

Appendix 1

Nottingham City

NCC1c

Where should major regeneration and transformation interventions be focused?

From a Gedling Borough perspective, the areas of Top Valley, Bestwood and Bestwood Park should be prioritised for regeneration. Use should be made of the SRF's and Neighbourhood Plans approach to ensure that the most deprived areas are targeted and funds are best utilised. Close co-operation between Gedling Borough Council and Nottingham City Council is required with regards to the above areas in terms of any cross border implications and opportunities for joined up working.

NCC2a

How can access to the main areas of employment and training opportunities within the City be improved?

Access to employment and training is one that affects the whole of the conurbation and Gedling Borough Council believe is best dealt with at that level. This question ties in with those within section 3.7 relating to Transport & Accessibility and section 3.4 relating to Employment. Alongside provision of physical infrastructure such as improved public transport, cycle routes and the like, consideration should be given to spatial options such as mobile training centres to allow people to access training at a more local level without the need to provide costly infrastructure. Consideration should also be given to improving the opportunities for home or remote working.

NCC2b

Should the development of sites for smaller locally based businesses, and existing businesses which need to be relocated, be supported through the provision of new sites? If so, what areas might be suitable?

Consideration should be given to the role of employment sites within Gedling Borough – e.g. Colwick Industrial Estate and proposed employment allocations at Teal Close and Gedling Colliery. NCRELS identified that the east of Greater Nottingham (i.e. Gedling Borough) was suited to small scale business serving the local area and would be an appropriate place to relocate business affected by the Regeneration Zones. Gedling Borough Council and Nottingham City Council should work closely together to ensure that an appropriate cross-boundary approach is taken to address the relocation of businesses affected by Regeneration Schemes. It is also important to recognize the need for a range of employment sites serving different purposes.

NCC5a

Include a general requirement that the scale of new retail development within the more localised centres should be appropriate to the centre in which it is located

Para NCC4.1.18 refers to PPS6 in relation to planning for town centres. It will also be important to take account of the draft of PPS4 (which incorporates PPS6) as this is likely to replace PPS6 within the next few months. Gedling Borough Council are of the opinion that a general requirement is a) already contained in both PPS6 and the draft of PPS4 and b) would not likely to be as effective as indicating the likely floor space threshold that are deemed to be appropriate (as per para 2.42 of PPS6).

It will also be appropriate to set floor space thresholds for retail developments to require the Impact Assessment as allowed by the new PPS4 (EC5.1 bullet point 7). This would apply to edge of centre and out of centre locations and would ensure that the nature of local centres is taken into account when considering planning applications that may affect them. Careful consideration should be given to establishing these figures and close cross-boundary working should be undertaken to ensure that the impact of centres in other districts is taken into account. Also permitted is the establishment of local impacts to be assessed alongside the key impacts contained in EC20.1 (bullet point 3 a-h). Again careful consideration should be given to what these impacts should be across the conurbation.

NCC5b

Consider setting thresholds for the level of development that is likely to be appropriate within the more localised centres. If so, what should the thresholds be?

While this is permitted in both PPS6 (Para 2.42) and the draft of PPS4 that is set to replace PPS6 (Policy EC7.2 bullet point 1), it should be made clear that this is not a fixed threshold. The purpose of these policies is to provide an indication of the likely appropriate scale of development and each development should be assessed on its own merits. Development that will significantly increase the attraction of a centre will be required to provide an Impact Assessment (see Policy EC18.2 of the draft of PPS4). The wording of the policy should make clear that a) the figure is not a maximum and b) an impact assessment may be required for development under the figure. Careful consideration should be given to establishing these figures and close cross-boundary working should be undertaken to ensure that the impact of centres in other districts is taken into account.

It will also be appropriate to set floor space thresholds for retail developments to require the Impact Assessment as allowed by the new PPS4 (EC5.1 bullet point 7). This would apply to edge of centre and out of centre locations and would ensure that the nature of local centres is taken into account when considering planning applications that may affect them. Careful consideration should be given to establishing these figures and close cross-boundary working should be undertaken to ensure that the impact of centres in other districts is taken into account. Also permitted is the establishment of local impacts to be assessed alongside the key impacts contained in EC20.1 (bullet point 3 a-h). Again careful consideration should be given to what these impacts should be across the conurbation.

