

## CHAPTER 9 – Appendices, Technical Reports and Proposals Map

### A2 APPENDIX 2: DEVELOPMENT BRIEFS

#### Objections

<b>A2</b>	<b>Appendix 2: Development Briefs</b>	
1165 2520		Siemens Properties Ltd Colliers Erdman Lewis
1155 2513		Greasley Parish Council Andrew Thomas Planning
1388 3627	Ms E Marshall	Environment Agency, Lower Trent Area

#### Summary of Objection Issues

##### **A2 Appendix 2: Development Briefs**

###### 1165/2520: Siemens Properties Ltd

1. The Siemens site including the Trent Vale Playing Fields (site Be(a)) should be identified as a potential development site which should be subject of a Development Brief. This Development Brief should acknowledge the need to rationalise and redevelopment of the site for a mix of uses. The key objective should be a retained and improved Siemens facility. Potential uses could include B1, B2 and B8 development, residential local shopping facilities and other associated uses. Access would be a material consideration.

###### *Council's Response:*

2. Refer to the proof of evidence for site Be(a) (Proof 035), and for site EM3b (Proof 022). An agreed position has been reached with the objectors which is reflected in these proofs. The employment development area allocated in the Plan does not in itself merit a Development Brief. A larger area is now the subject of a planning application for redevelopment for employment purposes, submitted by the objectors in March 2000.

###### 1155/2513: Greasley Parish Council

3. The development briefs set out the Council's position concerning some of the larger development allocations. However these briefs are for illustrative purposes only – indicating an example of how each site might be developed. Given the scale and importance of the proposals identified – consider that far greater weight should be attached to these development briefs if they are to have appropriate control over the pattern of development which eventually takes place.

###### *Council's Response:*

4. The Development Briefs form part of the plan and as such considerable weight can be attached to them. Furthermore at Revised Draft stage the final sentence of the Development Briefs was amended to read "The layout shown however may be subject to minor amendment." This wording strengthens the standing of the Development Briefs whilst still allowing some flexibility.

###### 1388/3627: Environment Agency, Lower Trent Area

5. Reference should be made to the encouragement of Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems in "relevant Development Brief Sites".

***Council's Response:***

6. The Council does not consider SUDS should be referred to in every Development Brief. However, following further consideration the Council has invited the Inspector to recommend the addition of a new criteria to Policy E1 – Good Design in the Built Environment. The use of SUDS is also referred to by the reasoned justification to policy E25 – Protection of Groundwater (Proof 078).

**Inspector's Conclusions**

1. Neither site Be(a) now conditionally withdrawn nor EM3b merited development briefs. They are relatively small sites, which raise few complex issues.
2. Only the Policies of the Plan enjoy the weight of the Act. Supporting text and appendices may be material considerations. Development briefs provide useful guidance on key aspects of a large site's development, but it would be short-sighted to regard them too rigidly. The precise locations and boundaries of particular uses, the detailed alignment of roads and footpaths are all matters that may in some cases be subject to alteration as a result of further detailed design.
3. I recommend in Chapter 3 that Policy E1 should include a new criterion covering the EA's concern. The Plan should be read as a whole and it is unnecessary to repeat the provisions of various policies that might apply in every allocation and development brief.

**Recommendation**

4. I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP in respect of these objections.
1. The list of Development Briefs on the first page of Appendix 2 refers to "C: Beeston: Land off Queens Road and Dovecote Lane".

**Inquiry Change**

- IC114
2. **The Council has recommended that, in the list on the first page of Appendix 2, the phrase "and Dovecote Lane" should be deleted.**
  3. This change ensures factual accuracy, as land off Dovecote Lane is not covered by the Brief.

**Inspector's Conclusions**

1. I recommend in Chapter 4 the allocation for housing development of part of the former site H2e, the Maltings, Dovecote Lane, Beeston. I conclude that the development of this and the adjoining allocated site should be co-ordinated, particularly in respect of footpath and cycleway links and possibly vehicular access, including emergency access. Also landscaping and possibly screening of the railway line needs to be considered jointly. These suggest an extension of Development Brief C, not IC114, which the Council put forward.

## Recommendation

- I recommend that Development Brief C be extended to include the adjoining housing allocation on the Maltings that I recommend.

### **A2a APPENDIX 2A - DEVELOPMENT BRIEF: LAND AT CENTRAL ORDNANCE DEPOT**

#### Objections

1331	5233	R471		Defence Estates East, MoD
1331	5234	R472		Defence Estates East, MoD
1331	5239			Defence Estates East, MoD
1331	3403			Defence Estates East, MoD GVA Grimley
2005	6388	R461	Ms ME Bradford	
2103	6653	R461	Mr K Bray	
2009	6396	R461	Mrs RC Callow	
2010	6398	R461	Mr JM Callow	
2021	6422	R466	Mrs HA Colton	
2021	6421	R461	Mrs HA Colton	
2043	6461	R461	Mrs M Doughty	
599	1755		Mr G Foster	Nottinghamshire County Council
599	4032		Mr G Foster	Nottinghamshire County Council
855	4775	R461	Mrs JE Gibbs	
1135	2370		Mr I Moss	House Builders` Federation
1677	5641	R470	Mr C Robson	
601	4603	R461	Mr S Rufus	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust
601	4604	R466	Mr S Rufus	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust

#### Summary of Objection Issues

##### 1331/5233 - Defence Estates East: MoD

- Defence Estates considers that reference to MOD's security requirements is not a matter for the Local Plan and should be deleted. If any reference is to be retained to security measures this should be worded in accordance with the phrasing in R308 (and not in R471) as the former makes it clear that the security requirements are a matter to be dealt with by the MOD, not Broxtowe Council.
- Delete reference to security measures. If any reference is retained, amend R471 to read, 'Appropriate security measures will be required by the Ministry of Defence on the northern boundary of the site'.

*Council's Response:*

#### Inquiry Change

- IC56
- Following further consideration the Council has recommended that the final bullet point of the Development Brief is amended to read:**

**“Appropriate security measures will be required by the Ministry of Defence on the northern boundary of the site”.**

4. This amended wording more accurately reflects the text within policy EM3a.

1331/5234 - Defence Estates East MoD

5. The plan accompanying the Development Brief is illustrative only and represents ‘an example’ of how the site might be developed. The plan is, by definition, conceptual and illustrative and it is therefore unreasonable to state that it may be subject to minor amendment. Matters of layout are for consideration through the planning application process and developers may come forward with acceptable alternative layouts.
6. Delete ‘minor’ from revision R472.

*Council's Response:*

7. The Development Briefs form part of the Development Plan, they are based on the Proposals Map and they indicate how the Council considers the sites should be developed. The text is phrased so as to emphasise the importance of the Development Briefs whilst still allowing some flexibility.

1331/5239 - Defence Estates East MOD

8. Support was expressed for R305 (paragraph 5.65) however it was proposed that an amendment should be made to Appendix 2A: the word “open” should be deleted from the eighth bullet point, in order to ensure consistency with the revised paragraph 5.65.

*Council's Response:*

9. The Council recognises that this would be an appropriate amendment.

**Inquiry Change**

- IC98** 10. **The Council has recommended that the word “open” should be deleted from the eighth bullet point.**

1331/3403 - Defence Estates East MoD

11. The Development Brief A should be amended to take account of the objections made to other parts of the Plan. (These points are referred to in the objectors’ proof of evidence).

*Council's Response:*

12. The objections made to other parts of the plan are dealt with under their own reference. No changes are proposed to Appendix A2a other than the Inquiry Changes described in this proof. However the Council acknowledges that it would be appropriate for the brief to mention that the requirement to protect mature trees should be subject to a survey to ascertain the quality and health of the trees.

**Inquiry Change**

- IC99** 13. **The Council has recommended that in the 14<sup>th</sup> bullet point, after “within and adjacent to the site”, the following should be added: “, subject to a survey to ascertain the quality and health of the trees,”**

2043/6461 - Mrs M Doughty

2016/6398 - Mr J MCallow  
2005/6388 - Ms M E Bradford

14. Lack of community facilities.

2103/6653 - Mr K Bray

15. Increased traffic. High density spoils setting of Attenborough and Chilwell. Pressure on existing schools, doctors, dentists, libraries.

2009/6396 - Mrs R C Callow

16. Lack of community centre and amenities.

2021/6421, 6422 - Mrs H A Colton

17. Housing out of character.

*Council's Joint Response:*

18. Refer to the Proof of Evidence for Site H2(a) : Central Ordnance Depot, Attenborough (Proof 010).

599/1755 - Nottinghamshire County Council

19. This objection was lodged in respect of policy H2a, however the proposed amendment relates to Appendix 2A. It is proposed that the plan accompanying Appendix 2A should be amended to indicate a second vehicular access onto Swiney Way.

*Council's Response:*

20. The Council acknowledges that a second vehicular access onto Swiney Way would be appropriate.

**Inquiry Change**

**IC97 21. The Council has recommended that the plan accompanying Appendix 2A should be amended to indicate a second vehicular access onto Swiney Way.**

599/4032 - Nottinghamshire County Council

22. The penultimate bullet point should be reworded as 'to enable parking standards to be agreed' as current wording infers catering for parking demand. (A slightly different wording, "to guide appropriate parking provision", is proposed in the objectors' proof of evidence). The reference in the housing section to developer contributions should be extended to include walking and cycling. The employment section should include a reference to contributions.

*Council's Response:*

**Inquiry Change**

**23. Following further consideration the Council has recommended an amendment to the last but one bullet point to read:**

IC57

- **“A transport impact study will be required for the whole site with an additional green commuter plan to enable parking standards to be agreed for the employment”.**

24. The Council considers that this change overcomes the objection.

25. It should also be noted that reference to the provision of walking and cycling measures was inserted into the Development Brief at Revised Deposit Stage (R469). Contributions are dealt with the Council's response to objections to policy EM2.

855/4775 - Mr J E Gibbs

26. Lack of local community facilities. Pressure on schools.

*Council's Response:*

27. Refer to the Proof of Evidence for Site H2(a) : Central Ordnance Depot, Attenborough (Proof 010).

1135/2370 - House Builders' Federation

28. The wording of the brief is inconsistent with policy RC3. Changes will also need to be made to the brief if the HBF's representations on policies H5, H6, RC9 and T1 result in changes to the plan.

*Council's Response:*

29. The wording of the brief is entirely consistent with the wording of Policy H2a - the site specific policy for this development. Furthermore, the Council does not consider that this wording is inconsistent with RC3 - the more general policy covering developers' contributions to education and community facilities. No further changes are required to the Development Brief.

1677/5640 - Mr C Robson

30. Security fears

601/4603 - Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust

31. We refer the Council to our comments on R149.

*Council's Joint Response:*

32. Refer to the Proof of Evidence for site H2(a): Central Ordnance Depot, Attenborough (Proof 010).

Additional issue

33. The Council has proposed that policy H2(a) should be amended in respect of education facilities, with the word "enhancement" being replaced with the phrase "provision and/or enhancement" (IC33). For consistency, the Council considers that an equivalent amendment should be made to the wording of the Development Brief.

**Inquiry Change**

34. **The Council has recommended that, in the first line of the seventh paragraph on the second page of the Development Brief, the word “enhancement” should be replaced with the phrase “provision and/or enhancement”.**

IC82

### Inspector’s Conclusions

1. IC56 and IC98 more accurately reflect the text to Policy H2a. They should therefore be supported. I would have thought that IC99 was so obvious that it hardly merits mention. There would be little point in protecting mature trees in poor health and of poor quality. However, IC99 is harmless enough.
2. R472 states that the accompanying plan illustrates an example of how the site could be developed. Clearly these terms do not preclude other layouts, which could be equally acceptable or even preferable. The term “minor” sits badly with the previous sentence and should be deleted from this and other briefs. Only the Policies of the Plan have the status afforded by the Act. The rest may be material considerations. I note the point relating to the allocations on the PM and I have already expressed reservations on some sites at attempts to define details of the layout at this stage and at this scale. In any case, the brief and the layout will need modification to include a site for a 1.4 ha Primary School; the former should also include an appropriate reference to joint use of part of the proposed school buildings for community activities and of its playing facilities for community recreation.
3. The objections of local residents and the NWT relate to the principle of the allocation or its density, which I consider, as appropriate, in Chapter 4.
4. IC97 indicates a second access to Swiney Way, which may be appropriate subject to my conclusions in para 2 above.
5. R469 should have dealt with the Highway Authority’s concern about the provision of walking and cycling measures. Policy T1 is noted in the margin but applies in any case and does not merit identification in Chapters 4 and 5, for reasons given there. IC57 proposed to deal with the issue of agreeing parking for the employment estate in a green commuter plan, but should refer to appropriate parking provision, as the Highway Authority requested, rather than to standards and to a “transport assessment” rather than a “Transport Impact Study”.
6. Like the HBF, I do not consider that the brief accurately reflects the terms of Policy RC3. The latter refers to an identified need for additional capacity to be achieved in educational and community facilities. The brief refers instead to the enhancement of education provision, which is wider, and to additional demands rather than an identified need. IC82 hardly improves matters. This bullet point in the brief should be reworded to accord more accurately with RC3. I expect the Council to make any commensurate modifications to the briefs that arise out of my recommendations on the Policy Chapters.

### Recommendation

7. I recommend that the RDDP be modified as set out in IC56, IC98, IC99, IC97, IC82 and IC57 except that the bullet point (containing R469) be modified to reflect more accurately the terms of Policy RC3 by deleting the term “enhancement” and that the terms “appropriate parking provision” be substituted for “parking standards” and the terms “transport assessment” be substituted for “transport impact study” both in IC57. I recommend that the Development Brief and PM be modified to provide for a 1.4 ha Primary School and also to make any other modifications arising from my recommendations on other Chapters. Otherwise, I recommend no modifications in respect of the above objections.

1. The first bullet point on the second page of Appendix 2A (Development Brief A) refers to policy H3.

### Inquiry Change

- IC113
2. **The Council has recommended that, in the first bullet point on the second page of Appendix 2A, the reference to “H3” should be replaced with “H5”.**
  3. This change ensures factual accuracy.

### Inspector’s Conclusions

1. IC113 corrects a factual error and should be supported.

### Recommendation

2. I recommend that the RDDP be modified as set out in IC113.

## **H2 (d) HOUSING SITE, LAND TO THE NORTH OF NEWTONS LANE, AWSWORTH A2(b)APPENDIX 2B, DEVELOPMENT BRIEF: LAND TO NORTH OF NEWTONS LANE, AWSWORTH**

### Objections

<b>4.42 New housing sites - Newtons Lane, Awsworth</b>				
748	4697	R178		David Wilson Homes North Midlands David Wilson Estates
748	4700	R177		David Wilson Homes North Midlands David Wilson Estates
599	4499	R178	Mr G Foster	Nottinghamshire County Council
599	4498	R177	Mr G Foster	Nottinghamshire County Council
1106	4922	R177	Mr R Hepwood	Miller Homes East Midlands
601	4629	R177	Mr S Rufus	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust
914	4816	R178	Mr M Smith	
913	4802	R178	Mrs J Smith	
913	4804	R177	Mrs J Smith	
914	4812	R177	Mr M Smith	

### **H2d New housing sites - Newtons Lane, Awsworth**



748	4701	R179		David Wilson Homes North Midlands
				David Wilson Estates
1155	2402			Greasley Parish Council
				Andrew Thomas Planning
1154	5057			W. Westerman Ltd
				DPDS Consulting Group
748	6983	PC2		David Wilson Homes North Midlands
1006	7042	PC2		Nuthall Parish Council
				Browne Jacobson Planning Unit
1155	7026	PC2		Greasley Parish Council
				Andrew Thomas Planning
1155	5122	R152		Greasley Parish Council
				Andrew Thomas Planning
748	1688			David Wilson Homes North Midlands
				David Wilson Estates
748	4699	R180		David Wilson Homes North Midlands
				David Wilson Estates
1006	4849	R152		Nuthall Parish Council
				Browne Jacobson Planning Unit
496	927		Ms DE Agnew	
286	620		Mrs AJ Allen	
287	621		Mr W Allen	
442	846		Mrs YJ Allen	
441	845		Mr CJ Allen	
130	158		Mr T Aram	
288	622		Mrs CA Aram	
478	895		Miss NC Bacon	
479	896		Mrs SP Bacon	
1108	4973	R180	Mr M Bagshaw	Stamford Homes Limited
				Barton Willmore Planning Partnership
1108	4958	R152	Mr M Bagshaw	Stamford Homes Limited
				Barton Willmore Planning Partnership
289	623		Miss S Ball	
471	886		Ms RL Ballard	
474	889		Mrs WA Ballard	
473	888		Mr SH Ballard	
290	624		Mrs M Barker	
536	999		Miss A Barlow	
291	625		Mrs AM Barlow	
292	626		Mr R Barlow	
293	627		Mrs D Barlow	
294	628		Mrs B Barnett	
1417	3717		Mrs J Basri	
1416	3716		Mr M Basri	
501	934		Mr J Bennett	
367	707		Mr DS Berry	
368	708		Mrs J Berry	
782	1435		Mr K Black	
781	1434		Mrs B Black	
480	898		Mrs H Blackmore	
481	900		Mr SC Blackmore	
295	629		Miss MN Blatherwick	
450	858		Mrs SJ Blyton	
449	856		Mr R Blyton	
296	630		Mrs SA Bowley	
362	702		Mrs TJ Bradshaw	
361	701		Mr PR Bradshaw	
452	861		Mr G Bramley	
451	859		Mrs S Bramley	
499	930		Mr TL Brown	
500	932		Mrs B Brown	

598	1686		Mr I Brown	CPRE - Broxtowe Group
476	892		Mrs A Brown	
2272	7006	PC2	Mr T Brown	
				Walter Scott & Ross Solicitors
297	631		Mr D Brunell	
299	633		Mr ED Bull	
298	632		Mrs EN Bull	
300	634		Mrs J Burton	
301	635		Mrs BA Buxton	
302	636		Mr DW Buxton	
521	977		Mr D Cadman	
305	639		Mrs B Chadwick	
304	638		Mr A Chadwick	
365	705		Mr NN Chamberlain	
366	706		Mr CL Chamberlain	
390	732		Mr I Chamberlain	
303	637		Mr G Chapman	
908	1682		Mr D Cheeseman	
458	869		Mr S Clarke	
307	641		Mr P Collins	
306	640		Mrs M Collins	
308	642		Mr KJ Cooper	
376	716		Mrs SM Corbett	
375	715		Mr DJ Corbett	
309	643		Mr G Cox	
484	903		Mr SJ Curry	
359	699		Mr P Darlison	
360	4224	R180	Mrs LM Darlison	
360	700		Mrs LM Darlison	
359	4223	R180	Mr P Darlison	
1100	2084		Mrs A Deamer	
1099	2080		Mr M Deamer	
378	718		Mrs C Deane	
380	719		Mr D Deane	
374	714		Mr A Deane	
310	644		Mr GL Duff	
411	761		Mr AR Dyer	
125	151		Mrs ME Edwards	
544	1012		Mrs SM Elliot	Cossall Parish Council
488	910		Mr P Ellis	
495	924		Mrs JA Ellis	
542	1009		Miss EF Fisher	
312	646		Mrs JA Fletcher	
311	645		Mrs I Fletcher	
599	1685		Mr G Foster	Nottinghamshire County Council
539	1004		Mr ES Fraser	
396	738		Miss K Frearson	
313	647		Mr FA Freeman	
1443	3807		Ms R Freeman	
128	156		Mrs AJ Gentry	
497	928		Miss J Glover	
316	652		Mr WS Granger	
315	651		Mrs B Granger	
317	653		Miss PJ Gregory	
386	726		Mrs C Gregory	
387	727		Mr A Gregory	
461	872		Mrs SL Hall	
459	870		Mr SA Hall	
318	657		Mrs C Harmer	
319	658		Mr P Harmer	
320	659		Mr E Harris	

