirement should be widened to include any necessary associated junction improvements (as determined in the Transport Assessment) which should also be in place prior to occupancy. The wording should be amended accordingly.

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

See reasoning and response to representation 302036.

### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

## **PM 2.63 H4 MANAGED RELEASE OF HOUSING SITES**

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
000053	300687	Mr K Adams
000111	300506	Councillor J Lonergan
000317	300302	Mr M Scotton
000326	300217	Mrs A Newman
000354	301128	Mr A Khosla
000467	300497	Mrs M Bolstridge
000479	300324	Mrs M Pickup
000696	301443	Mr L Green
001325	302638	Mr I D Griffiths
001750	300077	Miss J Sturton
001758	300849	Mrs A Pollard
001762	300564	Mr M Fisher
004322	302407	K Peacock
005024	300013	Mr A Krzesicki
005025	300012	Mrs S Harris
005044	300119	Mrs M A Robinson
005050	300164	Mr A R Foggo
005051	300170	Mrs M E Foggo
005052	300188	Mr H N Jones
005054	300199	Mr D B Reay
005062	300252	Mr I Rowe
005070	300289	Mr & Mrs P & M Himsworth
005075	300322	Mr K Pickup
005089	300407	Mrs K Brookes
005090	300414	Mr A J Walker
005095	300453	Mrs A J Ward
005097	300467	Mr J Cooling
005098	300477	Mrs L J Cooling
005099	300487	Mr P Newman
005155	300637	Mr K Redfern
005156	300654	Mrs K Redfern
005158	300668	Mr D McGeever



005159	300678	Mrs V McGeever
005161	300697	Mrs P Van Grondelle
005194	300807	Mr R W Collin
005196	300826	Mrs P Whalley
005197	300839	Dr V Pollard
005199	300857	Mrs D Horton
005200	300874	Mr R Horton
005212	300918	Mr M Wilcox
005213	300925	Mrs L K Wilcox
005222	300980	Mr D J Baker
005235	301025	Mrs H J Walker
005252	301078	Mrs A Flatters
005262	301140	Mrs K F Carlin
005263	301147	Mr E L Carlin
005275	301793	Miss A James
005287	301212	Mrs B Powell
005288	301216	Mrs C Lighthart
005298	301264	Mr J M Godber
005311	301313	Mr C J Shaw
005318	301323	Mrs A E Bainbridge
005320	301329	Mrs M A Gee
005321	301332	Mr M R Gee
005333	301401	Mrs M H O Ogrizovic
005342	301433	Mrs R G Green
005348	301489	Mr R Evans
005349	301502	Mrs R Evans
005356	301533	Mrs J Aughton
005357	301537	Mr D Aughton
005372	301620	Mrs M Bayley
005384	301622	Mr J Robinson
005388	301642	Mrs K A Coleman
005395	301977	Mr B Whitelocks
005397	301685	Mr R A Litman
005400	301692	Mrs M Passey
005416	301712	L Webster
005418	301717	Mrs M Cordin
005419	301721	Mrs M Phelps
005420	301725	Mr A Cordin
005421	301911	Mr W Lewis
005424	301730	Mr A W Browning
005433	301750	Mr A Foxall
005434	301752	Mr M English
005435	301978	Mr R Brothwell
005436	301757	T & J Carlisle
005443	301773	A Jenkin
005449	301781	Ms M Holland
005451	301784	M M F Fowler
005461	301802	Mr B J Barnsdall
005502	301874	Mrs S Johnson
005512	301888	Mrs N Secretan

005515	301891	Ms L Humber
005534	301918	Mrs S C Ecob
005536	301921	Miss B Hayes
005561	301958	Mrs K P Davies-Eyres
005572	301975	Miss S Litman
005574	301980	Miss T Litman
005577	301992	Mrs P Newton
005578	302029	Mr D Chambers
005579	302040	Mrs M Chambers
005581	302046	Miss H Newton
005585	302059	Mr R Benfield
005586	302061	Mrs C Benfield
005588	302071	Mrs L Newton
005591	302082	Mr C Newton
005605	302476	Mr J W Jacques
005606	302114	Mr D B Gaskell
005607	302121	Ms K M Beresford
005620	302156	Mrs P Harvey
005631	302176	Mr S Walker
005638	302186	Mrs D Scothern
005639	302190	Mr R Hardy
005656	302212	Mrs W Evans
005696	302328	Mr M Start
005728	302395	Mr T J Barker
005751	302466	Miss H E Scott
005753	302484	Mr J D Watson
005755	302500	Mr V Jackson
005764	302533	Mr H B Watt
005790	302678	Mrs M A Wade
005791	302683	Ms W J Little
005792	302686	Mr J Chambers
005793	302689	Mrs C J Smith
005794	302691	Mrs M Jemmett-Allen
005812	302716	Mr R Hull
005813	302720	John Chisholm
005816	302731	Anne Chisholm
005827	302761	Mrs A Hurt
005828	302759	Mr S Blagg
005833	302809	Mr J Hurt
005879	302872	Mr P Warren
005895	302925	Mrs B Davis

