# PM 5.5 T3 PROPOSED TRANSPORT SCHEMES

Correspondent No.	Representation No.	Correspondent Name
003981	302584	Miss A Plackett

### Summary of Objection

With reference to Gedling Relief Road the Inspector's comments in paragraph 42 regarding the impact of the road on the setting of Gedling House, a Grade II listed building: 'There may be scope for considering an alteration to the alignment the extent of cuttings and mitigation measures... and expect that EIA would explore this issue in detail'. English Heritage hope this recommendation will be acted upon at the appropriate time.

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

Your suggestions regarding the impact on Gedling House have been noted and will be taken into account at the appropriate time, through the Statement of Community Involvement in the Local Development Scheme.

### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

## PM 5.6 T3 PROPOSED TRANSPORT SCHEMES

Correspondent No.	Representation No.	Correspondent Name
000717	302041	Mrs K Haley

### Summary of Objection

The proposed Gedling Colliery / Chase Farm development is required to construct an access road around Gedling which will effectively replace County Council's long standing proposed Gedling Relief Road. However if the privately funded scheme does not come forward then County Council will continue to safeguard the Gedling Relief Road Scheme. The Gedling Relief Road Scheme should be reinstated in Policy T3 and a suitable cross reference made to PM 2.62 Policy H3. A scheme is recommended: A6211 Gedling Relief Road. This replaces the Gedling Bypass scheme and involves constructing new section of road between A612 at Burton Joyce and A6211 Arnold Lane. The purpose of scheme is to resolve local safety environmental and congestion problems caused by traffic passing through Gedling village. This scheme does not feature in current Greater Nottingham Local Transport Plan and should be viewed as a medium / long term scheme. Note that this scheme will no longer be necessary in event of the Gedling Access Road being provided in association with Gedling Colliery / Chase Farm redevelopment.

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

Proposed Modification is not accepted. Planning policy guidance note 12 on Development Plans (which remains in operation for development plans still being prepared) highlights in paragraph 5.22 that when safeguarding transport routes local authorities need to be realistic about the prospects of the start of the project in the plan period. The scheme does not feature in the current Greater Nottingham Local

### Gedling Borough Local Plan –Proposed Modifications – Responses to Objections Received

Transport Plan and by virtue of the fact that it should be considered as a medium/long term scheme it is not appropriate to safeguard the route within the Local Plan.

#### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

Correspondent No.	Representation No.	Correspondent Name
001325	302653	Mr I D Griffiths

## **Summary of Representation**

T3 - PM5.6 - support the elements ref Calverton rail line A614 Ollerton Road/Burntstump Hill/Gravelly Hollow Crossroads and A60/B2020 Ravenshead improvements.

#### **Response to Representation**

Your support for this Proposed Modification is welcomed.

#### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

Correspondent No.	Representation No.	Correspondent Name
005888	302910	Tom Lambshead

### **Summary of Objection**

Network Rail note proposed reopening of Gedling Colliery/ Calverton rail lines and their safeguarding. While not objecting in principle concerns that protection where there is no likely future rail re-use could stifle other development proposals. Any proposed reopening would need to be technically commercially and operationally feasible and have support of Train Operating Companies (TOCs) as well as Strategic Rail Authority. Network Rail would request full consultation and recommend that any reopening of lines takes into account Strategic Rail Authority document - 'New Stations A Guide for Promoters' Autumn 2004. PROPOSED REVISED WORDING - 'Full consultation will be required with the rail industry on these proposals. The safeguarding will remain unless the rail industry including the Strategic Rail Authority and Network Rail consider that the proposals are unlikely to come forward during the life of the plan. + LETTER

### Council's Response and Reasoning

Your suggestions have been noted and will be taken into account at the appropriate time.

### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

# PM 5.9 T4 PARK AND RIDE

Correspondent No.	Representation No.	Correspondent Name
000717	302039	Mrs K Haley

# Summary of Objection

PM 5.9 deletes reference to Leapool Park and Ride which is not accepted. The County Council will continue to safeguard land in order to secure the implementation of a network of Park and Ride sites in Greater Nottingham served by bus heavy rail or light rail. This is in accordance with the adopted 1996 Structure Plan Policy 5/1 and 2003 Joint Structure Plan Deposit Draft 5/1. The site forms part of this strategy and would need to be served by bus. The feasibility of this site is being reviewed as part of the preparation of the second Local Transport Plan for Greater Nottingham. In the interests of safeguarding the Leapool Park and Ride site from inappropriate development the County Council requests that this site be reinstated in Policy T4 and shown on the Proposals Map accordingly.