516	970		Ms D Harrison	
321	660		Mrs JM Hartshorn	
453	863		Miss LD Haystead	
1106	4924	R180	Mr R Hepwood	Miller Homes East Midlands
1106	4920	R152	Mr R Hepwood	Miller Homes East Midlands
1106	7008	PC2	Mr R Hepwood	Miller Homes East Midlands
1106	4906		Mr R Hepwood	Miller Homes East Midlands
532	993		Mr TM Hicks	
405	751		Mr R Holland	
323	662		Mr JE Holland	
322	661		Mr E Holland	
1396	3662		Mrs M Hornby	Awsworth Parish Council
517	971		Mr E Horsfield	
503	967		Mrs MA Horsfield	
324	663		Mr J Hutchby	
325	664		Mrs A Johnson	
325	4211	R152	Mrs A Johnson	
399	742		Mr BK Jones	
400	744		Mrs SD Jones	
358	698		Mr TJ Kayes	
456	865		Miss MR Kemp	
911	1689		Mr K Lee	Shilo North Forum
910	1684		Mr SA Leonardi	
1419	3998		Mr AJ Lovell	
126	154		Mr TW Lowe	
1480	3995		Mr TW Madden	
1481	3996		Mrs AD Madden	
134	162		Mrs B Marshman	
133	161		Mr TJ Marshman	
446	851		Mrs J McCartney	
540	1005		Ms SA McCullough	
492	921		Mr A McMillan	
494	923		Mrs M McMillan	
455	864		Mr GJ Moore	
381	721		Mr DR Morley	
382	722		Mr DS Morley	
383	723		Mrs RJ Morley	
780	1433		Mrs DH Morley	
1135	2427		Mr I Moss	House Builders` Federation
1135	5030	R152	Mr I Moss	House Builders` Federation
327	666		Mr GJ Murden	
326	665		Mrs LJ Murden	
392	734		Mrs A Newton	
391	733		Mr GI Newton	
487	908		Mrs C Nicholls	
328	667		Mrs L Nichols	
329	668		Mrs J Nix	
412	762		Mr N Norris	
413	764		Mrs EE Norris	
397	741		Mr A North	
330	669		Mrs GA O'Connor	
331	670		Mr JE O'Connor	
332	671		Ms CH Oldfield	
371	711		Mrs B O'Neill	
528	986		Mr MJ O'Neill	
394	736		Mr AJ O'Reilly	
228	675		Ms SE Page	
333	672		Mr RE Palmer	
896	1646		Mr A Parish	
784	1437		Miss D Parish	
466	880		Mr PJ Parkes	

462	873		Miss EM Parkes	
464	879		Miss SJ Parkes	
467	881		Mr BJ Parkes	
468	882		Mrs PA Parkes	
364	704		Mr DE Parnham	
363	703		Mrs J Parnham	
369	709		Mrs KA Parr	
370	710		Mr N Parr	
336	676		Mrs SM Pass	
335	674		Ms LM Pass	
334	673		Mr BM Pass	
384	724		Mrs JE Poundall	
385	725		Mr J Poundall	
778	1431		Mrs LM Powell	
785	1438		Mr A Powell	
777	1430		Mr H Powell	
538	1003		Mr R Quail	
337	677		Mr M Reveley	
909	1683		Ms HG Roberts	
388	728		Mr K Robins	
389	729		Mrs J Robins	
2218	6800	R152	Cllr RS Robinson	
407	756		Mrs PM Roe	
406	753		Mr GA Roe	
527	984		Mr BJ Ruddle	
601	1687		Mr S Rufus	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust
601	4615	R152	Mr S Rufus	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust
601	4575	R179	Mr S Rufus	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust
601	4576	R180	Mr S Rufus	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust
447	854		Mrs C Rule	
906	1680		Mr DR Sadler	
338	678		Mr K Sault	
				P. Gaughan Building Consultant
339	679		Miss M Shelton	
340	680		Mrs P Shelton	
373	713		Mrs K Slaney	
372	712		Mr M Slaney	
543	1010		Mr MB Smedley	
341	681		Mr A Smith	
395	737		Mr AR Smith	
914	4815	R180	Mr M Smith	
914	4811	R179	Mr M Smith	
913	4803	R179	Mrs J Smith	
913	4801	R180	Mrs J Smith	
913	4799	R152	Mrs J Smith	
475	891		Mr F Smith	
913	1691		Mrs J Smith	
914	1693		Mr M Smith	
914	4818	R152	Mr M Smith	
444	849		Mr S Smithurst	
776	1429		Miss A Spencer	
408	757		Mrs G Spibey	
410	759		Mr A Spibey	
342	682		Mr WP Staniland	Horizons Lifts UK
483	902		Mr B Stanley	
343	683		Mr PJ Stapleton	
485	906		Mr PC Stevenson	
344	684		Miss C Stirland	
345	685		Mrs R Stirland	
443	848		Mr PD Streets	
346	686		Mrs L Stroud	

907	1681		Mr EA Szymanski	
347	687		Mrs M Taylor	
348	688		Mr PJP Taylor	
132	160		Mrs JE Thomas	
131	159		Mr LH Thomas	
535	998		Mr RS Thompson	
534	995		Mrs L Thompson	
349	689		Mr AM Tivey	
351	691		Mrs MA Tolan	
350	690		Mr A Tolan	
469	883		Mr M Tyler	
470	885		Mrs C Tyler	
353	693		Mr T Vickers	
352	692		Mrs JS Vickers	
775	1428		Mr MA Waldrom	
1374	3450		Mr DM Walker	
1373	3449		Mrs L Walker	
1130	2229		Mr R Walters	Hallam Land Management
1130	7038	PC2	Mr R Walters	Hallam Land Management
1130	5003	R152	Mr R Walters	Hallam Land Management
1130	5006	R180	Mr R Walters	Hallam Land Management
1460	3861		Mrs C Ward	
354	694		Mr F White	
519	973		Mr N White	
530	988		Mr WJ Whitlam	
779	1432		Mrs JM Whitten	
783	1436		Mr JE Whitten	
524	980		Mr KJ Whitten	
523	979		Mrs DA Whitten	
355	695		Miss AE Whysall	
525	982		Ms A Wild	
402	748		Mrs KW Wilkinson	
401	746		Mr P Wilkinson	
520	976		Mrs J Willis	
531	992		Mr P Willis	
514	968		Mr R Wilson	
404	749		Ms IN Wilson	
457	867		Ms NJ Wolvin	
357	697		Mrs S Wolvin	
356	696		Mr RW Wolvin	
377	717		Mrs MD Wood	
912	1690		Mr AJ Wright	
1442	3802		Mrs M Wright	
786	1439		Miss T Wright	
1464	3883		Ms S Wright-Grainger	

**A2b Appendix 2b - Newtons Lane, Awwsworth**

748	4696	R476		David Wilson Homes North Midlands
				David Wilson Estates
748	4698	R482		David Wilson Homes North Midlands
				David Wilson Estates
496	4281	R479	Ms DE Agnew	
496	4280	R476	Ms DE Agnew	
496	4279	R474	Ms DE Agnew	
442	4251	R474	Mrs YJ Allen	
441	4250	R474	Mr CJ Allen	
2079	6571	R474	Mrs LA Ball	
2079	6570	R476	Mrs LA Ball	
2079	6569	R482	Mrs LA Ball	
2079	6572	R479	Mrs LA Ball	
1824	5934	R479	Mrs A Bamford	

291	4187	R474	Mrs AM Barlow	
291	4188	R479	Mrs AM Barlow	
1825	5935	R474	Miss A Barlow	
1825	5936	R479	Miss A Barlow	
2082	6578	R479	Mr SH Barry	
2082	6577	R474	Mr SH Barry	
2081	6575	R474	Mrs R Barry	
2081	6576	R479	Mrs R Barry	
1826	5938	R479	Mrs M Bennett	
501	4289	R479	Mr J Bennett	
501	4288	R474	Mr J Bennett	
1826	5937	R474	Mrs M Bennett	
2077	6567	R479	Mrs SD Berry	
2078	6568	R474	Mr DR Berry	
295	4191	R479	Miss MN Blatherwick	
295	4189	R474	Miss MN Blatherwick	
295	4190	R476	Miss MN Blatherwick	
1827	5939	R479	Mrs AM Brewster	
1828	5941	R474	Mr DG Brewster	
1828	5942	R479	Mr DG Brewster	
1827	5940	R474	Mrs AM Brewster	
598	4386	R473	Mr I Brown	CPRE - Broxtowe Group
499	4284	R479	Mr TL Brown	
2015	6408	R474	Mr S Brown	
2015	6407	R479	Mr S Brown	
499	4285	R474	Mr TL Brown	
500	4286	R479	Mrs B Brown	
500	4287	R474	Mrs B Brown	
598	4388	R479	Mr I Brown	CPRE - Broxtowe Group
598	4387	R475	Mr I Brown	CPRE - Broxtowe Group
299	4197	R479	Mr ED Bull	
298	4192	R474	Mrs EN Bull	
298	4193	R476	Mrs EN Bull	
298	4194	R479	Mrs EN Bull	
299	4195	R474	Mr ED Bull	
299	4196		Mr ED Bull	
521	4307	R479	Mr D Cadman	
521	4306	R474	Mr D Cadman	
1829	5943	R474	Ms J Cliff	
308	4201	R473	Mr KJ Cooper	
308	4199	R476	Mr KJ Cooper	
308	4203	R482	Mr KJ Cooper	
308	4198	R474	Mr KJ Cooper	
308	4200	R479	Mr KJ Cooper	
308	4202	R480	Mr KJ Cooper	
1830	5945	R479	Ms L Corbett	
1830	5944	R474	Ms L Corbett	
2019	6418	R479	Mrs K Curry	
484	4267	R479	Mr SJ Curry	
1100	4903	R474	Mrs A Deamer	
1100	4902	R479	Mrs A Deamer	
1099	4901	R479	Mr M Deamer	
1099	4900	R474	Mr M Deamer	
1833	5952	R479	Miss NA Dyer	
411	4246	R479	Mr AR Dyer	
411	4244	R474	Mr AR Dyer	
1832	5950	R479	Mrs GJ Dyer	
1832	5949	R474	Mrs GJ Dyer	
1831	5948	R479	Mrs AJ Dyer	
1831	5947	R476	Mrs AJ Dyer	
1831	5946	R474	Mrs AJ Dyer	

411	4245	R476	Mr AR Dyer	
1833	5951	R474	Miss NA Dyer	
1834	5954	R479	Mr MA Eardley	
1834	5953	R474	Mr MA Eardley	
1733	5737	R479	Mr EJ Edwards	
1733	5736	R476	Mr EJ Edwards	
1733	5735	R474	Mr EJ Edwards	
544	4320	R474	Mrs SM Elliot	Cossall Parish Council
544	4319	R479	Mrs SM Elliot	Cossall Parish Council
544	4318	R476	Mrs SM Elliot	Cossall Parish Council
488	4270	R479	Mr P Ellis	
488	4271	R474	Mr P Ellis	
1835	5955	R474	Mr A Fletcher	
1835	5956	R479	Mr A Fletcher	
1836	5957	R474	Mrs J Fletcher	
1836	5958	R479	Mrs J Fletcher	
1734	5738	R474	Mr IR Gentry	
1734	5739	R476	Mr IR Gentry	
128	4113	R479	Mrs AJ Gentry	
128	4112	R476	Mrs AJ Gentry	
128	4111	R474	Mrs AJ Gentry	
1734	5740	R479	Mr IR Gentry	
497	4282	R479	Miss J Glover	
1837	5959	R479	Mr JM Glover	
1839	5961	R479	Mrs G Glover	
317	4204	R474	Miss PJ Gregory	
1840	5962	R474	Mrs J Hall	
516	4301	R479	Ms D Harrison	
516	4300	R474	Ms D Harrison	
1106	4909	R482	Mr R Hepwood	Miller Homes East Midlands
1106	4917	R476	Mr R Hepwood	Miller Homes East Midlands
1106	4937	R474	Mr R Hepwood	Miller Homes East Midlands
1106	2141		Mr R Hepwood	Miller Homes East Midlands
1106	4939	R482	Mr R Hepwood	Miller Homes East Midlands
1841	5964	R476	Mrs M Holland	
323	4205	R474	Mr JE Holland	
323	4206	R476	Mr JE Holland	
1841	5963	R474	Mrs M Holland	
405	4239	R479	Mr R Holland	
1396	5320	R479	Mrs M Hornby	Awsworth Parish Council
1396	5321	R476	Mrs M Hornby	Awsworth Parish Council
1396	5322	R474	Mrs M Hornby	Awsworth Parish Council
1396	3666		Mrs M Hornby	Awsworth Parish Council
1396	5323	R482	Mrs M Hornby	Awsworth Parish Council
517	4303	R474	Mr E Horsfield	
517	4302	R479	Mr E Horsfield	
1842	5965	R474	Mrs B Hutchby	
1844	5969	R474	Mr O Hutchby	
1843	5968	R479	Mrs EM Hutchby	
1843	5967	R476	Mrs EM Hutchby	
1843	5966	R474	Mrs EM Hutchby	
324	4210	R479	Mr J Hutchby	
324	4209	R476	Mr J Hutchby	
324	4208	R474	Mr J Hutchby	
400	4235	R479	Mrs SD Jones	
400	4234	R474	Mrs SD Jones	
399	4233	R479	Mr BK Jones	
399	4232	R474	Mr BK Jones	
1847	5972	R474	Mrs RL Kelvey	
1845	5970	R474	Mrs J Kelvey	
1848	5974	R476	Mr KM Knowles	

1848	5973	R474	Mr KM Knowles	
1848	5975	R479	Mr KM Knowles	
1850	5980	R476	Mrs JS Love	
1850	5981	R479	Mrs JS Love	
1849	5978	R479	Mr A Love	
1850	5979	R474	Mrs JS Love	
1849	5977	R476	Mr A Love	
1849	5976	R474	Mr A Love	
446	4256	R474	Mrs J McCartney	
446	4257	R479	Mrs J McCartney	
446	4258	R474	Mrs J McCartney	
492	4273	R476	Mr A McMillan	
494	4278	R479	Mrs M McMillan	
494	4276	R474	Mrs M McMillan	
492	4274	R479	Mr A McMillan	
494	4277	R476	Mrs M McMillan	
492	4272	R474	Mr A McMillan	
1851	5982	R479	Mr R Mee	
1851	5983	R474	Mr R Mee	
382	4227	R479	Mr DS Morley	
382	4228	R474	Mr DS Morley	
381	4226	R479	Mr DR Morley	
381	4225	R474	Mr DR Morley	
1135	2376		Mr I Moss	House Builders` Federation
487	4268	R479	Mrs C Nicholls	
487	4269	R474	Mrs C Nicholls	
329	4213	R474	Mrs J Nix	
329	4212	R479	Mrs J Nix	
329	4214	R476	Mrs J Nix	
332	4215	R474	Ms CH Oldfield	
332	4216	R479	Ms CH Oldfield	
1852	5984	R479	Mr D Perkins	
2075	6563	R474	Mrs L Phillips	
2075	6564	R479	Mrs L Phillips	
2074	6561	R474	Mr D Phillips	
2074	6562	R479	Mr D Phillips	
538	4317	R479	Mr R Quail	
538	4316	R474	Mr R Quail	
337	4218	R479	Mr M Reveley	
337	4217	R474	Mr M Reveley	
1853	5987	R479	Miss MS Rose	
1853	5985	R474	Miss MS Rose	
1853	5986	R476	Miss MS Rose	
527	4310	R474	Mr BJ Ruddle	
527	4312	R479	Mr BJ Ruddle	
527	4311	R476	Mr BJ Ruddle	
601	4608	R476	Mr S Rufus	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust
601	4607	R474	Mr S Rufus	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust
601	4606	R473	Mr S Rufus	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust
601	4646	R479	Mr S Rufus	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust
447	4259	R474	Mrs C Rule	
447	4260	R479	Mrs C Rule	
1735	5743	R479	Mr M Sault	
338	4220	R476	Mr K Sault	
338	4221	R479	Mr K Sault	
1735	5741	R474	Mr M Sault	
1735	5742	R476	Mr M Sault	
338	4219	R474	Mr K Sault	
1650	5592	R474	Mrs J Sears	
1650	5591	R479	Mrs J Sears	
914	4817	R476	Mr M Smith	



395	4230	R474	Mr AR Smith	
395	4231	R479	Mr AR Smith	
914	4813	R473	Mr M Smith	
914	4819	R474	Mr M Smith	
914	4814	R479	Mr M Smith	
2076	6566	R474	Mrs M Smith	
2076	6565	R479	Mrs M Smith	
475	4262	R474	Mr F Smith	
475	4263	R476	Mr F Smith	
475	4264	R479	Mr F Smith	
913	4806	R479	Mrs J Smith	
913	4805	R473	Mrs J Smith	
913	4800	R474	Mrs J Smith	
444	4255	R474	Mr S Smithurst	
410	4243	R479	Mr A Spibey	
410	4242	R474	Mr A Spibey	
408	4240	R474	Mrs G Spibey	
408	4241	R479	Mrs G Spibey	
483	4266	R474	Mr B Stanley	
483	4265	R479	Mr B Stanley	
1855	5991	R476	Mrs P Streets	
1855	5992	R479	Mrs P Streets	
1855	5990	R474	Mrs P Streets	
443	4253	R476	Mr PD Streets	
443	4252	R474	Mr PD Streets	
443	4254	R479	Mr PD Streets	
1857	5996	R479	Mr DA Taylor	
1860	6004	R476	Mrs N Taylor	
1860	6003	R474	Mrs N Taylor	
1860	6005	R479	Mrs N Taylor	
1857	5994	R474	Mr DA Taylor	
1857	5995	R476	Mr DA Taylor	
1590	5506	R479	Mrs SA Thompson	
1861	6006	R474	Mrs A Tipping	
1861	6008	R479	Mrs A Tipping	
1861	6007	R476	Mrs A Tipping	
349	4222	R474	Mr AM Tivey	
1863	6011	R479	Mr D Utterson	
1863	6010	R474	Mr D Utterson	
1130	5021	R479	Mr R Walters	Hallam Land Management
1130	5022	R482	Mr R Walters	Hallam Land Management
1130	5020	R476	Mr R Walters	Hallam Land Management
1130	5019	R474	Mr R Walters	Hallam Land Management
1866	6014	R474	Mr SK Ward	
1460	5388	R474	Mrs C Ward	
1866	6015	R479	Mr SK Ward	
1460	5389	R479	Mrs C Ward	
530	4313	R474	Mr WJ Whitlam	
530	4314	R479	Mr WJ Whitlam	
525	4309	R479	Ms A Wild	
525	4308	R474	Ms A Wild	
520	4305	R479	Mrs J Willis	
520	4304	R474	Mrs J Willis	
2080	6574	R479	Ms K Willis	
2080	6573	R474	Ms K Willis	
514	4298	R479	Mr R Wilson	
514	4297	R474	Mr R Wilson	
404	4238	R479	Ms IN Wilson	
404	4237	R474	Ms IN Wilson	
1871	6021	R474	Mrs B Wood	
1873	6026	R479	Mrs JL Wood	

1873	6025	R476	Mrs JL Wood
1871	6020	R476	Mrs B Wood
1871	6022	R479	Mrs B Wood
1873	6024	R474	Mrs JL Wood
1876	6029	R479	Mr J Yeomans

### **Council's response to objections made to the Pre-Inquiry Changes**

1. This site was considered to be suitable for inclusion in the Revised Deposit Draft, when there was a need to find sites for over 2,000 new dwellings in order to meet Structure Plan requirements.
2. Pre-Inquiry Changes made to the plan in April 2001 involved the deletion of four greenfield sites proposed for housing, including this site. These Pre-Inquiry Changes were prompted by the Nottingham Urban Capacity Study, published in March 2001, which indicated that there would be considerable additional capacity for housing in the City before 2011. The Borough Council also re-estimated the likely annual rate of housing to be gained from windfall sites, as part of the Pre-Inquiry Changes.
3. The overall net result of these changes was to create a shortfall of 250 dwellings from the Structure Plan allocation figure for Broxtowe. The County Council did not raise any concerns about conformity of the Local Plan with the Structure Plan.
4. The four sites which were deleted, including this site, were all in Phase 2 of the Plan's housing phasing policy (HX; R224), reflecting their lower preference to Phase 1 sites which are mainly on previously-developed land. The borough council considers that they would not need to be developed within the Plan period. This site would have required a release from Green Belt for which this Council now cannot provide sufficient justification.
5. The issues of principle raised by the Pre-Inquiry Changes - regarding windfall rate, conformity with the Structure Plan and urban capacity - were debated at the Housing Round Table session at the start of the inquiry.

#### **Issues raised on objections prior to Pre-Inquiry Changes**

6. The Council's position on this site has changed between the Revised Deposit stage and the Pre-Inquiry Changes such that the site is no longer favoured by the Council. In this respect therefore those who were objecting to the inclusion of the site have now had their objections met. At the Inspector's request - and on the basis that he is dealing with objections made at the Revised Deposit stage - the Council has responded to those objections as if the site was still allocated.

**Due to the number of similar objections the following paraphrased summaries represent the issues raised. The Council has responded to each in turn.**

- (a) The proposed development involves the loss of Green Belt and a greenfield site.
- (b) There would be a loss of wildlife value.
- (c) The proposed development would spoil the area and the village.
- (d) Extra noise and pollution would be created.
- (e) There would be increased fears about security.
- (f) There would be a decrease in property values for existing residents.
- (g) There is no demand for housing here.

(h) Traffic would be increased in the area.

(i) There would be extra pressure on local facilities.

**(a) The proposed development involves the loss of Green Belt and a Greenfield site**

7. The Council accepted at an early stage in this plan review that the scale of new housing development to be provided to meet Structure Plan requirements was such that encroachment into Green Belt and greenfield land was unavoidable, in several locations in the borough.