### **Summary of Objection**

This latest version of the Gedling Local Plan takes more land out of Green Belt than the first version in 1997 despite a proven reduction in new homes required. There is no requirement for safeguarded land as Gedling have allocated more houses now than actually needed before 2021.

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

Technically this is true but as safeguarded land is to be treated as Green Belt for the lifetime of the Local Plan then the Revised Deposit as amended by the Proposed Modifications releases less land for development than the Consultative Draft Plan 1998. The Inspector has recommended (IR 2.63) that safeguarded land should be identified and the justification for this is clearly set out in his report. PPG 2, which remains extant provides the justification.

### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
000463	302508	Mr I Shaw
000574	302509	Mrs S Shaw

### **Summary of Objection**

Wish to raise the following objections, not considered in the 2003 Local Plan Inquiry:-  
The 2003/4 Joint Structure Plan was deposited 1 month after the end of the Inquiry and has progressed sufficiently, so the lower recommendation on housing figures should be considered. The Borough Council is continuing to use the out-of-date Structure Plan.

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

Cabinet report agreed 21st December 2004 addresses the issue of whether account should be taken of the emerging Joint Structure Plan. This is further reinforced by the legal opinion from Mr Spence QC following GAG5 legal representation.

### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
000717	301989	Mrs K Haley

### **Summary of Representation**

The identification of safeguarded land will serve to support the aims of both Green Belt and Joint Structure Plan in identifying land for reinstatement to Green belt or preventing its development until absolutely necessary. It will establish defensible Green Belt boundaries and provide for the long-term development needs of the Borough and Sub-area.

### **Response to Representation**

Your support for this Proposed Modification is welcomed.

### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b> 000717	<b>Representation No.</b> 301993	<b>Correspondent Name</b> Mrs K Haley
------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--

**Summary of Representation**

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.

<b>Correspondent No.</b> 000717	<b>Representation No.</b> 302005	<b>Correspondent Name</b> Mrs K Haley
------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--

**Summary of Representation**

The statement that Top Wighay Farm should be regarded as the first area of search for compensatory housing land should other major allocated sites fail to deliver dwellings at the required rate is welcomed.

**Response to Representation**

Your support for this Proposed Modification is welcomed.

**Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b> 001158	<b>Representation No.</b> 302501	<b>Correspondent Name</b> Mr D Buckland
------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--

**Summary of Representation**

Safeguarded land - The proposed modification is supported.

**Response to Representation**

Your support for this Proposed Modification is welcomed.

**Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b> 001324	<b>Representation No.</b> 302523	<b>Correspondent Name</b> Mr J Fletcher
------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--

**Summary of Representation**

Langridge Homes Ltd supports proposed modification to add Safeguarded Land policy after ENV30 and amend Proposals Map to show sites. However it is also considered that New Farm should be included as Safeguarded Land (see representations on IR 2.34 and PM 2.34).

### **Response to Representation**

Your support for this Proposed Modification is welcomed. See also the Council's response to representation 302513 relating to New Farm.

### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
005193	302630	Mrs P A Collin

### **Summary of Objection**

No justification for allocation of Cornwater Fields as safeguarded land. Never part of the original development plan and there has not been adequate prior consultation. Inspector's decision was based on inadequate information. There are no exceptional circumstances, as are required to justify taking land out of the green belt. There is a large amount of brownfield land in the Borough. Additional housing (including social housing) should be built on reclaimed land. Development elsewhere would help with urban regeneration.

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

The Inspector recommends the site South of Cornwater Fields should be safeguarded and that there is no over-riding need to allocate the site for residential development at this time. It will be treated as green belt for the plan period. Housing is not allocated and cannot be introduced until a sub-regional review of the green belt is completed by the Regional Assembly. The principle of releasing green belt land to meet the development needs of the Borough was agreed in the Adopted 1996 Structure Plan Review the strategic framework for the Replacement Local Plan. The legal opinion from Mr Spence QC endorses this decision further. Previous drafts of the Local Plan have allocated brownfield sites for development and these sites have already come forward such that the majority of the allocations remaining in the Local Plan are now greenfield (and cannot be released until the Local Plan is adopted). The urban capacity study considered opportunities for employment and housing purposes of brownfield sites and other under-utilised land in the urban area.

### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
005194	302632	Mr R W Collin

### **Summary of Objection**

No justification for the allocation of this land as white / safeguarded land - this was never part of the original plan and there has not been adequate prior consultation. Plus letter.

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

The Inspector recommends the site South of Cornwater Fields should be safeguarded and that there is no over-riding need to allocate the site for residential development at this time. It will be treated as green belt for the plan period. Housing is not allocated and cannot be introduced until a sub-regional review of the green belt is completed by the Regional Assembly. The Cabinet report agreed 21st December 2004 addresses the issue of whether account should be taken of the emerging Joint Structure Plan. This is further reinforced by the legal opinion from Mr Spence QC following GAG5 legal representation. The principle of releasing green belt land to meet the development needs of the Borough was agreed in the Adopted 1996 Structure Plan Review the strategic framework for the Replacement Local Plan. The legal opinion from Mr Spence QC endorses this decision further.

### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
005389	301644	Mr M V Coleman

### **Summary of Objection**

This latest version of the Gedling Local Plan takes more land out of Green Belt than the first version in 1997 despite a proven reduction in new homes required. There is no requirement for safeguarded land as Gedling have allocated more houses now than actually needed before 2021. + letter.

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

In response to the comment that the Proposed Modifications take more land out of the Green Belt than the first version of the Local Plan this is technically true. However as safeguarded land is to be treated as green belt for the lifetime of the Local Plan then the Revised Deposit as amended by the Proposed Modifications releases less land for development than the Consultative Draft plan 1998. The Inspector has recommended (IR2.63) that safeguarded land should be identified and the justification for this is clearly set out in his report. PPG2 which remains extant provides the justification. The Cabinet report agreed 21st December 2004 addresses the issue of whether account should be taken of the emerging Joint Structure Plan. This is further reinforced by the legal opinion from Mr Spence QC following GAG5 legal representation. The capacity of existing services to accommodate the proposed development has already been comprehensively addressed in the Inspector's Report which refers to 'the (perceived) inadequacy of particular services in Ravenshead' (section 2.40 parags 7-9) including local schools and medical services. The Urban Capacity Study provides a rationale for windfall provision of housing completions across the Borough. There has been some double counting and the evidence from 2 years of permissions is insufficient to justify a review at this stage.

### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b> 005624	<b>Representation No.</b> 302161	<b>Correspondent Name</b> Mr N Penlington
------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--

**Summary of Objection**

This latest version of the Gedling Local Plan takes more land out of Green Belt than the first version in 1997 despite a proven reduction in new homes required. There is no requirement for safeguarded land as Gedling have allocated more houses now than actually needed before 2021. The proposed developments are not sustainable. Brownfield sites must be used before Greenfield is considered.

**Council's Response and Reasoning**

In response to the comment that the Proposed Modifications take more land out of the Green Belt than the first version of the Local Plan this is technically true. However as safeguarded land is to be treated as green belt for the lifetime of the Local Plan then the Revised Deposit as amended by the Proposed Modifications releases less land for development than the Consultative Draft plan 1998. The Inspector has recommended (IR2.63) that safeguarded land should be identified and the justification for this is clearly set out in his report. PPG2 which remains extant provides the justification. The Inspector has considered environmental and sustainability issues relating to development in Ravenshead in section 2.40 parag 11 of his report. In addition the Environmental Assessment of the Local Plan establishes environment measures. Previous drafts of the Local Plan have allocated brownfield sites for development and these sites have already come forward such that the majority of the allocations remaining in the Local Plan are now greenfield (and cannot be released until the Local Plan is adopted). The urban capacity study considered opportunities for the development or redevelopment for employment and housing purposes of brownfield sites and other underutilised land in the urban area.

**Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b> 005687	<b>Representation No.</b> 302285	<b>Correspondent Name</b> Mr K Perkins
------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	---

**Summary of Objection**

Given the allocation of Land south of Cornwater Fields as safeguarded land there is a potential for 280 houses to be built on Green Field land in Ravenshead. Gedling Borough Council has not properly considered the environmental and sustainability problems that this would have on the Ravenshead community.

**Council's Response and Reasoning**

The site is not proposed for housing. The Inspector has considered environmental and sustainability issues relating to development in Ravenshead in section 2.40 parag 11 of his report. In addition, the Environmental Assessment of the Local Plan establishes environment measures.

**Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b> 005761	<b>Representation No.</b> 302524	<b>Correspondent Name</b> Professor & Mrs R James
------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--

**Summary of Objection**

Wish to raise objection not considered in 2003 Local Plan Inquiry:-- 2003/4 Joint Structure Plan deposited 1 month after end of Local Plan Inquiry contains lower housing requirements for Gedling.