## Council's Response and Reasoning

Modification put forward by the objector is not accepted. Planning Policy Note 12 on Development Plans (which remains in operation for development plans still being prepared) highlights in paragraph 5.22 that when safeguarding transport routes local authorities need to be realistic about the prospects for the start of the project in the plan period. Information received from Nottinghamshire County Council noted that whilst not confirming the abandonment of the Leapool Park and Ride the prospects for the foreseeable future do not look good. In addition Planning Policy Note 2 on Green Belts and Planning Policy Note 13 on Transport advise that park and ride may be appropriate in the green belt if certain conditions are met.

### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

Correspondent No.	Representation No.	Correspondent Name
002542	301199	Mrs D Towle

### **Summary of Objection**

To have a park and ride at Leapool is a good idea. I have to often get out of the car and press the light on the crossing just so that we can get out on to Mansfield Road because of volume of traffic.

### Council's Response and Reasoning

Planning Policy Note 12 on Development Plans (which remains in operation for development plans still being prepared) highlights in paragraph 5.22 that when safeguarding transport routes local authorities need to be realistic about the prospects for the start of the project in the plan period. Information received from Nottinghamshire County Council noted that whilst not confirming the abandonment of the Leapool Park and Ride the prospects for the foreseeable future do not look good. In addition Planning Policy Note 2 on Green Belts and Planning Policy Note 13 on Transport advise that park and ride may be appropriate in the green belt if certain conditions are met.

**Proposed Further Modification** 

No change.

Correspondent No.	Representation No.	Correspondent Name
001948	301986	Mr P Walster

### **Summary of Objection**

Principal of Park and Ride on edge of urban area seems very sensible. These who travelled down A60 to park on Goose Fair / The Forest site to get onto bus to Nottingham should be able to get onto bus at Leapool roundabout. This would not only ease the congestion but would be more "sustainable". The Inspector said that this matter should be reviewed at time of modifications and taking into account any progress on Feasibility Study and Local Transport Plan. However there has been no progress on 'Feasibility Study and Local Transport Plan' and therefore Park and Ride site should be protected. County Council comments that Leapool Park and Ride "may not be confirmed as further bus priority measures would be required along A60". Agree that bus measures would be difficult but surely the provision of Park and Ride would reduce number of cars - why should non-availability of bus priority measures affect this. Private investor monies would finance development.

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

Planning Policy Note 12 on Development Plans (which remains in operation for development plans still being prepared) highlights in paragraph 5.22 that when safeguarding transport routes local authorities need to be realistic about the prospects for the start of the project in the plan period. Information received from Nottinghamshire County Council noted that whilst not confirming the abandonment of the Leapool Park and Ride the prospects for the foreseeable future do not look good. In addition Planning Policy Note 2 on Green Belts and Planning Policy Note 13 on Transport advise that park and ride may be appropriate in the green belt if certain conditions are met.

### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.

# PM 5.19 T10 HIGHWAY DESIGN AND PARKING GUIDELINES

Correspondent No.	Representation No.	<b>Correspondent Name</b>
001948	302672	Mr P Walster

### Summary of Objection

Final sentence of the proposed amendment to paragraph 5.27 (PM 5.19 2a) should be amended to clarify that where car parking cannot otherwise be justified as part of a development (pedestrianised/ town centre location) the need to provide disabled parking bays will not arise. PROPOSED CHANGE - Replacement sentence - "Where a development is to include car parking spaces the only exception to a maximum standard of provision will relate to parking for the disabled where the Council will seek a minimum number of spaces as set out in Appendix 3 in respect of provision for parking spaces for the disabled."

Chapter 5

### Gedling Borough Local Plan –Proposed Modifications – Responses to Objections Received

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

With regards to the first point raised disabled people will still need to access areas for which reduced parking provision may otherwise be appropriate. As such the suggested amendment is not considered appropriate. With regards to the proposed change suggested by the objector the provision of parking for disabled people is clearly addressed by the County's document 'Parking Provision for New Development' (May 2004).

#### **Proposed Further Modification**

No change.