NCC5c

Should the Core Strategy seek to resist additional retail developments in areas where there are existing, but unimplemented, planning permissions for retail development?

Gedling Borough Council believe that it is unlikely that developers will wish to locate in areas that have significant levels of unimplemented permissions as it is an indication that local demand for retail may be limited. Also a factor is the three-year limit to commence development and it is likely that the level of unimplemented planning permissions will be not be substantial. If this does prove to be an issue, the provisions of draft PPS4 (due to replace PPS6 within the next few months) are likely to prove sufficient to counter any problems. An application for a development above 2500sqm and not in accordance with the development plan in an edge of centre or

out of centre location will need to provide a sequential assessment and an impact assessment. The developer is required to demonstrate that town centre options have been considered and also consider the positive and negative impacts of development “*taking account of the likely cumulative effect of recent permissions, developments under construction and completed developments*”.

To avoid the problem of developers submitting applications for just under the 2500sqm threshold, consideration should be given to setting floor space thresholds for retail developments to require the Impact Assessment as allowed by the new PPS4 (EC5.1 bullet point 7). This would apply to edge of centre and out of centre locations and would ensure that the nature of local centres is taken into account when considering planning applications that may affect them. Careful consideration should be given to establishing these figures and close cross-boundary working should be undertaken to ensure that the impact of centres in other districts is taken into account. Also permitted is the establishment of local impacts to be assessed alongside the key impacts contained in EC20.1 (bullet point 3 a-h). Again careful consideration should be given to what these impacts should be across the conurbation.

NCC6a

Prioritise the development of family housing on suitable sites within the City

Gedling Borough Council is of the opinion that this issue is best addressed at the HMA level and any approach should be supported by robust evidence. The figures provided in Para NCC4.1.19 need to be treated more sensitively due to the nature of the administrative boundaries in Greater Nottingham. The Strategic Housing Market Assessment (2006) shows that the outer suburbs of the conurbation are more popular with families and it may be that across the conurbation the figure for dwellings with six or more rooms is close to the 50% national figure referred to in Para NCC4.1.19. It is not clear the extent to which a policy encouraging large family housing will be able to alter this trend and other spatial approaches may need to be put in place to complement this policy. Careful consideration will need to be given to the location of sites as certain areas may be unpopular with families regardless of the provision of housing appropriate for them.

NCC7b

Encourage the development of more diverse housing types, and appropriate supporting facilities and infrastructure, within and adjoining the City Centre - particularly in the Regeneration Zones

The recent trend for flatted developments would seem to have been ended with the Credit Crunch. However in the long term, with a move to smaller households, well-designed flats may prove to be popular. The need to make efficient use of land remains and a marked reduction in densities on sites in the City will have impacts for the release of Green Belt land around the edge of the PUA. Innovative housing types should be encouraged though it is difficult to identify what these are at present. One option may be the provision of Work-live units to allow more residents to work from home. This may involve the provision of associated developments such as meeting rooms for rent and other facilities to support home working.

NCC10

What should be the priorities for public transport links within the City?

Gedling Borough Council is of the opinion that the NET should be the focus for public transport. Careful consideration should be given to opportunities to extend or enhance the tram. New housing development could be located to open up areas for extension to the NET and new Park & Ride schemes could be developed to encourage more drivers to use public transport for at least part of their journey.

The emphasis should be on both radial and orbital links, but for the latter, the focus should be on orbital links at the Greater Nottingham level rather than within the City as currently addressed by this option.

NCC11a

Should the Core Strategy seek to prioritise the creation of new public open spaces or enhance the quality of, and access to, existing ones?

The enhancement of existing public open space would benefit new and established communities and would cut down on maintenance costs in the long term. Consideration should be given to cross boundary work to establish a works programme to ensure that if, how and when enhancements are made is carried out in a joined up manner.

Erewash

EBC8a

Provide a Strategic Site Allocation for commercial employment generating development in a highly accessible location to a junction of the M1 Motorway. If so, where might an appropriate location?