8. The Green Belt generally protects the open character of the Erewash Valley and in so doing provides separation of built-up areas in Derbyshire from those in Nottinghamshire. The proposed housing development on this site would have provided a well-defined new Green Belt edge along a perimeter road, emphasised by planting. The Council believes that the overall character of the Green Belt on this stretch of the Erewash valley would not have been harmed by the development. The site lies to the eastern side of the Awsworth by-pass and has a proposed landscape buffer between that road and the edge of the proposed development. It is well related to the existing built-up area of Awsworth.

9. Regarding loss of greenfield land, proper regard was had to the site-searching sequence in PPG3 in the Revised Deposit Draft, such that greenfield land was only allocated once opportunities for building on previously developed land had been exhausted.

**(b) There would be a loss of wildlife value**

10. As part of the wider process of site selection the Council has adopted (in line with other Councils in Nottinghamshire) a process of site identification for wildlife interest through an audit of sites of importance for nature conservation (SINCs). It should be noted that there are no SINCs within the proposed housing site. If it was to emerge that there were any protected species on the site, any planning application for development would be considered in relation to policy E18.

11. The Council considers that wildlife features need not be damaged or destroyed by the development and every effort should be made to incorporate them in the proposed open space area. Although depicted on the Proposals Map for planting, it may be appropriate to create other types of habitat if this retains more of the existing wildlife characteristics of the area. Of particular importance is the need to allow routes of access for frogs and toads, as has already been specifically provided under the Awsworth by-pass directly to the west of this site.

**(c) The proposed development would spoil the area and the village**

12. The issue of new development spoiling the area or the village in principle is not accepted by the Council. Every effort would be made at the detailed planning stage to ensure that the new development is compatible with the character of the style of properties in the village. Policy E1 of the Plan is particularly relevant in this regard. Furthermore the new open space proposed offers opportunities to add to the village's attractiveness. Developers' contributions would be sought to secure improvements to recreation facilities in the village.

**(d) Extra noise and pollution would be created**

13. In general terms, new residential development does not give rise to unacceptable levels of noise or pollution. It is inevitable that with every new development some additional traffic is created which will marginally affect noise levels but not to the extent of creating nuisance. The Council has sought to minimise traffic increase by ensuring that new development sites are well located in relation to good public transport services. The proposed traffic calming on Park Hill should reduce traffic speeds.

**(e) There would be increased fears about security**

14. Issues about security can be properly dealt with when detailed planning applications come to be assessed under Policy E1 of the Broxtowe Local Plan Review, which include the criterion '(d) A safe and secure environment, where necessary including crime prevention features'. Liaison with the police authority's crime prevention officers takes place over detailed designs, to aid assessment against the principles contained in the good practice described in 'Planning out Crime'.

**(f) Loss of property values**

15. Concern that new development may lead to a loss of property values is not a planning matter.

**(g) No demand for housing**

16. This general issue was covered at the Round Table sessions. This confirmed that the Local Plan is required to identify sufficient housing land to meet the needs determined through the Structure Plan process.

**(h) Increased traffic**

17. The Council considers that the main road through Awsworth village, and Newtons Lane, are capable of carrying the traffic generated by this development. Both roads formerly carried much higher rates of traffic prior to the completion of the Awsworth by-pass. The Council recognises that Park Hill, which serves many of the internal residential streets of Awsworth, would have additional pressure on it. To compensate for this the Council was proposing traffic calming measures on Park Hill. The new road through the proposed development would also relieve some of the pressure on Park Hill, in that it would create a new alternative means of access for the adjoining residential streets. The Council also attempted to secure a new access to the proposed development from the Awsworth by-pass as a revision in the Revised Deposit Draft, but the County Council would not agree to the site being accessed from the by-pass. In any case this would not be essential to the scheme's acceptability in highway terms.

**(i) Pressure on facilities**

18. It is recognised that Awsworth is a community without certain local facilities such as a doctor, necessitating additional journeys to Eastwood and Ilkeston. The health authority was consulted during the plan's preparation and has not identified the need for any additional doctors to serve this area.
19. Most of the objections about facilities identified the primary school as the main target from pressure of extra residents. The County Council advised that the school is at or near capacity and Broxtowe Council had therefore specifically included in the Development Brief for the site (Appendix 2B) provision for a financial contribution to be negotiated, in order to improve education facilities.

**Inspector's Conclusions**

1. Most of the above objections are to the proposed allocation in Chapter 4, rather than to the development brief itself. I deal with them earlier where I conclude that the housing allocation H2d and the recreation proposals RC8b and T10h should be deleted as put forward by the Council in PIC2 but replaced by safeguarded land

under a new Policy E11 from the FDDP. Clearly in these circumstances Development Brief B should be deleted.

## Recommendation

2. I recommend that the RDDP be modified by deleting Development Brief B.

## **APPENDIX 2C DEVELOPMENT BRIEF C, LAND OFF QUEENS ROAD AND DOVECOTE LANE, BEESTON**

### Background

The Council have been in joint discussions with the promoters of the above site to explore objections submitted by David Wilson Homes and Beeston Lads Club in respect of the extent of the allocated housing area. The parties are also aware of the concerns of Sport England in respect of potential loss of sports facilities and the need to ensure that Nottingham Rugby Club achieve alternative accommodation before any development would commence on the site. The Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust have indicated their concerns that the 'margins' of the Lads Club playing fields display important grassland characteristics and wish to ensure the preservation of these areas. The Lads Club playing field is an identified SINC site as a consequence.

### Planning Issues

The Council regard the Rugby Club site as previously developed land in a sustainable location within the urban area and close to good transport and shopping facilities. The site is considered to be important in providing for new high density housing development in the Beeston area where alternative sites are limited. Access to the area can only be achieved by construction of a new road onto Queens Road since the highway authority regard the existing access from Ireland Avenue/Dovecote Lane to be incapable of dealing with the extra traffic from a development of this size. Such an access can only be achieved by crossing part of the existing playing fields, fronting Queens Road, in the ownership of Beeston Lads Club. The intention has always been to minimise the area of land taken from the playing fields, to maintain the open break between Beeston and Chilwell which this site provides and at the same time achieve a comprehensive development embracing residential and recreational land uses.

### Discussions with Objectors

After extensive discussions between Nottingham Rugby Club, Beeston Lads Club, David Wilson Homes, Sport England and Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust, the Council now accept that an additional area of the Lads Club playing field could be allocated without prejudice to the open break between Beeston and Chilwell with no net loss of formal playing field.

In order to overcome the reduction in the size and layout of the remaining playing pitch area at the Lads Club land and to resolve the future use of remaining open land in the ownership of Nottingham Rugby Club agreement has been reached to combine the two areas. This will have the following benefits:-

1. The creation of a single area of playing fields for both football and cricket - including the addition of one extra football pitch.
2. The ability to share new common changing room facilities.
3. The whole of the area to become available as public open space.
4. The retention of marginal grassland to protect wildlife interest.

5. The partial satisfaction of objections from Sport England and the Government Office in respect of loss of sports facilities.

*1-4 above will be achieved through a formal management agreement and land lease arrangements.*

As a result of these discussions the Council wish to propose an inquiry change to extend the allocated housing area for site H2e by approximately 0.5 hectares as shown on the attached plan. At the assumed density of this site at 40 dph this will increase the capacity of the site by a further 20 dwellings. However this will have no significant effect on the other issues relating to this site. Access details remain the same. The inquiry change will be formally included in the Council's written proof in respect of outstanding objections. An illustrative layout plan is also attached demonstrating how a suitable development could be achieved. This will form the basis for a revised development brief.

### Outstanding Objections

Subject to acceptance of the inquiry change David Wilson Homes and Beeston Lads Club will conditionally withdraw their objections. The Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust have indicated their intention not to pursue further their objection relating to wildlife interest on the site on the basis that the agreed solution will retain grassland margins.

The objection by Sport England to the loss of the Rugby Club site will remain until the Rugby Club can formally secure alternative facilities within the city of Nottingham. The Council endorse the view that development of this site should not proceed until satisfactory alternative premises have been secured by the Rugby Club. Negotiations to secure a site close to Beeston (within the Nottingham City boundary) are at a delicate stage - but are believed to be close to agreement.

A number of outstanding 'written' objections remain from other objectors which the Council will address in a separate written proof. The Council believes those other objections to be insufficient to outweigh the benefits from the allocation of this site in achieving the requirements of the structure plan for additional housing land and in accordance with the aims of PPG3 to achieve such allocation within existing urban areas.

### Inspector's Conclusions

1. I have already referred above to my recommendation relating to the Maltings site, which adjoins allocation site H2e. The Development Brief will need to be modified to reflect these and the enlarged allocation H2e and other provisions of the agreement reached with David Wilson Homes.

### Recommendation

2. I recommend that the Development Brief C be modified as above.

## **APPENDIX 2D DEVELOPMENT BRIEF D, LAND OFF SOLOMAN ROAD, COSSALL**

### **Objection**

599 2688

Mr G Foster

Nottinghamshire County Council

### **Summary of Objection Issues**

599/2688: Nottinghamshire County Council

1. The bullet point at the bottom of the first page should state "appropriate provision for parking of

vehicles and cycles should be made”, rather than “made in accordance with the Council’s adopted standards” which has the wrong connotation of catering for parking demand. Reference to provision of, or contributions for, walking and cycling should be included.

**Council’s Response:**

2. Reference to provision of developer contributions for walking and cycling facilities has been included in the Revised Deposit Draft (R498).
3. Following further consideration the Council wishes to amend the bullet point at the bottom of the first page of Development Brief D.

**Inquiry Change**

- IC128**
4. **The Council has recommended that the phrase “latest standards agreed with the highway authority” is deleted and replaced with the phrase “latest guidelines agreed with the highway authority”.**
  5. The Council considers that this amendment overcomes the objection and is in full accordance with PPG13.

**Inspector’s Conclusions**

1. IC128 appears to address the Highway Authority’s outstanding concerns and is worthy of support. R498 addressed earlier concerns.

**Recommendation**

2. I recommend that the RDDP be modified as set out in IC128.

**EM3d NEW EMPLOYMENT SITE - EAST OF A610, EASTWOOD  
A2E APPENDIX 2E, DEVELOPMENT BRIEF: LAND EAST OF A610, EASTWOOD**

**Objections**

<b>5.68</b>			<b><i>New Employment sites - East of A610, Eastwood</i></b>
1382	3495		Mr M Radulovic Eastwood Town Council
<b>5.68</b>	<b>R317</b>		<b><i>New Employment site - East of A610, Eastwood - Addition of sentence - extra explanation</i></b>
601	4591	R317	Mr S Rufus Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust
<b>5.68</b>	<b>R318</b>		<b><i>New Employment site - East of A610, Eastwood - Addition of access requirement and suitable uses</i></b>
599	4501	R318	Mr G Foster Nottinghamshire County Council
<b>5.68</b>	<b>R319</b>		<b><i>New Employment site - East of A610, Eastwood - Addition of locational details and new access requirements</i></b>
599	4502	R319	Mr G Foster Nottinghamshire County Council
<b>EM3d</b>			<b><i>New Employment site - East of A610, Eastwood</i></b>

1178	2744		Metropolitan & District Developments Ltd.
			Shoosmiths Solicitors
1155	2443		Greasley Parish Council
			Andrew Thomas Planning
552	1030	Mrs CA Barson	SABRHE
553	1033	Mr CC Barson	SABRHE
1149	2328	Mr JW Baylis	Inland Waterways Association
598	1604	Mr I Brown	CPRE - Broxtowe Group
1106	2224	Mr R Hepwood	Miller Homes East Midlands
1419	4025	Mr A J Lovell	
601	1603	Mr S Rufus	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust
551	1027	Mrs J Savage	
1085	2258	Mr JM Tebbs	SABRHE
1061	2102	Mr MA Topliss	
885	1612	Mr NL Topliss	
843	1581	Mrs R Weir	SABRHE

**EM3d R296 New Employment site - East of A610, Eastwood - Amended site area**

1419 5359 R296 Mr AJ Lovell

**EM3d R320 New Employment site - East of A610, Eastwood - Amended site area and addition of reference to access**1155 5091 R320 Greasley Parish Council  
Andrew Thomas Planning**EM3d R321 New Employment site - East of A610, Eastwood - Deletion of spine road requirement and addition of road access to south**1419 5363 R321 Mr AJ Lovell  
1155 5080 R321 Greasley Parish Council  
Andrew Thomas Planning**Appendix 2e - Development Brief**

599 3659 Mr G Foster Nottinghamshire County Council

**Summary of Objection Issues****5.68 New Employment Site - East of A610, Eastwood**1382/3495: Eastwood Town Council

1. Object to link between A610 and A608, as this will be a rat-run.

552/1030: Mrs C A Barson (SABRHE)553/1033: Mr C C Barson (SABRHE)551/1027: Mrs J Savage

2. The road is described, as a distributor road for development but most of the traffic flow would be as a by-pass from Eastwood. The road would divert traffic through Brinsley from existing roads such as the A610 and A38, which are better suited for carrying through traffic to the M1. The road may open up the area of Brinsley and Nethergreen to further development. The land should remain in the green belt until it has been demonstrated as being suitable for development.

***Council's Joint Response:***

3. The spine road requirement has been deleted from the Revised Deposit Draft (Revisions R319, R321, R501) and therefore the concerns regarding the use of the spine road as an Eastwood bypass are no longer applicable. The Council however continues to believe that this site is well placed to provide employment opportunities for the north of the borough.



## **5.68 - R318/R.319 East of A610, Eastwood: Addition of access requirement and suitable uses. Addition of locational details and new access requirements.**

### 599/4501: Nottinghamshire County Council

4. Revision R318 (and revisions R501/R504) state that access is taken solely from the A610. Further justification is required in terms of likely traffic impact, particularly the impact upon Eastwood Town Centre. Given the lack of information on traffic impact it is not possible to ascertain whether existing junctions will require alteration.

### 599/4502 Nottinghamshire County Council

5. Revision R319 indicates that the site is close to frequent bus services whereas most of the site is in fact well beyond the recommended maximum 400 metres walking distance from existing services. Further justification is required as to how this site can be integrated with suitable public transport arrangements.
6. This revision also indicates that a replacement access for the Mushroom Farm employment area will also be provided through the proposed development. Whilst this is welcomed, there still may be a need to allow bus access through the point of closure. Given the lack of information of transportation impact it is not possible to ascertain both the impacts of newly generated traffic and the effects of redistributing existing Mushroom Farm employment area traffic and whether existing junctions require alteration.

### *Council's Response:*

7. A Transport Assessment has been undertaken, in order to fully assess both the traffic impact and the public transport access.
8. Both Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire County Councils have confirmed that a new access road leading to the west of the Langley Mill by-pass (A610), to serve new development proposed in the Amber Valley Local Plan Review Deposit Draft (2001), could also feed into the A610 at the roundabout junction proposed for site EM3d. Because of the change in ground level between the A610 and the land to its west, the new access road proposed on its western side would need to be routed along the line of a former railway under the A610, to connect to it from the eastern side.

## **Employment Sites – East of A610, Eastwood**

### 1178/2744: Metropolitan & District Developments Ltd

1. Site EM3d, land west of Eastwood Hall is considered inappropriate and to be of doubtful deliverability within the Plan Period given the extensive reclamation costs, the need to provide new access from the A610 and the requirement for new highway works to provide a link beyond the site to the north of Eastwood. The implications of these constraints are that the site cannot reasonably be considered readily developable without major constraint, or that there can be any certainty it will be available within the Plan Period. The text to Policy EM3d recognises that the site is still partly under restoration and the development Brief recognises that the Council is yet to be satisfied that the loading capacity of the ex lagoon areas which cover a substantial portion of the site has been established. It is submitted that there can be no certainty that this site will become available within the Plan Period, or be developed and consequently should be deleted from the new employment allocations in Policy EM3. The implication of this site's deletion would reduce employment land allocation by some 16 hectares. This will result in a shortfall of some 33% in employment land supply, which should be met by identifying of an alternative site, or sites to accommodate the reduced land supply.

### *Council's Response:*

2. The Council considers that this site will be deliverable within the Plan period. It should be noted that the spine road is no longer required and has been removed from the development brief requirements (refer to revisions in the Revised Deposit Draft R319, R321, R501). Whilst the Council will obviously need to ensure that the loading capacity of the ex lagoon areas is suitable for the development proposed, the site investigations already undertaken indicate the site is suitable for development in principle. There is no reason why development on this site could not commence in the first part of the Plan period. The site need not be deleted and therefore no shortfall in employment land would result.

1155/2443: Greasley Parish Council

3. Although support the allocation of this site for employment use, object to the proposed development area of the site. There is a possibility that further land can be incorporated within the site, which maintains the logical rounding off the site and which does not impact adversely on the Green Belt.

*Council's Response:*

4. In response to an objection by P J Plant Ltd, the Council considered the merits of allowing a narrow parcel of land to be released from the Green Belt on the northern side of this allocated site. It was confirmed at the Council's Cabinet meeting on 30 October 2001 that the Council could support this extra release, which would thus form a proposed Inquiry Change (IC85). The plan attached to this proof identifies this area. This would be added to the proposed landscaping strip on the north side of the proposed employment site, and it is not intended to expand the developed area northwards from the position shown in the Revised Deposit Draft. The Green Belt adjustment is a relatively minor alteration and in the Council's view does not undermine the purpose of Green Belt in this locality. The Council is also aware of the need for compatibility with proposals emerging in the Amber Valley Local Plan Review, which may require a road under the A610 taking part of this parcel of land. Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire County Councils, as highway authorities, have indicated that there would be no objections to this highway new pattern of development. More detail is given in the second addendum to proof 003, which deals specifically with the P J Plant objection and proposes Inquiry Change IC85. This is also appended to this document for information.

1419/4025: Mr A J Lovell

5. The site should be extended to 25 hectares and should be allocated for a business park. (The A610 is a high quality under-utilised existing road, whereas the proposed business park at Watnall would require an inappropriate new route).

*Council's Response:*

6. The site could not be extended to the size required for a business park without unacceptable harm to the green belt and without the loss of a defensible green belt boundary. Whilst the A610 is capable of serving the proposed development, a larger site would have its own access and traffic problems. The County Council's requirement for a business park, as described in policy 13/3 of the Nottinghamshire Structure Plan, is that it must be within the vicinity of Junction 26 of the M1 motorway. This site is at the outer end of the Nottingham-Eastwood public transport corridor, and certainly beyond "the vicinity" of Junction 26.

1149/2328: Inland Waterways Association

7. We object to this proposal as the land is too close to the Green Belt between the urban areas of Eastwood and Langley Mill, and it will be too visible from the A610 road and the west of the Erewash Valley. Although the proposed tree planting will ultimately have an effect on the view this will be in the very long term and does nothing to alleviate any environmental problems or disturbance to the Nethergreen Brook, situated between Mushroom Farm and the proposed site. We were concerned with the crossings, disturbance and dumping of spoil into the Nethergreen

Brook during the construction of Mushroom Farm site, and the Nethergreen Brook should be cleaned out, as part of this proposal, if it is allowed. We should welcome the new access road through this area as part of the proposed development as it would reduce the volume of traffic through the particularly awkward traffic lights by the Sun Inn, Eastwood, but we are concerned by other possibilities. We believe that it would increase the traffic problems at the A610/M1 Junction 26 and at Langley Mill and Codnor in Amber Valley. The Engineering Study by Binnie and Partners on the restoration of the Cromford Canal from Langley Mill to Ironville used the redundant railway bridge under the A610 road access for the restored canal. We request that, if constructed, the new road and traffic island does not prejudice this route.

*Council's Response:*

8. The Council consider that the revised green belt boundary will be defensible and the loss of green belt will not affect the gap between built up areas. The site is partially screened by a colliery spoil hill to the north, and screening will be supplemented with a planting belt around the site. Planting will also take place around Nethergreen Brook in order to enhance the existing landscape quality. Disturbance to Nethergreen Brook will be minimised, in recognition of its water quality, and of the SINC (Site of Importance for Nature conservation) on its northern bank within the site.
9. The Revised Deposit Draft removes the requirement for a new spine road and therefore concerns regarding traffic problems at the A610/M1 Junction 26 and at Langley Mill are no longer applicable. The route of the Cromford Canal, if it ever became restored, would run alongside the new access road to Langley Mill proposed by Amber Valley District Council and described in paragraph 7 above.

601/1603: Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust

10. This site is in part a potential SINC and is adjacent to a SINC. Concerned thus that development would have an adverse affect on nature conservation interests. Recommend that this site be withdrawn from the local plan unless a further ecological survey and a mitigation package can demonstrate that development could occur with no net loss of nature conservation interest.

601/4591: Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (objection to 5.68 - R317 East of A610, Eastwood - Addition of sentence for extra explanation)

11. We reiterate our comments on this site from our response to the deposit draft. We recommend the site be deleted to preserve the green belt and its associated nature conservation value.