**Council's Response and Reasoning**

Cabinet report agreed 21st December 2004 addresses the issue of whether account should be taken of the emerging Joint Structure Plan. This is further reinforced by the legal opinion from Mr Spence QC following GAG5 legal representation.

**Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b> 005773	<b>Representation No.</b> 302583	<b>Correspondent Name</b> Mr and Mrs A J Johnson
------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	---

**Summary of Objection**

Gedling Local Plan removes large swathes of land from Green Belt when there is no justification for this course of action given commitment from Regional Assembly for strategic review of Notts / Derby Green Belt in 2007 - allocating significant amounts of safeguarded land will prejudice this. Joint Structure Plan (JSP) confirms Gedling Borough Council has no further housing land requirements to 2021. The 1998 Consultation Draft Local Plan allowed for more development sites than actually required but proposed modifications currently release more land from Green Belt than original plan in spite of falling housing requirements. Had Inspector been aware of forthcoming Regional Assembly Green Belt review and reduced JSP housing numbers he would not have safeguarded as much land.

**Council's Response and Reasoning**

The Local Plan Inquiry Inspector clarifies that the use of a safeguarded land policy will not pre-empt future green belt reviews (2.63 paras 19-22) such as by the Regional Assembly. The argument that the Local Plan should take into account the reduced housing requirement in the Joint Structure Plan is not accepted for the reasons set out in the detail of the report considered by Cabinet on 14th December 2004 and adjourned to 21st December 2004. This has been further reinforced by legal opinion from Mr Spence QC following GAG5 legal representation. The Inspector addresses the issue of the amount of safeguarded land to be identified under section 2.63 and concludes that more land should be identified rather than less. In reaching this conclusion he considers the issue as whether the identification of safeguarded land would prejudice any future green belt review and concludes that this would not be the case (section 2.63 paragraphs 19-22). In any event these sites cannot be developed without a full review of the Local Plan and as such their identification will not affect the development of brownfield sites within the City. Whilst it is accepted that technically the SDPM takes more land out of the Green Belt than the Consultative Draft Plan safeguarded land is to be treated as green belt



for the lifetime of the Local Plan such that the SDPM releases less land for development than the 1998 Consultative Draft Plan.

**Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
005789	302679	Mr J A Chisholm

**Summary of Objection**

South of Cornwater Fields – Safeguarded land. No exceptional circumstances for deletion of site from Green Belt - see D Manley QC legal opinion. Full weight should be given to Joint Structure Plan EIP Panel report paragraphs 8.4-8.5 and 8.7. 1996 SP recommendation for Green Belt Review has been overtaken by proposals for strategic review in RPG8. Whatever view is taken of JSP context it remains a material consideration. Wrong to safeguard land for long term needs which have not been properly examined.

**Council's Response and Reasoning**

The principal of releasing green belt land to meet the development needs of the Borough was agreed in the Adopted 1996 Structure Plan Review the strategic framework for the Replacement Local Plan. The Inspector has recommended (IR2.63) that safeguarded land should be identified and the justification for this is clearly set out in his report. PPG2 which remains extant provides the justification. The legal opinion from Mr Spence QC endorses this decision further. The Inspector clarifies that the use of safeguarded land will not pre-empt future green belt reviews (IR2.63 paras 19-22). The Inspector concluded (IR2.1) that it is not the role of Gedling's Local Plan to address the implications of any anticipated extra capacity in the City of Nottingham especially when not part of an adopted local plan. The strategic justification for employment land needs is set out in the Structure Plan and the emerging Joint Structure Plan increases the amount of employment land needed after the local plan period. The Regional Spatial Strategy has to take account of latest household projections and they are currently 18 to 19 % above the annualised rate for the approved RSS.

**Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
005885	302907	Mrs M Solomonides

**Summary of Objection**

This latest version of the Gedling Local Plan takes more land out of Green Belt than the first version in 1997 despite a proven reduction in new homes required. There is no requirement for safeguarded land as Gedling have allocated more houses now than actually needed before 2021. No more houses are needed in Gedling at present - many houses stand empty.

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

In response to the comment that the Proposed Modifications take more land out of the Green Belt than the first version of the Local Plan this is technically true. However as safeguarded land is to be treated as green belt for the lifetime of the Local Plan then the Revised Deposit as amended by the Proposed Modifications releases less land for development than the Consultative Draft Plan 1998. The Inspector has recommended (IR 2.63) that safeguarded land should be identified and the justification for this is clearly set out in his report. PPG2 which remains extant provides the justification. Regarding provision for empty homes, Nottinghamshire County Council make an allowance for empty properties at the strategic level. This is taken into account in the Structure Plan figures.

### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

## **2.71 H4 MANAGED RELEASE OF HOUSING SITES**

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
005319	301326	Mr & Mrs F & A Ellis

### **Summary of Objection**

Council has reneged on agreement to keep their land in Green Belt - brownfield or derelict sites should be used. Bestwood Village has sufficient housing for facilities available. More roads already far too busy for minor village road without extra cars etc. from additional housing.

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

Previous drafts of the Local Plan have allocated brownfield sites for development and these sites have already come forward such that the majority of the allocations remaining in the Local Plan are now green field (and cannot be released until the Local Plan is adopted). The urban capacity study considered opportunities for the development or redevelopment for employment and housing purposes of brownfield sites and other underutilised land in the urban area. The capacity of existing services has already been considered in that the relevant bodies have been consulted regarding the proposed allocation. This includes the Highway Authority (County Council) who have confirmed that the highways impacts of the development of the site would be acceptable. The site is not proposed for housing development in this Local Plan but is proposed to be safeguarded land and will be treated as Green Belt until a future review is undertaken.

### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

## **PM 2.77 H6 RESIDENTIAL DENSITY**

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
001330	302562	Mr A Johnson

### **Summary of Objection**

CPRE objects to reduction of density around schools / Park Lane. The housing density has been reduced around schools. CPRE objects to this as schools are an integral part of the community and provide facilities for use not just during school time but out of school hours. Schools should be well related to locations they are designated to service and in order to reduce the need to travel be located in higher density areas. CPRE therefore believes that density per hectare on Stockings Farm and North of Victoria Park should be the same as Gedling Colliery / Chase Farm. Number of dwellings at Park Lane Bestwood as proposed by Council (in second deposit draft) appears appropriate given the location of the site and its size. There is no reason why the density of this site should be reduced to the levels proposed by Inspector.

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

The Inspector concluded that the Local Plan policy on density was sound and in accordance with government guidance. With regards to the increase of density near schools he considered that locations near schools may be ideal for family housing (which is likely to mean larger dwellings and lower densities). The Inspector also noted that journeys to school are a small proportion of all the trips generated by the average household and if short journeys to school are to be achieved only at the expense of longer journeys to work/shops etc then this does not improve overall sustainability. No evidence has been provided by the objector to counteract these arguments. With regards to the number of dwellings at Park Road Bestwood the Inspector notes that this site is affected by his recommendation (accepted by the Council) that the proximity of a school to a site should not be a reason for raising the density of development. The objector provides no other justification for not accepting the Inspector's recommendation.

### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

## **PM 2.84 H6 RESIDENTIAL DENSITY**

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
001330	302561	Mr A Johnson

### **Summary of Objection**

CPRE objects to reduction of density at Park Lane Bestwood. Number of dwellings at Park Lane Bestwood as proposed by Council (in second deposit draft) appears appropriate given the location of the site and its size. There is no reason why the density of this site should be reduced to the levels proposed by Inspector.

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

With regards to the number of dwellings at Park Road, Bestwood the Inspector notes that this site is affected by his recommendation (accepted by the Council) that the proximity of a school to a site should not be a reason for raising the density of development. The objector provides no other justification for not accepting the Inspector's recommendation.

### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

## **PM 2.88 H13 COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT**

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
005777	302602	Mr N Dawes & Ms S Jones

### **Summary of Objection**

Objects to H13 statements. Suggest proposed alternations: Suggest the words 'or safeguarded' is inserted in Housing H13 objective as follows: Planning permission would not be granted, permission for a development which would prejudice the comprehensive development of any allocated or safeguarded site for the purpose for which it has been allocated or safeguarded. Propose that the last sentence of paragraph 2.47 ('Without the above policy.... prove difficult to resist') be deleted and replaced with 'This policy is to prevent such activities'.

### **Council's Response and Reasoning**

It is not accepted that the policy should be amended as suggested. The scenario referred to relates to only one site such that it would not be appropriate to amend the policy. In any event the issue can adequately be addressed by the Development Brief to be prepared for the site.

### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

## **PM 2.90 H16 AFFORDABLE HOUSING**

<b>Correspondent No.</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
000717	301990	Mrs K Haley

### **Summary of Representation**

The Inspector recommended no changes to the policy, but a fuller explanation of the way in which the requirement for affordable housing has been reached in the supporting text.

### **Response to Representation**

Your support for this Proposed Modification is welcomed.

**Proposed Further Modification**

No change.