A strategic employment site of the type described would have benefits for the whole of the Greater Nottingham conurbation and would be supported by Gedling Borough Council. Careful consideration will need to be given to its location and relationship with the transport network.

EBC8b

Prioritising and providing allocations for commercial employment generating development in accessible locations

An incremental approach promoting smaller sites would not have the same conurbation wide benefits as the identification of a strategic employment site. It is also not clear how a policy to reflect the approach of favouring employment land could be worded effectively.

EBC8c

Prioritising commercial employment generating development as part of the regeneration of Stanton Ironworks

Stanton Ironworks should be developed as a sustainable community. As such a portion of the land should be developed as employment land. Careful consideration will need to be given to the exact proportion to ensure a balance between viability and sustainability.

Broxtowe

BBC8a

Continue to safeguard the Toton Sidings site for a future strategic road/rail freight facility

Use of Toton Sidings as a strategic road/rail freight depot would have conurbation wide benefits. Policy 21 of the East Midlands Regional Plan (EMRP) encourages local authorities to give priority to the allocation of sites that “*can be served by rail freight*”. Policy 44 Objective T5 of the EMRP requires that steps are taken to lead to a “*modal switch away from the road based transport in the manufacturing, retail and freight distribution sectors*”. Finally, Policy 55 requires that new strategic distribution sites are identified. In conclusion the policies in the EMRP point to the need for a strategic road/rail freight depot in the Nottingham Core HMA and careful consideration should be given to Toton Sidings as a possible location.

BBC8b

Accept that a strategic road/rail freight facility is no longer a suitable proposal for this site (Toton Sidings)

It is understood that a study is being undertaken into potential locations for a strategic road/rail freight depot in the East Midlands. Until such time as this study is completed it would be premature to take any decision on the use of Toton Sidings.

Rushcliffe

RBC4

What weight should be given to areas of open countryside compared to open space and other land within built up areas?

It should be noted that open countryside is a local policy and does not carry the same weight as Green Belt. Careful consideration should be given to the balance between Green Belt, Open Space and Open Countryside.

RBC8

Are there any other specific local issues or options relating to Rushcliffe Borough that are not identified above and which you would like to raise?

Consideration should be given to the potential fourth Trent Crossing between Gedling Borough and Rushcliffe Borough. The exact location and nature of this have not yet been established but careful consideration should be given to how this may affect development within both Gedling Borough and Rushcliffe Borough.

Ashfield

AG5a

Should this Core Strategy take a longer term view of the distribution of future development around Greater Nottingham and identify potential locations for development beyond 2026? If so where should these future areas of growth be?

Gedling Borough Council are of the opinion that it is important to plan now for the period after 2026 (potentially after 2021 to tie in with the likely increased housing figures emerging from the RSS Partial Review). The RSS Partial review is likely to be finalised during Autumn 2011 (i.e. prior to the expected adoption of the Core Strategy in December 2011) and to ensure that adopted plans are sound it is important that areas to meet this growth are identified. Identification of broad areas for future growth will also provide flexibility in the event that allocated sites do not

come forward and will ensure that a Five-year land supply is maintained. Potential areas that could be identified include sites assessed in the Appraisal of Sustainable Urban Extensions (2008) but not required for the current round of housing targets. Consideration should also be given to sites that link in with sites within other Districts to ensure that opportunities for synergy are taken.

AG5b

In the longer term (post 2026), what should the future role of the Sub Regional Centres of Hucknall and Ilkeston in relation to Greater Nottingham. Should more development be concentrated here in the longer term?

Gedling Borough Council agree that consideration should be given to the concentration of more development in sub regional centres beyond 2026. Suitable sites both within and adjoining the PUA to meet growth for the period after 2026 (potentially after 2021 to tie in with the likely increased housing figures emerging from the RSS Partial Review) are likely to be limited. As noted by Ashfield District Council in paragraphs 3.4.21 and 3.4.23, transport links to Hucknall are already “fast and reliable” and Hucknall is an important retail, employment, leisure hub for Ashfield. Focusing growth on this sub-regional centre could further enhance both the number and range of facilities and services in Hucknall while allowing good access to regional scale facilities in Nottingham City Centre via an extended NET.