*Council's Response:*

12. Since the Development Brief for the site was prepared, a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) has been confirmed in a small part of the southern edge of the site, generally contained within the proposed landscaping strip on the north side of the Nether Green Brook. It has a diverse flora including common spotted orchids, herbs, and heavy ragwort; the latter supports cinnabar moths. This habitat should be able to be maintained and managed as part of the proposed open space fringing the development.

1061/2102: M A Topliss

13. Loss of Green Belt.

598/1604: CPRE - Broxtowe Group

14. Loss of Green Belt. Development would create less protection for Eastwood Hall and grounds. The site is next to Nethergreen and Hall Park and industrial units should not be placed near these. Land may not actually be suitable for building on - should be proven as suitable before land is taken out of the Green Belt. Any tree planting should be of native species of local provenance. The feasibility of a greenway should be explored.

*Council's Joint Response:*

15. The proposal to release this area of Green Belt for development follows a full consideration of all other opportunities for new employment land elsewhere, taking into account the need to connect directly to the main highway network and to be well related to frequent public transport services. Eastwood Hall will retain the high level of protection afforded to listed buildings, and its setting will also benefit from the large number of tree preservation orders in its grounds. Industrial units will not be placed close to Nethergreen or Hall Park and there will be a landscaped area using native species around the edge of the development. Finally, site investigations already undertaken on the site show that the land is suitable to build on.

1106/2224: Miller Homes East Midlands (formerly Birch plc)

16. Support the proposal to allocate 16 ha of land at Eastwood Hall, a previously used site. However object to policy insofar as it seeks to restrict development close to the eastern boundary of the site to class B1 of the use Classes Order 1987. Birch believes that this is unduly restrictive and that the kind of operation proposed can be controlled through traditional development control policies.

*Council's Response:*

17. The Council considers that it is reasonable to restrict development to B1 uses close to the eastern boundary due to the proximity of Eastwood Hall, a conference centre including accommodation blocks. General Industry uses are not appropriate in close proximity to residential occupants and conditions would not be effective in controlling amenity problems that might result from these uses.

1085/2258: Mr J M Tebbs - SABRHE

18. The land is unstable and should not be removed from Green Belt until it is proven to be suitable.

*Council's Response:*

19. The Council has no reason to believe this land is unstable. The Council will obviously need to be satisfied that the loading capacity of the ex-lagoon areas is suitable for the development proposed, but this will be assessed when an application is submitted. However, site investigations already undertaken show the site is suitable for development.

885/1612: Mr N L Topliss

20. Additional footpaths and cycle tracks should link Brinsley and other areas to the north in line with policies T2, T1 and T9. The original footpaths between the A608 and Stoney Lane and the Erewash could be re-established. These would provide greenways for tourists and local residents alike.

*Council's Response:*

21. The footpaths and cycle tracks shown on the development brief are extensive. There is already a link proposed through to the A608. However, it is not considered reasonable to require developers to extend the links through to Brinsley and other villages, well beyond the application site.

843/1581: Mrs R Weir

22. Since the demise of the coal industry we should be seeking to improve the general area since it is linked to heritage and not to fill the area up with a jumble of industrial or other development.

*Council's Response:*

23. The proposal to release this area of Green Belt for development follows a full consideration of all other opportunities for new employment land elsewhere. However, it is important to provide new employment opportunities especially since the demise of the coal industry. This site will be designed and landscaped in accordance with Policy E1 and would not be acceptable as a “jumble” of development.

**EM3d - R296/R320 - East of A610, Eastwood: Amended site area and addition of reference to access**

1419/5359: Mr A J Lovell

24. Object to area for allocation should be 18 hectares not 14.8.

1155/5091: Greasley Parish Council

25. Object to reduction in site area; this site should have been enlarged. May place pressure on other sites. (Therefore also object to R500 in the Brief).

*Council's Joint Response:*

26. The area of the allocated site was reduced at Revised Deposit Draft stage (from 16ha to 14.8ha) in order to properly provide a landscaped edge along the proposed Green Belt boundary. Overall, the Plan's employment requirement was still met, through compensating additions to the total stock of employment facility provide new allocations elsewhere.
27. Further consideration has since been given to an area of land measuring 2.5ha immediately to the north-west of the site, being part of a former railway line. This area was subject of an objection to its continued inclusion in the Green Belt. Inquiry change IC85 has been proposed in response to this objection, as detailed in paragraph 12 above.

**EM3d - R321 East of A610, Eastwood: Deletion of spine road requirement and addition of road access to south**

1155/5080: Greasley Parish Council

28. Object to deletion of link road as this could have an adverse impact on traffic pressure on the town centre main junction. Therefore also object to R501.

1419/5363: Mr A J Lovell

29. Object to removal of link road, as it would improve safety for pedestrians particularly on Mansfield Road by removing through traffic on the Central Eastwood part of the A608, and also reduce noise here.

*Council's Joint Response:*

30. A Transport Assessment has been undertaken to assess the traffic impacts. The use of a Green Travel Plan and alternative means of transport would assist in minimising extra traffic pressure on Eastwood Town Centre.

**Inspector's Conclusions**

1. All the above objections relate to the allocation itself rather than to the Development Brief. I consider them in Chapter 5 earlier.

### Recommendation

2. I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP in respect of these objections.

### Appendix 2E - Development Brief

599/3659: Nottinghamshire County Council

1. Whilst the principle of this development has been accepted in highway terms, further justification is required in terms of traffic impact on Eastwood Town Centre. Reference should be made to possible contributions to walking and cycling.

#### *Council's Response:*

2. The Council considers that the text is clear concerning the requirements for development. A Transport Assessment has been undertaken to assess the traffic impacts. It should be noted that at Revised Deposit Draft stage additional reference to walking and cycling measures was made (R505).

### Inspector's Conclusions

1. R505 should have met the Highway Authority's earlier concerns relating to measures to assist walking and cycling. I have already considered their other point in Chapter 5. Further work on the TA should be to establish what mitigation measures might be appropriate, including the extent of any B1 uses; not the principles of the allocation, which I support. I see no need for any further modification to the Development Brief except to redraw the northern site boundary.

### Recommendation

2. I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP in respect of this objection but the northern site boundary should be redrawn to reflect my recommendations in Chapter 5.

### Appendix 2F - Development Brief

#### **H2(j) HOUSING SITE - ILKESTON ROAD, STAPLEFORD**

##### **4.48 New housing sites - Ilkeston Road, Stapleford**

1154	5052	R207		W. Westerman Ltd DPDS Consulting Group
2083	6580	R208	Mrs C Bradshaw	STRAG
2083	6579	R207	Mrs C Bradshaw	STRAG
1390	5312	R207	Mrs B Cobon	Trowell Parish Council
1390	5313	R208	Mrs B Cobon	Trowell Parish Council
1882	6045	R207	Miss J Fletcher	STRAG
1882	6046	R208	Miss J Fletcher	STRAG
1888	6107	R207	Mr RG Gough	STRAG
1883	6062	R208	Mr JC Jesson	STRAG
1883	6065	R207	Mr JC Jesson	STRAG

1884	6069	R207	Mrs E Perry	STRAG
1884	6070	R208	Mrs E Perry	STRAG
1885	6087	R208	Mr N Phillips	STRAG
1901	6176	R207	Mrs J Phillips	Stapleford and Trowell Rural Action Group
1901	6177	R208	Mrs J Phillips	Stapleford and Trowell Rural Action Group
1885	6086	R207	Mr N Phillips	STRAG
1886	6103	R208	Mrs K Quirk	STRAG
1890	6110	R208	Cllr KE Rigby	Trowell Parish Council / STRAG
1890	6109	R207	Cllr KE Rigby	Trowell Parish Council / STRAG
2102	6652	R207	Scrimshire	
2085	6614	R208	Mr DJ Stocks	STRAG
2085	6613	R207	Mr DJ Stocks	STRAG
760	4729	R207	Mr B Thompson	STRAG
761	4737	R208	Mrs CA Thompson	STRAG
1897	6139	R208	Mr I Turner	STRAG
1897	6138	R207	Mr I Turner	STRAG
2084	6596	R207	Mrs JL Ward	STRAG
2084	6597	R208	Mrs JL Ward	STRAG
1736	5745	R208	Mr PJ Ward	STRAG
1736	5744	R207	Mr PJ Ward	STRAG
1899	6156	R207	Mr PW Warman	STRAG
1899	6157	R208	Mr PW Warman	STRAG
1782	5854	R207	Ms T Whitchurch	STRAG
1782	5855	R208	Ms T Whitchurch	STRAG

**H2j*****New housing sites - Ilkeston Road, Stapleford***

1155	5135	R168		Greasley Parish Council Andrew Thomas Planning
1155	7031	PC6		Greasley Parish Council Andrew Thomas Planning
1155	2433			Greasley Parish Council Andrew Thomas Planning
1006	7046	PC6		Nuthall Parish Council Browne Jacobson Planning Unit
1154	6994	PC6		W. Westerman Ltd
1154	2349			W. Westerman Ltd DPDS Consulting Group
1006	4855	R160		Nuthall Parish Council Browne Jacobson Planning Unit
1154	5064	R160		W. Westerman Ltd DPDS Consulting Group
1154	5068	R168		W. Westerman Ltd DPDS Consulting Group
1155	5130	R160		Greasley Parish Council Andrew Thomas Planning
2215	6796	R168	Miss K Alten	
1108	4966	R160	Mr M Bagshaw	Stamford Homes Limited Barton Willmore Planning Partnership
1108	4980	R211	Mr M Bagshaw	Stamford Homes Limited Barton Willmore Planning Partnership
613	1518		Mr S Barber	Broxtowe Real World Coalition
2099	6643	R168	Mr D Barson	
835	1516		Mrs N Bellamy	
763	1408		Mrs JA Bird	STRAG
763	4742	R209	Mrs JA Bird	STRAG
763	4741	R168	Mrs JA Bird	STRAG
2083	6582	R168	Mrs C Bradshaw	STRAG
2083	6583	R211	Mrs C Bradshaw	STRAG
2083	6581	R209	Mrs C Bradshaw	STRAG
1780	5852	R168	J Bromage	
1593	5509	R168	Mr SW Bywater	

1649	5590	R211	Mrs BM Bywater	STRAG
1649	5589	R209	Mrs BM Bywater	STRAG
1649	5588	R160	Mrs BM Bywater	STRAG
2216	6797	R168	Mrs SP Clayton	
1390	3630		Mrs B Cobon	Trowell Parish Council
1390	5315	R210	Mrs B Cobon	Trowell Parish Council
1390	5314	R209	Mrs B Cobon	Trowell Parish Council
2162	6742	R168	Mrs Z Cockcroft	
1880	6039	R168	Mr R Daibell	STRAG
1595	5511	R168	Miss MC Downie	Stapleford Town Council
1882	6047	R209	Miss J Fletcher	STRAG
1882	6049	R211	Miss J Fletcher	STRAG
1882	6048	R168	Miss J Fletcher	STRAG
1381	3489		Ms F Forgham	Government Office for the East Midlands Government Office for the East Midlands Nottinghamshire County Council
599	1407		Mr G Foster	
834	1515		Mr JD Hatfield	
2107	6675	R168	Mr J Hayes	
762	1406		Mrs V Hessey	
762	4740	R168	Mrs V Hessey	
2163	6743	R168	Mr B Hughes	
2214	6795	R168	Mrs A Jamieson	
1883	6066	R211	Mr JC Jesson	STRAG
1883	6064	R168	Mr JC Jesson	STRAG
1883	6063	R209	Mr JC Jesson	STRAG
1872	6023	R168	Mr AM Keen	
836	1517		Mr M Lacey	
2164	6744	R168	Mr R Lee	
1419	5355	R160	Mr AJ Lovell	
788	1441		Mr DB Lowth	
1135	5038	R160	Mr I Moss	House Builders` Federation
1135	2435		Mr I Moss	House Builders` Federation
1884	6072	R168	Mrs E Perry	STRAG
1884	6073	R211	Mrs E Perry	STRAG
1884	6071	R209	Mrs E Perry	STRAG
1885	6089	R168	Mr N Phillips	STRAG
1901	6178	R209	Mrs J Phillips	Stapleford and Trowell Rural Action Group
1885	6090	R211	Mr N Phillips	STRAG
1901	6191	R211	Mrs J Phillips	Stapleford and Trowell Rural Action Group
1901	6192	R168	Mrs J Phillips	Stapleford and Trowell Rural Action Group
1885	6088	R209	Mr N Phillips	STRAG
2109	6677	R168	Mr R Pierrepont	
1887	6106	R211	Mr T Quirk	STRAG
1889	6108	R209	Mr M Quirk	STRAG
1886	6105	R211	Mrs K Quirk	STRAG
1886	6104	R209	Mrs K Quirk	STRAG
1890	6111	R209	Cllr KE Rigby	Trowell Parish Council / STRAG
1890	6113	R211	Cllr KE Rigby	Trowell Parish Council / STRAG
1890	6112	R168	Cllr KE Rigby	Trowell Parish Council / STRAG
2218	6799	R160	Cllr RS Robinson	
1781	5853	R168	MA Sheikh	
2106	6674	R211	Mr N Starr	
2106	6673	R209	Mr N Starr	
2106	6672	R160	Mr N Starr	
2085	6616	R168	Mr DJ Stocks	STRAG
2085	6617	R211	Mr DJ Stocks	STRAG
2085	6615	R209	Mr DJ Stocks	STRAG
760	1404		Mr B Thompson	STRAG
761	1405		Mrs CA Thompson	STRAG
761	4738	R211	Mrs CA Thompson	STRAG
1897	6141	R168	Mr I Turner	STRAG



1897	6140	R209	Mr I Turner	STRAG
1897	6142	R211	Mr I Turner	STRAG
1736	5746	R209	Mr PJ Ward	STRAG
2084	6598	R209	Mrs JL Ward	STRAG
2084	6600	R211	Mrs JL Ward	STRAG
2084	6599	R168	Mrs JL Ward	STRAG
1736	5747	R168	Mr PJ Ward	STRAG
1736	5748	R211	Mr PJ Ward	STRAG
1899	6160	R211	Mr PW Warman	STRAG
1899	6159	R168	Mr PW Warman	STRAG
1899	6158	R209	Mr PW Warman	STRAG
766	1416		Cllr D Watts	Liberal Democrats
1782	5857	R168	Ms T Whitchurch	STRAG
1782	5858	R211	Ms T Whitchurch	STRAG
1782	5856	R209	Ms T Whitchurch	STRAG
1659	5607	R168	Mrs TM Whittaker	
123	4106	R160	Mr D Woodhouse	

**A2f Appendix 2f - Ilkeston Road, Stapleford**

1154	5070	R518		W. Westerman Ltd DPDS Consulting Group
1154	5071	R521		W. Westerman Ltd DPDS Consulting Group
1154	5069	R509		W. Westerman Ltd DPDS Consulting Group
1154	2354			W. Westerman Ltd DPDS Consulting Group
1879	6036	R510	Mr RG Barson	STRAG
1879	6035	R509	Mr RG Barson	STRAG
1879	6033	R521	Mr RG Barson	STRAG
1879	6037	R515	Mr RG Barson	STRAG
763	4749	R518	Mrs JA Bird	STRAG
763	4750	R521	Mrs JA Bird	STRAG
763	4747	R512	Mrs JA Bird	STRAG
763	4746	R511	Mrs JA Bird	STRAG
763	4743	R508	Mrs JA Bird	STRAG
763	4745	R510	Mrs JA Bird	STRAG
763	4744	R509	Mrs JA Bird	STRAG
763	4748	R515	Mrs JA Bird	STRAG
2083	6593	R519	Mrs C Bradshaw	STRAG
2083	6584	R508	Mrs C Bradshaw	STRAG
2083	6585	R509	Mrs C Bradshaw	STRAG
2083	6586	R510	Mrs C Bradshaw	STRAG
2083	6587	R511	Mrs C Bradshaw	STRAG
2083	6588	R512	Mrs C Bradshaw	STRAG
2083	6589	R513	Mrs C Bradshaw	STRAG
2083	6590	R515	Mrs C Bradshaw	STRAG
2083	6594	R520	Mrs C Bradshaw	STRAG
2083	6592	R518	Mrs C Bradshaw	STRAG
2083	6595	R521	Mrs C Bradshaw	STRAG
2083	6591	R516	Mrs C Bradshaw	STRAG
1390	5318	R518	Mrs B Cobon	Trowell Parish Council
1390	5316	R514	Mrs B Cobon	Trowell Parish Council
1390	5317	R515	Mrs B Cobon	Trowell Parish Council
1880	6038	R520	Mr R Daibell	STRAG
1880	6042	R513	Mr R Daibell	STRAG
1880	6040	R516	Mr R Daibell	STRAG
1880	6041	R519	Mr R Daibell	STRAG
1881	6044	R511	Mr S Fisher	STRAG
1881	6043	R508	Mr S Fisher	STRAG
1882	6058	R518	Miss J Fletcher	STRAG

1882	6061	R520	Miss J Fletcher	STRAG
1882	6059	R519	Miss J Fletcher	STRAG
1882	6057	R516	Miss J Fletcher	STRAG
1882	6056	R515	Miss J Fletcher	STRAG
1882	6055	R513	Miss J Fletcher	STRAG
1882	6053	R511	Miss J Fletcher	STRAG
1882	6052	R510	Miss J Fletcher	STRAG
1882	6051	R509	Miss J Fletcher	STRAG
1882	6050	R508	Miss J Fletcher	STRAG
1882	6054	R512	Miss J Fletcher	STRAG
1882	6060	R521	Miss J Fletcher	STRAG
1883	6067	R508	Mr JC Jesson	STRAG
1883	6068	R509	Mr JC Jesson	STRAG
1135	2380		Mr I Moss	House Builders` Federation
1884	6084	R520	Mrs E Perry	STRAG
1884	6083	R519	Mrs E Perry	STRAG
1884	6082	R518	Mrs E Perry	STRAG
1884	6081	R516	Mrs E Perry	STRAG
1884	6080	R515	Mrs E Perry	STRAG
1884	6079	R513	Mrs E Perry	STRAG
1884	6077	R511	Mrs E Perry	STRAG
1884	6074	R508	Mrs E Perry	STRAG
1884	6085	R521	Mrs E Perry	STRAG
1884	6078	R512	Mrs E Perry	STRAG
1884	6075	R509	Mrs E Perry	STRAG
1884	6076	R510	Mrs E Perry	STRAG
1901	6179	R508	Mrs J Phillips	Stapleford and Trowell Rural Action Group
1885	6101	R519	Mr N Phillips	STRAG
1885	6100	R518	Mr N Phillips	STRAG
1885	6099	R516	Mr N Phillips	STRAG
1885	6098	R515	Mr N Phillips	STRAG
1885	6097	R513	Mr N Phillips	STRAG
1885	6096	R512	Mr N Phillips	STRAG
1885	6095	R511	Mr N Phillips	STRAG
1885	6094	R521	Mr N Phillips	STRAG
1885	6093	R510	Mr N Phillips	STRAG
1885	6102	R520	Mr N Phillips	STRAG
1885	6091	R508	Mr N Phillips	STRAG
1901	6183	R512	Mrs J Phillips	Stapleford and Trowell Rural Action Group
1901	6180	R509	Mrs J Phillips	Stapleford and Trowell Rural Action Group
1901	6181	R510	Mrs J Phillips	Stapleford and Trowell Rural Action Group
1901	6182	R511	Mrs J Phillips	Stapleford and Trowell Rural Action Group
1901	6184	R513	Mrs J Phillips	Stapleford and Trowell Rural Action Group
1901	6186	R516	Mrs J Phillips	Stapleford and Trowell Rural Action Group
1901	6187	R518	Mrs J Phillips	Stapleford and Trowell Rural Action Group
1901	6188	R519	Mrs J Phillips	Stapleford and Trowell Rural Action Group
1901	6189	R520	Mrs J Phillips	Stapleford and Trowell Rural Action Group
1901	6190	R521	Mrs J Phillips	Stapleford and Trowell Rural Action Group
1885	6092	R509	Mr N Phillips	STRAG
1901	6185	R515	Mrs J Phillips	Stapleford and Trowell Rural Action Group
1890	6121	R516	Cllr KE Rigby	Trowell Parish Council / STRAG
1890	6115	R509	Cllr KE Rigby	Trowell Parish Council / STRAG
1890	6125	R521	Cllr KE Rigby	Trowell Parish Council / STRAG
1890	6124	R520	Cllr KE Rigby	Trowell Parish Council / STRAG
1890	6122	R518	Cllr KE Rigby	Trowell Parish Council / STRAG
1890	6120	R515	Cllr KE Rigby	Trowell Parish Council / STRAG
1890	6119	R513	Cllr KE Rigby	Trowell Parish Council / STRAG
1890	6118	R512	Cllr KE Rigby	Trowell Parish Council / STRAG
1890	6117	R511	Cllr KE Rigby	Trowell Parish Council / STRAG
1890	6116	R510	Cllr KE Rigby	Trowell Parish Council / STRAG
1890	6114	R508	Cllr KE Rigby	Trowell Parish Council / STRAG

1890	6123	R519	Cllr KE Rigby	Trowell Parish Council / STRAG
601	4651	R512	Mr S Rufus	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust
601	4650	R509	Mr S Rufus	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust
601	4649	R508	Mr S Rufus	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust
1891	6127	R511	Miss S Shooter	STRAG
1891	6126	R510	Miss S Shooter	STRAG
2085	6621	R511	Mr DJ Stocks	STRAG
2085	6624	R515	Mr DJ Stocks	STRAG
2085	6625	R516	Mr DJ Stocks	STRAG
2085	6626	R518	Mr DJ Stocks	STRAG
2085	6627	R519	Mr DJ Stocks	STRAG
2085	6628	R520	Mr DJ Stocks	STRAG
2085	6619	R509	Mr DJ Stocks	STRAG
2085	6622	R512	Mr DJ Stocks	STRAG
2085	6618	R508	Mr DJ Stocks	STRAG
2085	6620	R510	Mr DJ Stocks	STRAG
2085	6623	R513	Mr DJ Stocks	STRAG
2085	6629	R521	Mr DJ Stocks	STRAG
1893	6130	R518	Mr S Taylor	STRAG
1893	6128	R513	Mr S Taylor	STRAG
1894	6133	R521	Mrs AH Taylor	STRAG
1893	6129	R515	Mr S Taylor	STRAG
1894	6134	R516	Mrs AH Taylor	STRAG
1893	6131	R520	Mr S Taylor	STRAG
1894	6135	R519	Mrs AH Taylor	STRAG
1894	6132	R512	Mrs AH Taylor	STRAG
760	4733	R521	Mr B Thompson	STRAG
1896	6137	R509	Mr SJ Thompson	STRAG
760	4731	R519	Mr B Thompson	STRAG
761	4739	R515	Mrs CA Thompson	STRAG
760	4736	R516	Mr B Thompson	STRAG
760	4735	R513	Mr B Thompson	STRAG
1895	6136	R510	Mrs NC Thompson	STRAG
760	4730	R518	Mr B Thompson	STRAG
760	4732	R520	Mr B Thompson	STRAG
760	4734	R512	Mr B Thompson	STRAG
1897	6146	R511	Mr I Turner	STRAG
1897	6154	R521	Mr I Turner	STRAG
1897	6153	R520	Mr I Turner	STRAG
1897	6150	R516	Mr I Turner	STRAG
1897	6151	R518	Mr I Turner	STRAG
1897	6149	R515	Mr I Turner	STRAG
1897	6152	R519	Mr I Turner	STRAG
1897	6147	R512	Mr I Turner	STRAG
1897	6148	R513	Mr I Turner	STRAG
1897	6143	R508	Mr I Turner	STRAG
1897	6145	R510	Mr I Turner	STRAG
1897	6144	R509	Mr I Turner	STRAG
1736	5751	R508	Mr PJ Ward	STRAG
1736	5752	R509	Mr PJ Ward	STRAG
1736	5753	R510	Mr PJ Ward	STRAG
1736	5754	R513	Mr PJ Ward	STRAG
1736	5750	R512	Mr PJ Ward	STRAG
1736	5749	R511	Mr PJ Ward	STRAG
2084	6601	R508	Mrs JL Ward	STRAG
2084	6602	R509	Mrs JL Ward	STRAG
1736	5755	R515	Mr PJ Ward	STRAG
2084	6612	R521	Mrs JL Ward	STRAG
1736	5756	R516	Mr PJ Ward	STRAG
1736	5757	R518	Mr PJ Ward	STRAG
1736	5758	R519	Mr PJ Ward	STRAG

1736	5759	R520	Mr PJ Ward	STRAG
1736	5760	R521	Mr PJ Ward	STRAG
2084	6611	R520	Mrs JL Ward	STRAG
2084	6610	R519	Mrs JL Ward	STRAG
2084	6609	R518	Mrs JL Ward	STRAG
2084	6608	R516	Mrs JL Ward	STRAG
2084	6605	R512	Mrs JL Ward	STRAG
2084	6606	R513	Mrs JL Ward	STRAG
2084	6607	R515	Mrs JL Ward	STRAG
2084	6603	R510	Mrs JL Ward	STRAG
2084	6604	R511	Mrs JL Ward	STRAG
1899	6164	R511	Mr PW Warman	STRAG
1899	6172	R520	Mr PW Warman	STRAG
1899	6171	R521	Mr PW Warman	STRAG
1899	6170	R519	Mr PW Warman	STRAG
1899	6169	R518	Mr PW Warman	STRAG
1899	6168	R516	Mr PW Warman	STRAG
1899	6167	R515	Mr PW Warman	STRAG
1899	6165	R512	Mr PW Warman	STRAG
1899	6163	R510	Mr PW Warman	STRAG
1899	6162	R509	Mr PW Warman	STRAG
1899	6161	R508	Mr PW Warman	STRAG
1899	6166	R513	Mr PW Warman	STRAG
1782	5869	R520	Ms T Witchurch	STRAG
1782	5862	R511	Ms T Witchurch	STRAG
1782	5870	R521	Ms T Witchurch	STRAG
1782	5868	R519	Ms T Witchurch	STRAG
1782	5866	R516	Ms T Witchurch	STRAG
1782	5865	R515	Ms T Witchurch	STRAG
1782	5864	R513	Ms T Witchurch	STRAG
1782	5867	R518	Ms T Witchurch	STRAG
1782	5863	R512	Ms T Witchurch	STRAG
1782	5861	R510	Ms T Witchurch	STRAG
1782	5860	R509	Ms T Witchurch	STRAG
1782	5859	R508	Ms T Witchurch	STRAG

**A2g Appendix 2g - Bilborough College, Strelley**

1135	2381		Mr I Moss	House Builders` Federation
1385	3602		Mr B Neville	Sport England (East Midlands)
601	4653	R525	Mr S Rufus	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust
601	4652	R522	Mr S Rufus	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust

**A2h Appendix 2h - Main Road, Watnall**

1155	5094	R536		Greasley Parish Council Andrew Thomas Planning
1155	5093	R538		Greasley Parish Council Andrew Thomas Planning
1155	5092	R540		Greasley Parish Council Andrew Thomas Planning
748	4711	R538		David Wilson Homes North Midlands David Wilson Estates
1155	5098	R535		Greasley Parish Council Andrew Thomas Planning
1155	3655			Greasley Parish Council Andrew Thomas Planning
748	4714	R543		David Wilson Homes North Midlands David Wilson Estates
748	4713	R537		David Wilson Homes North Midlands David Wilson Estates
598	4392	R538	Mr I Brown	CPRE - Broxtowe Group
598	4391	R534	Mr I Brown	CPRE - Broxtowe Group

927	4826	R538	Mr RP Bullock	
927	4827	R532	Mr RP Bullock	
599	4528	R543	Mr G Foster	Nottinghamshire County Council
599	3226		Mr G Foster	Nottinghamshire County Council
214	4144	R542	Dr DL Hedderly	
1222	2923		Mr JR Holmes	Holmes Antill
798	4761	R537	Mr GW Jones	
502	4290	R542	Mrs B Meadows	
1166	2838		Mrs B Neville	Nottingham City Council. Development Department
601	4654	R532	Mr S Rufus	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust
601	4655	R537	Mr S Rufus	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust
601	4656	R538	Mr S Rufus	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust
1130	2340		Mr R Walters	Hallam Land Management

### **Council's response to objections made to the Pre-Inquiry Changes**

1. This site was considered to be suitable for inclusion in the Revised Deposit Draft, when there was a need to find sites for over 2,000 new dwellings in order to meet Structure Plan requirements.
2. Pre-Inquiry Changes made to the plan in April 2001 involved the deletion of four greenfield sites proposed for housing, including this site. These Pre-Inquiry Changes were prompted by the Nottingham Urban Capacity Study, published in March 2001, which indicated that there would be considerable additional capacity for housing in the City before 2011. The Borough Council also re-estimated the likely annual rate of housing to be gained from windfall sites, as part of the Pre-Inquiry Changes.
3. The overall net result of these changes was to create a shortfall of 250 dwellings from the Structure Plan allocation figure for Broxtowe. The County Council did not raise any concerns about conformity of the Local Plan with the Structure Plan.
4. The four sites which were deleted, including this site, were all in Phase 2 of the Plan's housing phasing policy, reflecting their lower preference to Phase 1 sites which are mainly on previously-developed land. The borough council considers that they would not need to be developed within the Plan period. This site would have required a release from Green Belt for which this Council now cannot provide sufficient justification.
5. The issues of principle raised by the Pre-Inquiry Changes - regarding windfall rate, conformity with the Structure Plan and urban capacity - were debated at the Housing Round Table session at the start of the inquiry.

### **Issues raised on objections prior to Pre-Inquiry Changes**

6. The Council's position on this site has changed between the Revised Deposit stage and the Pre-Inquiry Changes such that the site is no longer favoured by the Council. In this respect therefore those who were objecting to the inclusion of the site have now had their objections met. At the Inspector's request - and on the basis that he is dealing with objections made at the Revised Deposit stage - the Council has responded to those objections as if the site was still allocated.

**Due to the number of similar objections the following paraphrased summaries represent the issues raised. The Council has responded to each in turn.**

- (a) Loss of Green Belt, and a greenfield land
- (b) 'Sequential approach' not followed correctly
- (c) Inappropriate minimum net density selected
- (d) Development would spoil Trowell
- (e) Development would spoil recreation and landscape value of area
- (f) Site has medium/high archaeological potential

- (g) Site is close to a prominent area for special protection and the Nottingham Canal
- (h) Increased traffic in the area
- (i) The site needs proper provision of emergency accesses
- (j) Public transport serving the site is inadequate
- (k) There would be a loss of wildlife value
- (l) There would be pressure on drainage, and a danger of flash floods.
- (m) There are inadequate local medical facilities.
- (n) There would be pressure on local schools.
- (o) There is no reference to recreation facilities being provided.
- (p) The precise boundaries of various elements within the development site should be refined.
- (q) The development site boundary should revert to the Deposit Draft version.

(a) Loss of Green Belt, and a greenfield land

7. The Council accepted at an early stage in this plan review that the scale of new housing development to be provided to meet Structure Plan requirements was such that encroachment into Green Belt and greenfield land was unavoidable, in several locations in the borough.
8. In general terms, the Council considers that it is very difficult to expand any of the urban areas in the south of the borough without significant encroachment onto land which is crucial to the functions of Green Belt. The extensive area of Green Belt north of Stapleford currently has its southern boundary against the edge of built development along Ilkeston Road and Trowell Road, offering views across open land from these roads. Nevertheless, the Council originally considered that a reasonable degree of openness had been achieved with this housing allocation, as substantial areas of open space would be provided for public access. Although a degree of separation of areas of built development would be lost through development of this land the Council did not consider the land separated distinct urban settlements. The northern part of this urban area is referred to as Trowell due to the lie of the parish boundary. However, in planning terms these residential estates clearly form part of the Stapleford urban area, and are distinct from the village of Trowell which lies to the north-west of the M1. As such the Council contended that the development of H2K did not remove or reduce a gap between urban areas. However, this is not to say that this Green Belt land is not important - indeed it is in recognition of this importance that the site was proposed for deletion as a pre-inquiry change.
9. It is also clear from the objections received that in the perceptions of local people this area of open land does make an important contribution to the character and distinctiveness of Trowell.

(b) 'Sequential approach' not followed correctly

10. In selecting housing development sites, proper regard was had to the site-searching sequence in PPG3. Greenfield land was only allocated once opportunities for building on previously-developed land had been exhausted.

(c) Inappropriate minimum net density selected

11. There is a bus service on Stapleford Road/Trowell Road with a greater than 4-an-hour frequency. This provides a service to Ilkeston and a service to Stapleford, which terminates at Nottingham. However, no service connects directly with the main A52 corridor to provide a direct fast service to Nottingham. There is also a lesser frequency service along Ilkeston Road which similarly does not connect with the A52. Taking this level of service into account, it was considered that a minimum net density of 35 dwellings per hectare was appropriate for this site, and the Council is confident that this can be achieved. The Council would be reluctant to increase this density requirement in this urban fringe situation, bearing in mind the need for development to be in character with its surroundings. However, if a higher density solution is ultimately submitted for this site, then the Council would assess the scheme with regard to the principles of good design contained in policy E1.

(d) Development would spoil Trowell

12. Trowell village, sited to the north of the M1 motorway, has not expanded greatly over the last 30 years and retains much of its village character. However the area of Trowell to the south of the M1 has enlarged in recent years, expanding Stapleford urban area. Whilst it is accepted that this proposed development would extend the urban area further on its southern edge, the Council considered in allocating this site that this was an acceptable continuation of the development pattern which need not be out of character with the surrounding area.

(e) Development would spoil recreation and landscape value of area

13. A substantial area of public open space and recreational facilities would be provided within the proposed development. In landscape terms, Stapleford Hill would continue to dominate local viewpoints and houses would not encroach on higher ground. Public access along existing paths which currently cross privately-owned farmland, for example the footpath following the north side of the brook, would be enhanced by additional public open space created alongside the path.

(f) Site has medium/high archaeological potential

14. Changes were proposed to the Local Plan at Revised Deposit Draft stage over the circumstances envisaged by this objection, ie that archaeological interest worthy of protection or recording is discovered during preparation work for an application on a development site. Revisions R101 and R102 introduced a new policy and associated text which provides for an archaeological evaluation to be submitted where appropriate, and suitable conditions to be imposed to deal with treatment of any archaeological remains. The Council was aware that English Heritage had recently investigated ancient bell pits (early coal mines) in this area and had not considered any remains on this site worthy of designation as an Ancient Monument; a nearby example, south of Strelley village, was designated as a result of the same survey.

(g) Site is close to a prominent area for special protection and the Nottingham Canal

15. The site proposed at the Deposit Draft Stage was adjacent to Stapleford Hill and approximately 150 metres from the Nottingham Canal. However, this part of the site has never been envisaged for built development, and would have formed part of a proposed country park, compatible with both of these important features in the landscape. The contraction of the built part of the site at the revised Deposit Draft stage resulted in built development being approximately 400 metres from Stapleford Hill, and 300 metres from Nottingham Canal. The Council is satisfied that these important features would not have been compromised by the development.

(h) Increased traffic in the area

16. Traffic generated by this site would dissipate directly into the strategic highway network, potentially in five main directions, which would contribute to minimising its impact on traffic on any particular route. The five directions are: northwards to the Nottingham-Trowell A609 corridor; south eastwards to the Nottingham-Stapleford A52 corridor; north-eastwards along the A6002 Western Outer Loop road; south to Stapleford town centre along Pasture Road; west towards Stanton along Moorbridge Lane. The Council is well aware of the need for improvement to the IlkestonRoad/Trowell Road/Pasture Road junction at the south-west corner of the site, and this would need to be undertaken as part of the development, as specified in policy H2j. Policy T1 will also apply, involving the negotiating of a contribution from developers in line with the Interim Transport Planning Statement. Any contribution received would be assessed to determine whether this should be spent on public transport infrastructure works.

(i) The site needs proper provision of emergency accesses

17. In response to the concerns regarding emergency access the Development Brief was amended at

Revised Deposit Draft Stage (R518). The bullet point regarding vehicular access now reads: "separate vehicular access points should be created for the two residential areas with no vehicular access between the two sites. The northern area will require an emergency link access. The southern area will require two vehicular access points". The Council considers the concerns expressed have been overcome by this amendment.

(j) Public transport serving the site is inadequate

18. There is a bus service on Stapleford Road/Trowell Road with a greater than 4-an-hour frequency. There is also a lesser frequency service along Ilkeston Road. The level of service and the fact that the current services does not connect directly with the main A52 corridor to provide a direct fast service to Nottingham, has been taken into account in setting a minimum density of 35 dwellings per hectare. Furthermore, the Development Brief states that financial contribution will be negotiated toward the retention or improvement of public transport facilities serving the immediate vicinity of the site. Although the site layout has not been determined it is considered that access to existing bus services could be provided by ensuring good pedestrian linkages into and out of the site - as required by the Development Brief for site H2j. Bus penetration into the site would not be necessary as the whole site is within 400 metres of existing bus services.

(k) There would be a loss of wildlife value

19. The site does not include any areas designated for their wildlife value. However it is accepted that the brook and adjacent hedgerows will support wildlife. It is in recognition of this that the Development Brief requires the retention and enhancement of existing landscape quality and the creation of a corridor of open space leading to open countryside.

(l) There would be pressure on drainage, and a danger of flash floods

20. The Council is aware of the problems that have arisen in connection with the brook that runs through the site. The Environment Agency and the Council's drainage experts have confirmed that works will be required to increase the capacity of the culvert to ensure problems are avoided. This will have cost implications for the developers and in recognition of this an inquiry change is proposed.
21. Therefore, if the Inspector finds that this site should be reinstated then in the Council's view the following Inquiry change is required. An additional bullet point would need to be inserted below the bullet point in Development Brief F starting "financial contribution .....". The new bullet point should read "The Council will need to be satisfied that works are to be undertaken as part of the development to ensure satisfactory drainage on site and in the immediate vicinity".

The above amendment will ensure that the developers are aware that works will need to be undertaken to ensure the drainage is adequate. The Environment Agency has confirmed that the existing problems can be overcome and have not raised an objection to this allocation.

(m) There are inadequate local medical facilities

22. Sites for local health facilities are not usually allocated through the local plan process. This is a matter for the Local Healthcare Trust and GP practices who have not requested any sites in the locality. Planning applications for development of this type will be determined with reference to local plan policies and any other material circumstances.

(n) There would be pressure on local schools

23. The new housing development will result in additional demand for school places. The Development Brief states that "Financial contribution will be negotiated toward the provision and/or enhancement of education facilities commensurate with additional demands created by the resident population of



the development site". Nottinghamshire County Council has not raised any objection with regard to educational provision.

- (o) There is no reference to recreational facilities being provided
24. The Development Brief (in the Revised Deposit Draft) does refer to recreational facilities. The text states "Provision should be made for the identification, provision and dedication of land for a sports pitch and pavilion and for passive recreation (including contribution toward the future maintenance thereof) in convenient relationship to existing facilities and open spaces".
- (p) The precise boundaries of various elements within the development site should be refined
25. The Council considers that the proposed Development Brief gives sufficient detail concerning the development of site H2K. The precise boundaries will not be ascertained until an application is submitted.
- (q) The development site boundary should revert to the Deposit Draft version
26. In order to retain a green break between urban areas the housing allocation was reduced in the Revised Deposit Draft. This also had the effect of making the development less prominent. The requirement for a large area of open space has been considerably reduced allowing the Green Belt boundary to be realigned. The Green Belt boundary as shown in the Revised Deposit Draft followed a defensible line and was logical for the housing development then proposed.

#### **Rebuttal Of Evidence Submitted by Objectors**

27. Site H2j was promoted by the landowner's agent at the consultation stage of the Broxtowe Local Plan. The site was allocated for development in the Deposit Draft and Revised Deposit Draft Local Plan. However, the site was proposed for deletion as a Pre-Inquiry change as the result of a process explained in the main Proof 027. The Council considers it is important to provide additional information and clarification on some of the points raised in the objectors proofs.
28. As part of the Local Plan Review process the Council was required to identify sites on which to develop housing to meet the Structure Plan requirement. The Borough's brownfield sites were not sufficient to meet this requirement and therefore the Council had to look to greenfield land. Whilst the Council recognise that arguments can be made both for and against the development of this site, H2j is an urban extension which adjoins the main urban area of Stapleford and consists mainly of Grade 4 agricultural land. As such, and following a detailed site examination, the Council allocated Site H2j in the Deposit Draft. The site continued to be allocated in the Revised Deposit Draft, although with a significantly reduced area.
29. Whilst at no point was the Council oblivious to the impacts development of this site would have, the site was considered as the least damaging of the alternatives to which the council could turn. The Council is not able to agree with STRAG with regard to the perceived consequences of the development. STRAG states "Such a development would certainly have devastating consequences on the environment and its inhabitants (human and otherwise), and would encourage further development of the area". This statement appears not to be based on a clear or factual assessment of the proposal.
30. The site as allocated in the Revised Deposit Draft provides 245 new homes in two separate areas segregated by the stream. The Development Brief states that the development proposals shall include measures for the retention and enhancement of the existing landscape quality provided by the stream and adjacent hedgerows and trees. This requirement would provide easy and attractive access to the open countryside for both new and existing residents. Substantial open space and recreational facilities would also be provided as part of the development. With regard to flood concerns the Environment Agency have confirmed that the problems concerning land drainage could be overcome by the developer either by improving the watercourse or balancing the additional flows on site. The access arrangements as detailed in the Revised Deposit Draft

meet County Highways requirements, and the new bus services provide better connections with Nottingham. As such the Council does not consider the consequences of such a development would be ‘devastating’.