GB1

How should the revision of the Green Belt and Countryside be approached, in order to accommodate future growth needs?

Gedling Borough Council feel it would be more appropriate to deal with Green Belt and Countryside separately to avoid potential confusion regarding the relative weight of these. Green Belt is a national policy designation and carries significant weight compared to the local ‘Countryside’ designation.

GB1b

To take account of likely future development needs beyond the Plan period, should the Green Belt and Countryside boundaries be reviewed further to create “safeguarded land” which could be allocated in a future planning document to meet long term development needs?

Gedling Borough Council are of the opinion that it is important to plan now for the period after 2026 (potentially after 2021 to tie in with the likely increased housing figures emerging from the RSS Partial Review). The RSS Partial review is likely to be finalised during Autumn 2011 (i.e. prior to the expected adoption of the Core Strategy in December 2011) and to ensure that adopted plans are sound it is important that areas to meet this growth are identified. Identification of broad areas for future growth will also provide flexibility in the event that allocated sites do not come forward and will ensure that a Five-year land supply is maintained. Potential areas that could be identified include sites flagged up in the Appraisal of Sustainable Urban Extensions (2008) but not required for the current round of housing targets. Consideration should also be given to sites that link in with sites within other Districts to ensure that opportunities for synergy are taken.

RG2

How can major growth proposals benefit existing communities?

Gedling Borough Council are of the opinion that a combination of both RG2a and RG2b is the appropriate way to ensure that the community facilities are provided. Consideration needs to be given to the proximity of existing services to allocated sites and the potential to expand these facilities to meet the higher demands. Growth could also be directed to areas where new provision also benefits existing communities such as areas that are identified as suffering from a lack of facilities or services.

EE2

How do we consolidate and create a viable role for existing industries and business?

In planning for existing employment sites consideration needs to be given to cross boundary issues. Gedling Borough Council will seek to work closely with Ashfield District Council to ensure that the most appropriate course is taken when taking decisions regarding the location of employment generating uses.

EE3

How should we provide high quality and well located employment generating development?

In planning for new employment development, consideration needs to be given to cross boundary issues. Gedling Borough Council will seek to work closely with Ashfield District Council to ensure that the most appropriate course is taken when taking decisions regarding the location of employment generating uses.

EE4c

Is there scope for the town centres to accommodate office-based employment?

Which of the town centres would be most suitable for further development?

The potential for sub-regional centres such as Hucknall to accommodate office development should be fully explored. Due to excellent public transport links, the proximity of the M1 and its pivotal role in the economy of Ashfield District, Hucknall is well placed to take opportunities to broaden its economic base.

EE5

How do we respond to the challenge Ashfield faces and develop a prosperous, dynamic and high value local economy?

The potential for sub-regional centres such as Hucknall to accommodate new employment generating development should be fully explored. Due to excellent public transport links, the proximity of the M1 and its pivotal role in the economy of Ashfield District, Hucknall is well placed to take opportunities to broaden its economic base.

TA1

How should the accessibility of major new developments be approached?

In the short term, focus should be on sites that are currently well served by public transport. This would make use of existing infrastructure and may also provide the opportunity for the standard of services to be raised.

TA1b

Should major new development only be permitted in association with the provision of major new public transport infrastructure and services and highway capacity improvements?

Gedling Borough Council agree that appropriate transport works should accompany any major new development, whether this is the provision of new or expanded infrastructure. Consideration should be given to sites that can be linked with sites in adjoining districts to benefit from the opportunity for infrastructure to serve a number of sites.

TA3

What should be the priorities for major transport infrastructure?

New development should be located to make use of a wide range of existing infrastructure including proposed transport schemes. Where development is encouraged in conjunction with new transport infrastructure, consideration should be given to wider Greater Nottingham implications as well as local implications.

NI1

Where can existing infrastructure support growth in Ashfield and Greater Nottingham?

Extensions and improvements to the NET line in Hucknall would support growth in a sub-regional centre that is an important economic and retail centre for Ashfield and also provides an important route for residents to access regional scale facilities and employment in Nottingham City (especially the City Centre).