31. However, whilst the Council cannot agree with STRAG’s view on the consequences of development, the Council understands and shares the concerns expressed over the loss of Green Belt land. Furthermore, it is recognised that this site forms part of an attractive and open landscape which also serves to protect the coalescence of existing housing developments. As such, when the results of the Nottingham Urban Capacity Study became known and the Council reassessed the level of housing provision required in Broxtowe, this site was one of the first to be considered for deletion. Of the four sites eventually proposed for deletion site H2j was one of two Green Belt sites (the other being H2d).
32. The Council is also very aware of the strength of feeling of local people regarding this site. The objector’s proof draws attention to the number of objections received in relation to this site, but does not quote the correct figures. Therefore, as a point of clarification the number of objections received at each stage of the Local Plan process is presented below:

Consultation Draft - Whilst individual comments were not published the site H2j (then referred to as Site Sd1) did result in site specific objections as well as more general comments regarding the need to protect green belt around Stapleford.

Deposit Draft - 23 objections and one representation of support

Revised Deposit Draft -	R160	12	
(All revisions relate to H2j)	R168	38	
	R207	18	Note: Objections include a petition with 2322 signatures
	R208	16	
	R209	22	
	R210	1	
	R211	21	
	R508-R521	<u>193</u>	
Total No of objections		<u>321</u>	

One representation of support was also received.

It should be noted that this situation is not reflected in the proof provided by Westerman.

33. In conclusion, the Council would request that in view of the site’s contribution to the purposes of Green Belt, the proposed pre-inquiry change to delete this site is upheld.

### Inspector’s Conclusions

1. These objections relate mostly to the proposed allocation in Chapter 4. There I conclude that the housing allocation H2j and the recreation proposals RC8l, RC7d and RC4 should be deleted as put forward by the Council in PIC6 but replaced by safeguarded land under a new Policy E11 from the FDDP. Clearly in these circumstances it is unnecessary to reach conclusions on the details of the Development Brief F, which should be deleted.

### Recommendation

2. I recommend that the RDDP be modified by deleting Development Brief F.

## **Appendix 2G - Development Brief - Housing Allocation H2k on Land North of Bilborough College, Strelley.**

### **Objections**

<b>4.49</b>	<b>R212</b>	<b><i>New housing site - Bilborough College, Strelley - Deletion of reference to traffic island and addition of explanation for density selected for site</i></b>	
599	4500	R212	Mr G Foster Nottinghamshire County Council
<b>4.49</b>	<b>R213</b>	<b><i>New housing site - Bilborough College, Strelley - Amendment to clarify requirement for enhanced recreation facilities</i></b>	
1111	4993	R213	Mr M Slattery Bilborough College FPDSavills
<b>H2k</b>		<b><i>New housing site - Bilborough College, Strelley</i></b>	
1155	2439		Greasley Parish Council Andrew Thomas Planning
934	1732		Mr P Appleyard
928	1725		Mr K Appleyard
877	1584		Mr CB Argyle
874	1569		Ms S Beales
871	1562		Mr PJ Bentley
942	1753		Mrs KM Bosley
764	1412		Mrs JM Bradley
115	131		Mr A Bradley Strelley Village Parish Group
116	134		Mrs E Bradley Strelley Village Parish Group
769	1419		Dr A Brenan
875	1573		Dr DP Clifford
118	140		Mr MJ Cresswell Strelley Village Parish Group
933	1731		Dr RC Daniels
932	1730		Mrs AB Daniels
770	1421		Ms T De Graaf
759	1403		Mr TA England
930	1727		Mr B Haslam RSPB
931	1728		Mrs ST Haslam
935	1734		Mr S Ireland
939	1744		JD Knight
873	1566		Miss D Lewis
937	1740		Sir P Mansfield
881	1605		Dr P Milburn
768	1417		Mr I Mitchell
1135	2436		Mr I Moss House Builders` Federation
929	1726		Mr J Page
940	1749		TA Richards
880	1593		Mr MR Robbins
941	1751		Miss JA Russell
878	1589		Miss K Ryan
119	143		Mr PM Shouls
936	1737		Mrs E Shouls
114	130		Ms BA Smith
117	137		Mrs D Stevenson Strelley Village Parish Group
866	1555		Mr MN Stirland
894	1638		Mrs J Whitley
767	1414		Mr KP Whitley
868	1560		Mr BW Whittle Strelley Village Parish Group

882 1609

Mr T Winson

**H2k R161 New housing site - Bilborough College, Strelley - Amendment in table to number of dwellings application of minimum density**

1108	4967	R161	Mr M Bagshaw	Stamford Homes Limited Barton Willmore Planning Partnership
1006	4856	R161		Nuthall Parish Council Browne Jacobson Planning Unit
1155	5131	R161		Greasley Parish Council Andrew Thomas Planning
1154	5065	R161		W. Westerman Ltd DPDS Consulting Group
1135	5039	R161	Mr I Moss	House Builders` Federation
601	4569	R161	Mr S Rufus	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust

**H2k R214 New housing site - Bilborough College, Strelley - Amendment to clarify requirement for replacement recreation facilities**

1111	4995	R214	Mr M Slattery	Bilborough College FPDSavills
------	------	------	---------------	----------------------------------

**H2k R215 New housing site - Bilborough College, Strelley - Insertion of reference to minimum density**

601	4587	R215	Mr S Rufus	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust
1108	4981	R215	Mr M Bagshaw	Stamford Homes Limited Barton Willmore Planning Partnership

**A2G - Development Brief Bilborough College, Strelley**

1135	2381		Mr I Moss	House Builders` Federation
------	------	--	-----------	----------------------------

**A2G R522 - Bilborough College, Strelley - Amend number of dwellings required**

601	4652	R522	Mr S Rufus	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust
-----	------	------	------------	--------------------------------

**A2G - R525 - Bilborough College, Strelley - Amended density figure**

601	4653	R525	Mr S Rufus	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust
-----	------	------	------------	--------------------------------

**4.XX R221 Phasing of housing - Addition of explanation of context and basis for phasing housing sites**

1111	4994	R221	Mr M Slattery	Bilborough College FPDSavills
------	------	------	---------------	----------------------------------

**4.XX R224 Phasing of housing - Insertion of policy for the phasing of housing sites**

2166	6746	R224	Mrs CM Anderton	Bilborough College FPD Savills
2165	6745	R224	Ms GF Archer	Bilborough College FPD Savills
2167	6747	R224	Mrs JD Bartrop	Bilborough College FPD Savills
2168	6748	R224	GS Bhabra	Bilborough College FPD Savills
2169	6749	R224	M Blackett	Bilborough College FPD Savills
2154	6734	R224	Ms PC Brojaka	Bilborough Corporation FPD Savills
2171	6751	R224	Ms J Brown	Bilborough College FPD Savills
2170	6750	R224	AR Brown	Bilborough College FPD Savills
2155	6735	R224	Mr RA Chambers	Fernwood Comprehensive School
2173	6753	R224	L Chambers	Bilborough College FPD Savills
2172	6752	R224	J Chambers	Bilborough College

2174	6754	R224	Mr A Chatterton	FPD Savills Bilborough College
2175	6755	R224	DW Coleman	FPD Savills Bilborough College
2176	6756	R224	Mrs TJ Corbett	FPD Savills Bilborough College
2177	6757	R224	VJ Coulter	FPD Savills Bilborough College
2178	6758	R224	Mr RU Dickin	FPD Savills Bilborough College
2179	6759	R224	Mr RA Dossetter	FPD Savills Bilborough College
2180	6760	R224	Mr IT Gilbert	FPD Savills Bilborough College
2181	6761	R224	S Gray	FPD Savills Bilborough College
2182	6762	R224	Mrs SP Higham	FPD Savills Bilborough College
2183	6763	R224	Mrs CA Hitchcock	FPD Savills Bilborough College
2184	6764	R224	H Jones	FPD Savills Bilborough College
2185	6765	R224	Mrs N Junger	FPD Savills Bilborough College
2186	6766	R224	Mrs MA Kight	FPD Savills Bilborough College
2187	6767	R224	Miss A Lard	FPD Savills Bilborough College
2188	6768	R224	Mr S Lewis	FPD Savills Bilborough College
2189	6769	R224	Mr S Lowe	FPD Savills Bilborough College
2190	6770	R224	MissC Magner	FPD Savills Bilborough College
2157	6737	R224	Mrs M Moore	FPD Savills Bilborough College
2191	6771	R224	Mr P Morley	FPD Savills Bilborough College
2193	6772	R224	Ms DE Mountford	FPD Savills Bilborough College
2194	6773	R224	Mrs SP Phillips	FPD Savills Bilborough College
2158	6738	R224	A Pryor	FPD Savills Bilborough College
2195	6774	R224	Mrs CM Scothern	FPD Savills Bilborough College
2196	6775	R224	MissK Scott	FPD Savills Bilborough College
2159	6739	R224	Mrs S Scott	FPD Savills Bilborough College Corporation
2197	6776	R224	A Sharpe	FPD Savills Bilborough College
1111	4985	R224	Mr M Slattery	FPD Savills Bilborough College
2198	6777	R224	DJ Sully	FPD Savills Bilborough College
2199	6778	R224	Ms BJ Taylor	FPD Savills Bilborough College
2200	6779	R224	GH Thompson	FPD Savills Bilborough College

2201	6780	R224	CM Thomson	Bilborough College FPD Savills
2203	6782	R224	Mr M Ward	Bilborough College FPD Savills
2202	6781	R224	Ms C Ward	Bilborough College FPD Savills
2161	6741	R224	Mr JP Warsop	Bilborough College FPD Savills
2204	6783	R224	WJ Witts	Bilborough College FPD Savills
2205	6784	R224	Mr SG Worthington	Bilborough College FPD Savills

### **PIC9 Amend Phasing Policy**

1167	7021	PC9		Bryant Homes (East Midlands) Antony Aspbury Associates
595	7018	PC9		Beeston Lads Club Antony Aspbury Associates
572	7012	PC9		The Catesby Property Group Antony Aspbury Associates
1154	6995	PC9		W. Westerman Ltd DPDS Consulting Group
1437	6990	PC9	Mr R Cole	National Playing Fields Association
1199	7015	PC9		Mr R Reynolds
601	7065	PC9	Mr S Rufus	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust

### **Issues Raised**

1. **Due to the number of similar objections the following paraphrased summaries represent the issues raised. The Council has responded to each in turn.**
  - (a) Objection is made to the allocation of this site and the resulting loss of a greenfield site.
  - (b) There are already adequate sports facilities around the college. Development of the present playing fields will result in a lack of sports provision within the area.
  - (c) Object to the requirement for the replacement sports facility to be made available before the playing fields are developed for housing.
  - (d) The prescribed level of development is inappropriate. Some objectors consider that the density should be increased to maximise the level of development; other objectors that the density should be decreased as it is too excessive for this site.
  - (e) The development will result in a different type and character of housing to the surrounding area.
  - (f) The affordable housing requirement should not be inflexibly applied to each and every housing allocation.
  - (g) Development will result in an increased level of traffic on Bilborough Road. Justification is needed to show how this site can be satisfactorily accessed.
  - (h) Development will result in loss of wildlife and wildlife habitat.
  - (i) Development will result in loss of natural boundaries/hedges.
  - (j) Development would have an adverse impact on Strelley village and the Conservation Area.
  - (k) Development will result in increased noise, litter and pollution.
  - (l) A precedent is set for future releases of land within the area.

- (m) Development will put pressure on local facilities.
- (n) It is unreasonable to seek financial contribution for educational provision.
- (o) The wording of the Development Brief (A2(G)) is inconsistent with Policy RC3 with regard to education facilities.
- (p) The site allocation is not in accordance with PPG3's 'Sequential test'.
- (q) The land should be placed in Phase 1 of the Phasing policy to allow commencement of the redevelopment of Bilborough College.
- (r) Playing fields should not be lost to development unless there is an established surplus of all forms of open space, as defined by PPG17.

### **Pre-Inquiry Changes**

**The Council's Pre-Inquiry Changes proposed the removal of site H2(k) from Phase 2 of Policy HX: 'Phasing' to Phase 1 (PIC9) overcoming those objections in category (q) above, listed to the Phasing Policy. The following are the issues raised to this proposed amendment.**

- (s) PPG3 not draft PPG17 should be used to guide the decision to class the land as previously developed. Playing fields are excluded from the PPG3 definition.

### *Council's Response:*

#### **Location**

Broxtowe College is situated partly within the City boundary and partly within the Broxtowe boundary. The College buildings and part of the grounds sit in the City with the northern playing fields in Broxtowe. The boundary line runs through these fields at the south east corner. The A6002 (Bilborough Road) forms the green belt boundary.

- (a) **Allocation of site/Loss of Greenfield Site**
2. The Council has undertaken an urban capacity study which revealed that all new development could not be accommodated within the urban area. Therefore a site search process was undertaken to identify sites at the edge of the urban area that would be suitable for development. Site H2(k) consists of playing fields (3.5 hectares) the use of which has declined over recent years. This has resulted in Bilborough College putting the site forward for development, to assist in funding the expansion and redevelopment of the existing range of facilities offered by the college.
  3. The site is considered suitable for development as it lies on the edge of an existing urban area - Nottingham City, and the site is not within green belt. The site is not considered to be a green field site as the land identified for development lies within the curtilage of Bilborough College and is thus defined as previously developed land. (PPG3, Annex C and draft PPG17 para 24). The site is also accessible to frequent public transport as outlined in paragraph 14 below. It can be integrated into the existing urban environment as the site will be well landscaped, with existing groups of mature trees to be retained. Importantly, the site is also readily available for development as no constraints to development have been identified.

- (b) **Development will result in lack of sports provision**

4. The Council is satisfied that the loss of three playing fields at Bilborough College will be offset by the provision of a new multi-purpose sports facility in the College grounds (in the City Boundary). This sports hall will be in addition to one retained playing field which is currently well used. Sport England have agreed that the provision of such a new facility would be an acceptable alternative, as a replacement for the three lost pitches. (See Appendix 3).
5. Guidance contained in PPG17 maintains that playing fields should normally be protected except where: sports and recreation facilities can best be retained and enhanced through the redevelopment of a small part of the site alternative provision of equivalent community benefit is made available; or where there is an excess of sports pitch provision and public open space in the area, taking account of the recreation and amenity value of such provision (paragraph 42). In this case alternative provision is being provided to replace the loss of the playing fields of more than equivalent community benefit. The local community will be able to take advantage of this facility, since the existing facilities are currently not offered to players outside the college. In addition to one retained football pitch therefore a greater choice of recreational activity will be catered for.
6. With regard to an identification of an excess of sports pitch provision and public open space within the area, the Council's Technical Report 5 considers facilities which were available for public use, by area and by type, reflecting guidance in PPG17. The College playing fields fall within the Trowell and Strelley area. It is noted that this area is deficient in playable open space in relation to the NPFA standard. The Council did not include the northern Bilborough College playing fields within the assessment for the area due to their college use. Additional provision open to the wider community would assist in reducing this deficiency.

**(c) Replace the sports facility before development**

7. The promoters of the site have objected to the Council's requirement in policy H2(k) for the replacement sports facility to be made available before the playing fields are developed for housing. The wording at Revision R214 of the Revised Deposit Draft reads
8. 'Land in close proximity to the site should be identified for replacement recreation facilities, and provided and dedicated prior to housing construction'.
9. The purpose of this addition to the policy was to ensure early replacement of the lost playing fields. After further consideration it is acknowledged that the requirement as worded could constrain the College from commencing its rolling programme of redevelopment for the reasons set out in Objector 1111's proof of evidence.
10. The Council accept that amendment to the wording of Policy H21(k) as proposed by the objector, (which in turn is supported by Sport England) would still meet the objective of ensuring early provision of the new facilities without constraining development on the site. (see Objector's Proof, Appendix 19).

**Inquiry Change**

11. **The Council has recommended that paragraph 3 of Policy H2(k) should be amended to read,**
- IC84 12. **'Land is close proximity to the site should be identified for replacement recreational facilities which should be completed prior to occupation of the first dwelling'.**
13. This change will ensure a degree of flexibility is provided so that a new access road can be constructed thus allowing the redevelopment of the college and the associated replacement sports facility to commence. The new access forms part of the housing scheme making it essential that the housing development commences before replacement recreation facilities can be provided.



This would also ensure any disruption to the normal operation of the college can be kept to a minimum.

**(d) Density**

14. The density figure chosen reflects the proximity of the site to frequent public transport services. One bus every 2 to 3 minutes runs on Bramhall Road/Bracebridge Drive (within the city boundary) and pedestrian and cycle links from the site via Bartlow Road/Hanslope Crescent ensures good accessibility to these services. These services are however slightly beyond 400 metres (approximately 550 metres). Consequently the Council does not feel that it is reasonable to set a higher minimum density than 35 dwellings per hectare. The density accords with policy H6 of the Revised Deposit Draft and with guidance in PPG3.
15. Further explanation of density policy is contained in the Council's Housing Round Table Paper (CD83).

**(e) Different type and character of housing**

16. The design and layout of any proposed development will be assessed when an application is submitted. All new development must accord with Policy E1 - Good Design in the Built Environment - which will require any proposal to meet criteria relating to (a) amenity, (b) create safe and secure environments, (c) respect the setting of the proposed development and (d) provide landscaping and open space. Although the density of new housing will be higher than some of the adjacent development, this does not mean that designs need be out of character with the area. There is of course no requirement that the housing area should always be the same as an adjacent area. Policy H3: Housing Type and Size also emphasises that development should provide a variety of house types and sizes to cater for a range of housing requirements.
17. Policy H5: Affordable Housing, requires sites of over one hectare or over 25 dwellings to ensure at least 25% of dwellings built will be affordable. PPG3 encourages Local Authorities to ensure that new housing developments help secure a better social mix by avoiding the creation of large areas of housing of similar characteristics (Para 10).

**(f) Affordable Housing**

18. The requirement for affordable housing accords with Policy H5. Further explanation is contained in the Council's Housing Round Table Paper.

**(g) Increased level of traffic/access**

19. The Council recognises that all new development will lead to some increase in traffic. However careful choice of sites helps minimise the additional number of car journeys made. PPG3 states that sites adjacent to existing urban areas, and with good access to public transport, are likely to be more sustainable. As such the Council considers the development of this site will not lead to an unacceptable number of additional car journeys.
20. With regard to suitable access to the site a Transport Assessment has been submitted by the promoter of the site to the County Council (the Local Highway Authority) and the City Council (the local highway authority for Nottingham). The scope of the assessment included the proposed residential development and the proposed renewal and expansion of the College. The TA concluded that a new roundabout on Bilborough Road at the junction with the site could be achieved as a means of accessing the new residential development, and the college. This is deemed suitable by the Local Highway Authorities.
21. At Revised Deposit stage Revisions R212 and R529 removed the reference to the need to provide a new traffic island on Bilborough Road. This was intended to allow greater flexibility in the design of new traffic arrangements onto the site as a consequence of the deletion of the playing fields

allocation to the west of Bilborough College. At the time of drafting the Plan no junction had been designed to take account of the changed circumstances. However, the Council continues to support the provision of a roundabout in helping to reduce vehicle speeds on Bilborough Road and is satisfied that satisfactory access can thus be achieved.

**(h) Loss of wildlife and wildlife habitat**

22. There are no designated wildlife sites within the site and the schedule produced in 2001 by the Nottinghamshire Biological and Geological Records Centre (NBGRC) confirms that the site is not a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC). If it were to emerge that there were any protected species on the site, any application for development would be considered in relation to policy E18: Species Protection.

**(i) Loss of natural boundaries/hedges/trees**

23. Within the site there are a number of trees to be protected which provide opportunities to become the main focus of open space and landscaping within development. A line of Sorbus, Prunus and Ash running adjacent to Bilborough Road act as an important shield from the road reducing the visual impact of the development from the greenbelt.

**(j) Adverse impact on Strelley village**

24. The Council does not consider that development on this site would have an adverse impact on Strelley village which is a well defined, free standing village settlement separated from the site by Bilborough Road and open fields. Every effort will of course be made at the detailed planning stage to ensure that new development is compatible with the character and style of properties in the vicinity. Policy E1 of the plan is relevant in this regard. (see (e) above). Furthermore the new open space proposed to the Bilborough Road frontage offers further separation. Some of these objections related to the Deposit Draft version which included playing fields on the west side of Bilborough Road; these were removed in the Revised Deposit Draft version.

**(k) Increased noise, pollution and litter**

25. It is inevitable that there will be some noise and disturbance during the construction of new development. However, once the development is complete there is no reason to believe that additional housing will result in unacceptable noise or increased pollution problems. With regard to the housing, an earth mound is required between Bilborough Road and the edge of the development protecting it from traffic noise. (Development Brief A2(g): R526).

**(l) Development would set a precedent**

26. The Council needs to allocate land to meet the borough's housing requirement to 2011. The allocation and proposed development of site H2(k) does not set a precedent for the development of adjacent land, or any other land, due to the strong retained Green Belt boundary along the A6002 (Bilborough Road). The Council has allocated a number of sites across the Borough, to meet its requirements. In addition, Local Plan policies exist to protect land from development. Proposals for development on other land not specifically allocated or protected would need to be assessed on its own merits.

**(m) Pressure on facilities**

27. There are a range of local facilities close to the site including shops, a health centre and library. Those shops on Bracebridge Drive form part of a local shopping centre (Nottingham City Local Plan). The County Council has advised that the nearby primary and secondary schools are at or near capacity and the Council has therefore specifically included within the Development Brief and

Policy H2(k) provision for a financial contribution to be negotiated in order to improve education facilities.

**(n) Financial contributions to educational provision**

28. The Council considers the request for contributions towards school improvements (other than those to the college) appropriate and fair as a need for additional capacity likely to arise from development of this site has been identified. There is no spare capacity at the surrounding primary and secondary schools, (Melbury School and William Sharp Comprehensive) to accommodate pupils generated by the new residential development. (See Appendix 1, letter dated 27.4.99). This accords with Policy RC3, which states that where a proposed development would result in an identified need for additional capacity to be achieved in educational or community facilities planning permission will not be granted until provision has been made or contribution has been negotiated towards measures which assist in meeting such need.
29. The fact that proceeds of the development of this site is likely to be used for improvements to the College is not in itself sufficient to justify avoidance of the requirements arising from Policy RC3. All sites will be expected to fund appropriate requirements arising directly from site development eg access/drainage together with other needs such as open space, affordable housing, transport and education. Once needs are established and costs agreed the remaining residual value reflects the "profit" to the landowner. In this case the "profit" to the landowner may be used to fund improvement to Sixth Form education - but that is coincidental and irrelevant to the consideration of the needs arising from the proposal.

**(o) Wording of Development Brief and Policy RC3**

30. Although the brief and policy RC3 do not use identical wording, the Council considers that there is no inconsistency in their meanings.

**Inquiry Change**

**IC38 However, after further consideration the Council has recommended that the final paragraph of Policy H2 (k) should be amended to delete the second occurrence of the word "provision" and insert in its place the word "facilities".**

31. This change will ensure the wording of Policy H2 (k) is entirely consistent with the wording of the Development Brief. The Council considers that this wording would be consistent with RC3 - the more general policy covering developers' contributions to education and community facilities.

**(p) PPG3 Sequential Test**

32. The Council has undertaken an urban capacity study which revealed that all new development could not be accommodated within the urban area. A previously developed urban extension, such as is proposed, is a sustainable option for development within the sequential approach identified in PPG3, paragraph 30. Moreover the site relates well to the existing urban area, has good accessibility to a wide range of facilities and is accessible to frequent public transport services. As such the Council considers the allocation of site H2(k) is entirely accordance with PPG3.

**(r) Established surplus of playing fields should be identified**

See the Council's response in paragraph 6 of this proof.

**(q) & (s) Phase 1/Draft PPG17**

33. It is the Council's view that new, albeit 'draft' government guidance, should be of material

consideration when producing local plans. In this case draft PPG17, modernises and extends the scope of relatively outdated guidance of PPG17, published in 1991.

34. Objectors have questioned the Council's interpretation of advice given in draft PPG17 with regard to the definition of previously developed land and possible conflict with Annex C of PPG3. Since this guidance was issued the Council reassessed the allocation and under the definitions considered it to be previously developed land. The Council, supported by the Government Office for the East Midlands, see no conflict between the advice in the two documents (see Appendix 2, letter dated 11.4.01). The Council does acknowledge though that even if classed as previously developed there should not be an automatic presumption that it should be developed. However in this case due to the sustainable nature of the site's location and the wider benefits arising, development is considered appropriate. Consequently the site has been removed from Phase 2 of the Phasing policy to Phase 1 in the Pre-Inquiry Changes based on the assumption that previously developed sites should be developed before greenfield.

### Inspector's Conclusions

1. Again these objections are mostly to the principles of the allocation that I support in Chapter 4.
2. In Chapter 4, I conclude that the net density should be 40 dph in view of its sustainable location. I also conclude that the provisions of Policy RC3 towards any extra education facilities that may be required is inappropriate in this case and I see no case for contributions to retain or improve the good standard of PT services in the vicinity. I also see no case with this particular allocation for any contribution towards affordable housing. In consequence, the bullet points containing R524 and R530 should be deleted. The term "minor" should be deleted from the paragraph containing R531, as I conclude above, it is inconsistent with the first sentence of that paragraph. As I recommend in Chapter 4 the words "probably via a new traffic island" should be included in the Development Brief to reverse part of R529. I support IC84 and IC38 as appropriate in Chapter 4.

### Recommendation

3. I recommend that the RDDP be modified by deleting the bullet points containing R524 and R530 and by deleting the term "minor" from the paragraph containing R531. The minimum density should be increased to 40 dph. The words "probably via a new traffic island" should be included in the Development Brief to reverse part of R529. The brief should also be modified to reflect my recommendations in Chapter 4.

## **Appendix 2H - Development Brief**

<b>H2I</b>	<b>HOUSING</b>	<b>}</b>	<b>Development east of Main Road, west of New Farm Lane, and west of M1, Watnall/ Nuthall</b>
<b>EM2</b>	<b>BUSINESS PARK</b>	<b>}</b>	
<b>EM3f</b>	<b>EMPLOYMENT</b>	<b>}</b>	
<b>T10hw</b>	<b>PROPOSED ROAD</b>	<b>}</b>	

### **Objections**

For full list see Appendix 1.

### **Issues Raised by objectors**

#### Need and locational issues

- (a) A business park is not needed in Broxtowe.
- (b) Watnall/Nuthall should not be the preferred location for a business park.
- (c) It is not appropriate for substantial housing, employment and other development to be proposed together with the business park.
- (d) The loss of green belt land is not justified.

#### Transport issues

- (e) The transport and traffic implications of the development are not acceptable; the principal points are:
  1. traffic congestion will be increased, especially at Nuthall roundabout;
  2. uncertainty whether the NET will be extended to the site during the Plan period;
  3. current bus services are poor and proposed services are uncertain and/or inadequate.
- (f) An extra sentence should be added to the Development Brief relating to requirements of the Highways Agency.
- (g) The junction of the spine road with the B600 is in an inappropriate position.
- (h) The development is likely to result in further development in the vicinity of the spine road and link road; no landscaping is proposed adjacent to these roads.

#### Other possible adverse impacts

- (i) The loss of high quality agricultural land is not justified.
- (j) The impact on wildlife is unacceptable.
- (k) The impact on landscape is unacceptable.
- (l) The impact of the development on public footpaths is unacceptable, and increased use of the footpaths would result in problems for existing residents.
- (m) The development will place undue pressure on existing facilities.
- (n) The retail proposals would have a significant impact on Kimberley town centre.

- (o) The development would result in a significant loss of identity for local communities.
- (p) The impact on the Moorgreen Show ground is unacceptable.
- (q) The impacts on the Hempshill Hall Protected Open Area, Hempshill Hall itself and Nuthall cemetery are unacceptable.
- (r) New and existing residents would be significantly affected by noise and pollution.
- (s) There are significant problems on the site in respect of drainage and ground stability.
- (t) There are significant archaeological features on the site which may not be adequately safeguarded.
- (u) The development would have a significant impact on Nuthall Conservation Area.
- (v) The development would have a significant impact on safety and security for existing residents.

#### Policy details

- (w) The business park should not be restricted to solely Class B1 use.
- (x) Various minor changes should be made to Development Brief H and policy H2(l) relating to transportation issues.
- (y) The policy for the business park is excessively detailed.
- (z) There will be inadequate provision of affordable housing.
- (aa) The proposed housing density is inappropriate and the phrase “minimum net housing density” in policy H2(l) is unclear.
- (bb) The reference in policy H2(l) to “further education provision” is inappropriate.
- (cc) The proposed school may not have adequate access and security.
- (dd) There is no mechanism which will ensure that formal sports provision is actually made.
- (ee) Land at New Farm Lane could be satisfactorily developed independently of the remainder of the development.
- (ff) Detailed changes should be made to the requirements of policy H2(l).
- (gg) The reference to policy H2(k) is inappropriate.
- (hh) The deleted phrase on the first page of the Development Brief should be reinstated.
- (ii) The development should involve the provision of public access to land around Temple Lake and south of the A610.

#### Site boundaries

- (jj) The “white land” to the north of the housing on the first Deposit Draft should be reinstated.

#### Phasing

- (kk) The development is unlikely to be completed within the plan period.
- (ll) It is inappropriate for some of the housing development to be in phase one rather than phase two.
- (mm) The phasing of education provision is inappropriately stated in the plan.

## **The Council's Responses**

**It is considered necessary to provide background information to this allocation before responding to the issues raised.**

### EVOLUTION OF THE ALLOCATION FOR DEVELOPMENT EAST OF MAIN ROAD, WATNALL

#### **Introduction**

1. The allocation of land to the east of Main Road, and west of the M1, for business park, housing, and employment uses, with associated local facilities, is fundamental to the strategy underlying the local plan review. This allocation creates an area of mixed development served by its own infrastructure, incorporating a business park in the location required by the Nottinghamshire Structure Plan, ie in the vicinity of Junction 26 of the M1. It is well situated in relation to the Nottingham-Eastwood public transport corridor and close to the edge of Nottingham. In terms of the housing element, this allocation should be seen as a "strategic site" within the meaning ascribed by the DTLR document 'Planning to Deliver', ie that which is critical to the delivery of the strategy set out in the plan, and which may cross over between the phases of the plan. In policy Hx(R224), the Broxtowe Local Plan proposes 250 houses in Phase 1 of the Plan period and 500 houses in Phase 2. With regard to PPG3 (2000) this development is a planned major urban extension in accordance with para.67.
2. The Nottinghamshire Structure Plan Review (1996) recognised the importance of the Junction 26 area for business park development by declaring in policy 13/3 that the area "in the vicinity" of the Junction should be the location for 50 hectares of business park or other prestige employment development. This was split notionally into 25 hectares for Nottingham City and 25 hectares for Broxtowe, and included in the provision totals for these districts. Thus, of Broxtowe's 115 hectares allocated in policy 13/2, 25 hectares should be this form of development. The nature of the "notional" split into two parts was later confirmed as appropriate in practice when the City Council successfully proposed an allocation at Chilwell Dam Farm through their Local Plan review, adopted in 1997. The policy also confirms that an allocation for business park should be on the edge of the built-up area, and exclusively for B1 uses. This specification has been followed in reviewing the Broxtowe Local Plan and allocating the site at Watnall.

#### **The Junction 26 Study**

3. Taking Policy 13/3 as a starting point, the Structure Plan EIP Panel recommended that a joint land-use/transportation study should be undertaken for the strategically important location around Junction 26 of the M1. This study took place in 1995/6 and involved officers of all of the local authorities with an interest in the area: Nottingham City and County Councils, and Ashfield and Broxtowe districts.
4. It was decided that Stage One of the Study would comprise work for the Structure Plan Review process and Stage Two would assist district councils in the preparation of local plans. Part of the remit for Stage One was to examine whether there was a need for a Watnall-Kimberley by-pass as part of the strategic road network; it was concluded that there was no justification for such a route to be identified in the Structure Plan.
5. It is recorded in the Stage One report that Broxtowe Borough Council considered that the Study should re-examine Policy 13/3 requiring "50 hectares of business park in Nottingham/Broxtowe in the vicinity of Junction 26". This wording appeared to favour Nottingham City Council's Chilwell Dam Farm business park proposal, to which Broxtowe objected. At that time Chilwell Dam Farm was still due to be considered as part of the Deposit Draft City Local Plan, for which the inquiry was later in 1996. However, the City and County Councils wished Policy 13/3 to remain as worded in the Deposit Draft Structure Plan Review.

6. The outcome of the City Local Plan inquiry was that Chilwell Dam Farm was confirmed as a business park covering approximately 25 hectares, thus leaving the remaining 25 hectares needed to satisfy Policy 13/3 to be allocated within the Broxtowe Local Plan review.
7. The Study defined an area around Junction 26 that could be considered to accord with the definition "in the vicinity", and examined 10 general locations. It was agreed that 20 hectares was the minimum practical size for any business park, as stated in the Structure Plan, para. 13.48. It was accepted by all members of the Study that there were strategic economic advantages to physical proximity to the motorway junction which outweighed the need to safeguard higher-graded agricultural land. In other words, the Study members concluded that there were no suitable sites for a business park in the vicinity of Junction 26 which did not lie on the best and most versatile agricultural land.
8. Stage Two of the Study examined potential sites in more detail, in particular their relationship to the highway network. The Watnall site which is now proposed in the Broxtowe Local Plan was termed Site J in the Study. The view of the City and County Councils at that time was that Site J would complement the Chilwell Dam Farm proposal, but that it would effectively rely upon planned motorway improvements before it would be implemented.
9. In the Stage Two conclusions it was noted that if motorway improvement scheme proposals (of which details are given in para.10 below) did not go ahead, the development of Site J would require a new road across the motorway to Low Wood Road and a major capacity improvement at Nuthall roundabout.

### **Highway proposals**

10. In 1994, the Highways Agency had introduced proposed improvements relating to this stretch of the M1, and specifically to Junction 26. These improvements incorporated slip roads running directly between the motorway and the A610 (to the east of Nuthall roundabout). These slip roads would have enabled traffic from Nottingham travelling north on the M1 to avoid both the Nuthall roundabout and the Junction 26 roundabout. Similarly, traffic travelling on the M1 from the north, towards Nottingham, would have had the same faster, more direct route. CD87, the consultation leaflet for the scheme, illustrates this arrangement.
11. This Highways Agency improvement scheme was put 'on hold' (but not safeguarded) in July 1998, to await the outcome of a Multi-Modal Study for this stretch of the M1 corridor. This Study has not yet reached its final report, which is expected in February 2002.
12. The basis of this proposed highway improvement scheme became the preferred solution for servicing the Watnall development, but without slip roads to the motorway. Thus a road from the development area was proposed to pass under the motorway, with a connection to Low Wood Road and a further connection going under Low Wood Road to join with the A610 east of Nuthall roundabout. With these connections, the development gains access to the Nuthall roundabout and the motorway, with a more direct option for traffic to and from Nottingham which avoids the Nuthall roundabout.
13. It was then necessary to show that this arrangement would operate satisfactorily from the point of view of traffic generation to and from the site impacting on the existing road network, and a Transport Assessment was commissioned which was submitted for discussion with the County Council in 1999. Work has progressed continuously on the Transport Assessment since this date, in order to refine and test its assumptions and data. In September 2001 the County Council confirmed it was satisfied with the proposed package of highway works as contained in the final Transport Assessment documents (CD49, CD49a).

### **Mixed use development**



14. Having decided on the basic location for the business park, the Council's strategy was to create a mixed use development by allocating adjoining land for housing in sufficient quantity to support a primary school and a local centre, and to attract a viable and frequent public transport service. The principle of creating mixed use developments is advised in PPG1, paras. 8-12. The housing, employment, and local facility allocations will mutually benefit from their proximity, which will save a significant number of journeys. The cost of the initial infrastructure investment is thus spread over a large and varied development area, improving the scheme's viability and likely rate of progress.
15. The developers promoting the site have produced information confirming the viability of the development including its infrastructure, and to expect it to be completed within the plan period. This information is included as Appendix 2.

## RESPONSES TO ISSUES RAISED

### (a) A business park is not needed in Broxtowe

16. Paragraph 2 above explains that this allocation is required by the Nottinghamshire Structure Plan Review (1996), and was expected to be incorporated in the current Broxtowe Local Plan Review. The matter was discussed at the Employment Round Table earlier in this inquiry, and subsequently the County Council has confirmed by letter that, if the Broxtowe Local Plan Review had not included a business park in accordance with policy 13/3, it would have been out of conformity with the Structure Plan, because a major strategic element would have been omitted from the plan. The requirement for a business park in the region had previously been identified in the adopted regional planning guidance (RPG, 1994: CD28) which, in para. 4.18, stated that the region lacked a good supply of high quality business parks where companies seeking prestigious sites for relocation or expansion could be accommodated.

### (b) Watnall/Nuthall should not be the preferred location for a business park

17. The introductory paragraphs of this proof, covering the deliberations of the Junction 26 study and the options available "in the vicinity of Junction 26" describe how Watnall/Nuthall became the preferred location for the business park. Other potential business park sites have been suggested by objectors, but all have disadvantages in terms of Green Belt and/or sustainability when compared to the Watnall proposal. None of the other sites suggested appear to offer the investment in infrastructure needed in order to ensure that the impact of extra traffic, particularly on the Nuthall roundabout, will be acceptable. Separate proofs of evidence will cover each of the sites that have been promoted by objectors as alternative business park sites.
18. Discussions at the Employment Round Table Session of this inquiry established that the Watnall/Nuthall site is included within the category 'Strategic High Quality Employment Site' in the report of that name (CD33) undertaken for the East Midlands regional planning guidance. The guidance in the draft RPG, at policy 17 and its associated paragraphs 4.11-4.13, reinforces the Structure Plan's assumptions about business park requirements.

### (c) It is not appropriate for substantial housing, employment and other development to be proposed together with the business park

19. As explained in paragraph 14 above, the Council wished to create a mixed use development as it would have various benefits over a business park isolated from other uses. The amalgamation of the uses gives an opportunity to create viable infrastructure, including local facilities and public transport. It also reduces the number of individual locations of Green Belt release in the Plan area.

### (d) The loss of Green Belt is not justified

20. The Council accepted at an early stage in this plan review that the scale of new housing

development to be provided to meet Structure Plan requirements was such that encroachment into Green Belt and greenfield land was unavoidable, in several locations in the borough. This point was established at the Round Table sessions earlier in the inquiry.

21. As noted in earlier paragraphs, the impetus for the Watnall Green Belt release was the Nottinghamshire Structure Plan policy 13/3 which states that business park development should take place in the vicinity of Junction 26 of the M1. The Junction 26 Study concluded that sites to the north-west and south-east of the junction were the most suitable options. A site to the south of the junction, east of the motorway, known as Chilwell Dam Farm, became allocated in the adopted Nottingham Local Plan, satisfying approximately half of the Structure Plan's allocated 50 hectares for business park development in this area.
22. Broxtowe Borough Council subsequently expressed a preference for the remaining 25 hectares of business park to be to the east of Watnall. The Green Belt in this area does not contribute so crucially to the gap between Nuthall and Nottingham, compared to Green Belt to the east of the motorway. Any site to the south-west of the motorway junction would have encroached on more attractive landscape and higher ground; it would have been unduly prominent and poorly related to the existing built-up area.
23. As explained in para. 14 above, having earmarked this site for a business park, the Council wished to create a mixed use development by also allocating housing, a primary school and a local centre. This necessarily involved a more substantial Green Belt release. Environmental damage will be minimised by retaining large open areas between pockets of built development throughout the whole mixed allocation area. This will provide a suitable transitional environment between the existing built-up area and the wider countryside, and protect the areas of mature woodland and other ecological interest within the site.
24. A new Green Belt boundary has to be chosen with regard to physical features: to the north of the site this is a prominent field boundary which also marks the route of the long-distance Robin Hood Way. To the east of the development, the edge of the business park will form a suitably distinctive boundary. To the north of the business park, the spine road will form a strong defensible boundary. A substantial planting belt will reinforce this proposed Green Belt boundary along the eastern edge of development. The development area is thus strongly contained and a precedent has not been set for further encroachment in the future.
25. In conclusion, whereas the loss of Green Belt is always regrettable the Council believes that:
  - (i) it has adhered to the Structure Plan in allocating land for a business park in this location;
  - (ii) it has sought to create a more sustainable development than would be the case with isolated housing, business park and employment allocations, and this justifies a larger Green Belt release;
  - (iii) it has avoided release of Green Belt in the most sensitive parts of the Nuthall-Nottingham gap;
  - (iv) it has proposed an environment with much opportunity for recreation and public access, ensuring the continuation of key aspects of the present area designated as Green Belt; and
  - (v) it has effectively contained the development with defensible Green Belt boundaries to ensure that a precedent is not set for further encroachment into Green Belt in the future.

#### Transport issues

- (e) The transport and traffic implications of the development are not acceptable
26. A Transport Assessment has been carried out by the promoters of the development (Core Document CD49). After a long period of discussion, checking and testing the information, this

document has been accepted by the highway authority as demonstrating that a particular package of highway infrastructure improvements, and public transport, will be suitable for serving the proposed development site, and acceptable in terms of its impact on the highway network. The Borough Council trusts the County Council to critically assess the Transport Assessment, and endorses its conclusions on this matter. There are no objections in principle to this allocation on highway grounds from either the Highways Agency or the City Council. A detailed rebuttal has been prepared, which defends the content and methodology of the Transport Assessment in the face of technical points that have been raised in objectors' proofs (CD89, CD89a).

27. In response to objections about the likelihood of the NET being extended to the site, the Council has not relied upon this in proposing this site, and the developers have also confirmed that the site's viability does not depend on it. Because of the benefit to the borough in having further NET coverage, the Plan's designations and text allow for the route to be safeguarded, and ensure that route options are not prejudiced by any aspect of the Plan's proposals.
- (f) An extra sentence should be added to the Development Brief relating to the requirements of the Highways Agency
28. The Highways Agency has requested that a further sentence be added to the Development Brief for the site which confirms their interest in ensuring the Junction 26 roundabout is improved if necessary. The Transport Assessment deals with this issue and makes recommendations for the roundabout's improvement. The Council accepts that this extra sentence is a logical addition to this text.

### **Inquiry Change**

**IC69 The Council has recommended that the following change should be made: An additional sentence should be added to the end of the third paragraph under section (1) of Development Brief H to read as follows: "The transport assessment must fully consider the impact of the proposed development on the M1, in particular junction 26, and the need for mitigation works in accordance with the requirements of the Highways Agency".**

- (g) The junction of the spine road with the B600 is in an inappropriate position
29. The Transport Assessment confirms a suitable position for the junction of the spine road with the B600. The need for access into individual private drives in the vicinity has been taken into account in producing a detailed design for the junction, shown in the Transport Assessment.
- (h) The development is likely to result in further development in the vicinity of the spine road and link road; no landscaping is proposed adjacent to these roads
30. A new road may be constructed through Green Belt without prejudicing the status of that land. The Borough Council has a long record of defending the Green Belt status of the land between the M1 motorway and the edge of Nottingham, and this proposed road will not change the Council's position. For much of its length it will follow a natural hollow; it will be constructed in a slight cutting where necessary to cross under the motorway and Low Wood Road. The only sections significantly elevated above surrounding ground level will be where connections are made to Low Wood Road, and further east to Nottingham Road, in order to meet those roads at grade. Otherwise there will be little change to the general openness of the land through which the spine road will run east of the motorway. Pressure for further development will be strongly resisted. Any kind of built development in this area east of the motorway would be in danger of creating the coalescence of Nuthall and Nottingham, and would be poorly related to both of these built-up areas. The area will remain as Green Belt, continuing to perform the functions of Green Belt, and should not be prejudiced by the proposed roads.

31. No detailed design for the roads has been drawn up to show landscaping, but there will be an opportunity to introduce planting and mounding at appropriate places along the route. This will be particularly important in the area of Low Wood Road where existing vegetation will be most affected by the proposed road. The developers have indicated that extensive parcels of land can be made available which stretch substantially beyond what is needed for the road and its associated works; there is thus ample space for landscaping including re-contouring where appropriate to enhance the road at the detailed design stage. This would also confirm the road as a completed entity with no opportunities for further development in the future. This issue can best be dealt with by additional sentences in the Development Brief H in Appendix 2 of the Plan.

### **Inquiry Changes**

**The Council has recommended that the following change should be made:**

**Two additional sentences should be added to the end of the fourth paragraph of section (1) of Development Brief H to read as follows:**

IC70

**“There will be a need for substantial landscaping in association with the proposed roads running across the land east of the M1 motorway, to protect the character and appearance of this area and minimise visual impact. The landscaping proposals should also take account of the need to divert a watercourse where the road passes under Low Wood Road (A6002).**

(i) The loss of high quality agricultural land is not justified

32. Almost all the farm-land around Junction 26 of the M1 is classified as best and most versatile agricultural land, ie Grade 3a and above. The majority of the agricultural land within the Watnall development site is Grade 2, with the remainder being mainly Grade 3a.

33. It was an inevitable consequence of the Nottinghamshire Structure Plan Review policy 13/3 that some higher quality agricultural land would be lost in the subsequent local plan reviews which sought to implement this policy. The specific reference to ‘in the vicinity’ of Junction 26 for a new business park or prestige employment development, and its subsequent interpretation agreed by all participants of the Junction 26 Study, has dictated those circumstances. The Structure Plan also contains a policy of protecting best and most versatile agricultural land (policy 3/13). Clearly policy 13/3 represents the imposition of a policy central to the sub-area’s economic growth in a way which provides an exceptional case to allow an environmental policy to be overridden. The allocation and development of the Chilwell Dam Farm site for a business park already demonstrates this, as this was also Grade 2 and Grade 3a agricultural land.

34. The 1997 PPG7 (CD16/e), in paragraph 2.18, anticipates these circumstances and states that land in grades 1, 2 and 3a should only be developed exceptionally, if there is an overriding need for the development, and sufficient land in lower grades is unavailable (as is the case with trying to satisfy policy 13/3 of the Structure Plan). Changes to this paragraph resulting from parliamentary answers in March 2001 put less weight on the protection of best and most versatile agricultural land. This paragraph now concludes: “The decision whether to utilise best and most versatile land for development is for each local planning authority, having carefully weighed the options in the light of competent advice,” indicating a less restrictive attitude than apparent in the 1997 PPG7.

(j) The impact on wildlife is unacceptable

35. Within the development site, account has been taken of the location of important ecological sites in the pattern of allocations. Two former railway lines which have become re-vegetated, one of them partly with the status of a Site of Special Scientific Interest, are within the areas proposed

as open space, and their present character would be preserved and potentially enhanced. The SSSI is relatively self-contained and in a deep cutting in comparison to the level of the surrounding ground.

36. The considerable extent of open space allocated within the overall development site will give many opportunities for creating new ecological habitats. Full details of the present ecological value of the site are contained in Appendix 3.
- (k) The impact on landscape is unacceptable
37. Consideration of the impact on the landscape of the area is contained in Appendix 4, which appraises the landscape qualities in detail.
- (l) The impact of the development on public footpaths is unacceptable, and increased use of the footpaths would result in problems for existing residents
38. The site has a footpath running along the northern edge of the development, from which an open view will be retained to the north. This is part of the long-distance footpath called the Robin Hood Way. Its route would not be altered by development, and in the eastern section of the site it will run on the northern fringe of the planted landscaped buffer alongside the motorway.
39. The site also has a footpath running along the eastern edge of development, following the access track to New Farm. This will be enhanced by additional mounding and planting to the east, which forms part of the visual buffer and noise barrier to the motorway, and by some planting and landscaping to its west side around the edge of the business park. It will be retained on its present route.
40. The only other footpath across the site, which will also be retained on its present route, links the end of Common Lane with a bridge over the motorway leading towards Bulwell Wood. A substantial proportion of this path will run through open space or landscaping, with a smaller section running through the housing development.
41. In none of the above cases is it envisaged that problems will be caused for existing residents by increased use of any of the paths. The central footpath across the site, which is likely to be the most used as it serves the local centre and primary school, does not run next to any existing residential properties excepting Common Farm. Many additional paths will be created within the development area as part of the proposals, and this will spread the additional walkers and pedestrians on to more routes.
- (m) The development will place undue pressure on existing facilities
42. The aim of the Watnall development is to be as self-supporting as possible, in the interests of sustainability. Hence allocations for a local centre and primary school occupy central positions in the total development area, and are intended to become operational in its early phase. It is however accepted that there is likely to be a critical threshold of viability for local shops or the school which will have to be reached before these facilities can realistically be expected to be implemented. In the very early stages of development, therefore, it is possible that children will be travelling to existing primary schools nearby. The extra pressure to be placed on Kimberley Secondary School by the new housing is to be dealt with through financial contributions to education facilities.
43. If the shops are not operational in the development's early phase, new residents will for a period of time have to travel to other local shops on Main Road or to the district centre at Kimberley, approximately 3km away. This is not significantly different from the existing situation for most residents in the northern part of Watnall.

44. The nearest doctor's practices are at Regent Street and Nottingham Road, Kimberley; the health authority was consulted during the plan's preparation and has not identified the need for any additional doctors to serve this area. Should any need arise, it should be possible to accommodate it within the local centre.
- (n) The retail proposals would have a significant impact on Kimberley town centre
45. The local centre for the development is intended to cater for the needs of occupiers of new housing and employment areas, and should not draw any existing trade away from Kimberley town centre. The development brief specifies that the local centre should not exceed 2,500 sq.m. in gross shopping floorspace, with no one unit larger than 1,250 sq.m. This would preclude a store large enough to be an attraction to a wider area, such as a large superstore, or any other store which might effectively compete with Kimberley town centre. It is expected that the local centre would be likely to comprise up to five or six smaller shop units, with one larger unit as an anchor, typically a small supermarket. This is similar in form to that of a successful local centre at Ranson Road in Chilwell, serving new housing built on the former Ordnance Depot land. The units there are occupied by a newsagents/general store, two hot food take-away businesses, a video hire shop, a chemist, dry cleaners and a Lidl supermarket. There is no indication that this local centre has any detrimental effect on Beeston town centre, which is approximately 4km away. A similar size facility will be a positive asset to the Watnall development and assist in ensuring that it is sustainable. In summary, the proposed local centre should have no detrimental impact on Kimberley town centre; in fact it should experience extra trade from new residents wishing to shop for a wider range of goods than available in the local centre, for example at Sainsbury's supermarket.
- (o) The development would result in a significant loss of identity for local communities
46. The development is aiming to strengthen the identity of Watnall, allowing a focus on new local shopping and other facilities. The new development is however separated from the existing built-up part of Watnall and therefore unlikely to significantly affect the identity of existing local communities. Historically, Watnall consisted of more than one focus - Watnall Chaworth and the more southerly part of Watnall. Through development expansion in the later part of the twentieth century they have become joined to each other, and also joined to the edge of the general built-up area centred on Kimberley. This built-up area has several distinct sub-areas which have their own characteristics. The new development will likewise create a further sub-area with its own identity. It will contain more facilities than are already present in Watnall, but this situation will not replace or undermine the identity of nearby parts of the built-up area which are already recognised as being within Watnall.
- (p) The impact on the Moorgreen Showground is unacceptable
47. In the Deposit Draft the Moorgreen Showground was earmarked partly for housing development, and partly for "white land". However, the revision to density in the Revised Deposit Draft meant that the housing site could be reduced in size, and the Moorgreen Showground could remain on its present site, unaffected by the proposed development. Objections to loss of views from, or the setting of, the show when in progress for its three days annually are not properly taking into account the extra planting which will in time enhance the housing development's northern edge, reinforcing the proposed Green Belt boundary. This will soften the views of new housing from the showground site. The aspect to the north and east of the showground site will remain open. Any change of view which may occur need not affect the functioning or enjoyment of the show.
- (q) The impacts on the Hemphill Hall Protected Open Area, Hemphill Hall itself and Nuthall Cemetery are unacceptable
48. The Hemphill Hall Protected Open Area will remain substantially open despite the road route and will not include any built development. It is accepted that the existing character of the south-west part of the area will be altered but the opportunity will exist to create new landforms and

features to complement the remaining unaffected parts of the area. The most attractive part of the right of way across the southern part of the Protected Open Area is through the mature woodland directly to the south of Hempshill Hall, which is untouched by the proposals.

49. The setting of Hempshill Hall is formed by the open meadow immediately to the north of the driveway from Low Wood Road. The land which will be affected by the new route is further south and not so directly in view of the listed buildings, and therefore does not contribute to its setting. The route runs south of the buildings, at a lower level, and south of the mature woodland which obscures views of the buildings from this direction.
50. Nuthall cemetery is on the edge of the urban area and unfortunately is already badly affected by noise from the M1 motorway, which spoils the quiet contemplation that visitors to a cemetery might expect. The proposals would introduce mounding and planting in the immediate vicinity of the cemetery, in particular to its east side, which would help to reduce the effect of the motorway. The south-east corner of the business park development area will be close to the cemetery, but this will also have a landscaped edge and particular care will be taken to protect the setting of the cemetery.
- (r) New and existing residents would be significantly affected by noise and pollution
51. Residential and business park development should not give rise to unacceptable levels of noise or pollution. The general employment allocations, within which B2 and B8 uses are acceptable, are located away from existing or proposed residential areas. At the only point where proposed employment and housing come within 100 metres of each other, in the north-west part of the development as depicted in the Development Brief, there would be an open space buffer with opportunities for planting and mounding to aid separation of the uses.
52. As regards the potential effects of noise and pollution from the motorway on future residents and occupants of the business park, it should be noted that an Air Quality Review and Assessment has been undertaken for Broxtowe by NETCEN (October 2000), to consider whether Air Quality Management Areas should be designated within the borough. This has indicated that it is likely that the air quality objectives for nitrogen dioxide and particulates will be met at all locations assessed near the M1 and major roads in Broxtowe, where members of the public might be exposed for the relevant periods. The report specifically considered the Watnall/Nuthall proposals and notes that the distance between the housing development and the M1 carriageway is a minimum of 200 metres. The report states that “at this distance the emissions from traffic on the M1 would have insignificant impact on the exposure of residents in the proposed housing according to the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges”. Monitoring for nitrogen oxide continues to take place at 17 sites throughout the borough, including some points close to the M1 at Nuthall, which will allow a future review of the issue.
- (s) There are significant problems on the site in respect of drainage and ground stability
53. The Environment Agency has not raised any issues relating to drainage for this development site. It is accepted that the watercourse under Low Wood Road close to the proposed underpass would need to be diverted and treated carefully to preserve its function and appearance. An inquiry change referred to in para.32 above introduces a reference to this requirement.
54. The Council is not aware of any issues relating to ground stability on the development site or on the route of proposed roads. The area was not previously mined, or subject to landfill and therefore no problems of this nature are anticipated.
- (t) There are significant archaeological features on the site which may not be adequately safeguarded
55. A full detailed report has been carried out on the potential archaeological interest of the site, and is appended as Appendix 5. The Revised Deposit Draft includes a policy (EXX, R102) which deals with protecting and recording new archaeological finds.

(u) The development would have a significant impact on Nuthall Conservation Area

56. There are no elevated parts of Nuthall Conservation Area which offer views over the development site, and conversely there are no views from parts of the development site, or its proposed access roads, in which the Conservation Area is prominent. Open land is retained in Green Belt separating the development site from the northern edge of the Conservation Area along Back Lane. Therefore there is no detrimental effect caused to the Conservation Area.

(v) The development would have a significant impact on safety and security for existing residents

57. There is no reason for assuming that the proposed development would lead to any problems of safety or security for existing residents. When detailed layouts are drawn up for the development, care will be taken to assess these under Policy E1 of the Broxtowe Local Plan Review, which includes as criterion (d): "A safe and secure environment, where necessary including crime prevention features". Liaison on these matters takes place with the police authority's crime prevention officers, with reference to the principles contained in 'Planning Out Crime'.

Policy details

(w) The business park should not be restricted to solely Class B1 use

58. The developers consider that non-B1 uses should be allowed within the business park. The requirement for B1-only development is consistent with policy 2/6 of the Structure Plan and with paragraph 2.94 of the Structure Plan, which indicates that areas within Greater Nottingham and the M1 corridor are likely to be able to support entirely Class B1 business parks. Nevertheless the Council is prepared to introduce further text which indicates that Supplementary Planning Guidance would be prepared, covering the issue of the acceptable uses on the business park, and indicating that some uses which are ancillary to B1 uses will be acceptable.

**Inquiry Changes**

**The Council has recommended that the following change should be made:**

**At the end of the first paragraph of Policy EM2, the following should be added:**

**IC79 '..., or be ancillary to B1'".**

**Delete third sentence of para. 5.61 and replace with:**

**IC80 Supplementary Planning Guidance will be prepared for the business park which will set out development principles and expand on which uses can be considered as ancillary to B1 use.**

**IC81 In Development Brief H, under section 2, an extra sentence should be added to the first point as follows:**

**"Supplementary Planning Guidance will be prepared for the business park which will set out development principles and expand on which uses can be considered as ancillary to B1 use".**

**In the previous sentence, the word "solely" should be deleted, in recognition of**



**the possibility of acceptable ancillary uses to B1.**

- (x) Various minor changes should be made to Development Brief H and Policy H2(l) relating to transportation issues
- 59. Nottinghamshire County Council has proposed that three amendments should be made to Development Brief H and one to policy H2(l). The Council accepts that these would be appropriate minor changes to the Plan.

**Inquiry Changes**

**The Council has recommended that the following changes should be made:**

- IC71 (a) **On the second page of Development Brief H, the final sentence of the second paragraph should be replaced with the following: “A transport assessment will be required for the whole site, with a green commuter travel plan to guide appropriate parking provision for the employment land”.**
- IC72 (b) **On the fourth page of Development Brief H, an additional bullet point should be added to the second paragraph: “Walking and cycling facilities in the vicinity of the site”.**
- IC73 (c) **On the fifth page of Development Brief H and on the Proposals Map, an additional section of bus route should be shown adjacent to the link road and joining the new junction on the A610.**
- IC74 (d) **The final paragraph of policy H2(l) should be replaced with the following: “A master plan shall be negotiated specifying a scheme of phasing for this housing development in relation to the provision of the spine road, new bus lanes and services, and off-site highway improvements including to the A610 roundabout, together with an agreed schedule of financial contributions to these measures”.**
- (y) The policy for the business park is excessively detailed
- 60. The Government Office considers that policy EM2 appears over-detailed and suggests that the Council considers the level of detail necessary in the policy. Having re-considered this matter, the Council remains of the view that the policy is of an appropriate level of detail to provide clear guidance to potential developers and members of the public.
- (z) There will be inadequate provision of affordable housing
- 61. Some objectors consider that the housing development is likely to consist predominantly of large, expensive dwellings with insufficient “starter homes” and “affordable” housing. However, policy H3 will ensure that the development provides a variety of house types and sizes to cater for a range of housing requirements, whilst policy H5 will ensure that at least 25% of dwellings will be “affordable”. The need for “affordable” housing is referred to in the Development Brief for the site (third page, second paragraph). The issue of affordable housing was dealt with more generally at the Housing Round Table Session.

- (aa) The proposed housing density is inappropriate and the phrase “minimum net housing density” in policy H2(l) is unclear
62. Some objectors have argued that the proposed density is too low, others that it is too high. The issue of housing density was discussed at the Housing Round Table Session on 2-4 October. The Council’s views are given in paragraph 13.1 of its Round Table Paper and details of the discussion are given in paragraphs 1.56-1.69 of the Notes of the Round Table Sessions. With regard to the Watnall/Nuthall site, the proposed minimum net density has been increased from 30 dwellings per hectare (dph) in first Deposit Draft to 40 dph in the Revised Deposit Draft. The Council considers that the figure of 40 dph will accord with government guidance in PPG3 (particularly paragraphs 57-58), which encourages development at higher densities than has been achieved in the past, and will ensure efficient use of the land, whilst avoiding densities which would be so high as to be seriously out of character with the surrounding area. This density is also consistent with policy H6, which gives guidance on densities for developments throughout the borough.
63. Some objectors also object to the use of the phrase “minimum net housing density”. This phrase is used at various points in the Housing Chapter and it was therefore discussed at the Housing Round Table Session. The Council accepted that the phrase could be clarified (as mentioned in paragraph 1.61 of the Notes of the Round Table Sessions) and the Council will therefore address this matter as an Inquiry Change or at the Modifications stage of the review.
- (bb) The reference in Policy H2(l) to “further education provision” is inappropriate
64. Some objectors have objected to the use of the phrase “further education provision” in policy H2(l). The Council acknowledges that the phrase “secondary education provision” would be clearer and would be consistent with the phrase used in Development Brief H (third page, sixth paragraph).

### Inquiry Change

**IC75      The Council has recommended that, in the ninth paragraph of policy H2(l), the phrase “further education provision” should be replaced with “secondary education provision”.**

- (cc) The proposed school may not have adequate access and security
65. The County Council considers that the location of the school in the Revised Deposit Draft may result in security and access difficulties. However the Borough Council considers that detailed access and security arrangements, together with the precise positioning of the school, can be resolved at the detailed planning application stage.
- (dd) There is no mechanism which will ensure that formal sports provision is actually made
66. Sport England considers that there should be a mechanism to ensure that formal sports provision is actually made and that a requirement for a maintenance sum to be set aside should be included in policy H2(l) rather than only in the brief. However the Council is confident that, though the normal Section 106 procedures, it will be able to ensure that the required provision is made without the need for a formal “mechanism”. The wording of the policy was amended in the Revised Deposit Draft to strengthen the emphasis on sports provision. However, in order to provide further clarity, an additional reference to this matter is now proposed.

### Inquiry Change

IC76

**The Council has recommended that, in the final paragraph of policy H2(I), after the words “phasing details”, the words “, associated facilities” should be added.**

- (ee) Land at New Farm Lane could be satisfactorily developed independently of the remainder of the development
67. The Hanson Family Trust considers that their site could be accessed satisfactorily from New Farm Lane and could therefore be developed independently. However the Council has consulted the county highway authority on this issue and can confirm that there is, in the opinion of the two councils, no satisfactory means of accessing the site except from the proposed spine road. Both New Farm Lane and Spencer Drive are of inadequate width to provide suitable access, and problems may also be caused at the junctions of these roads with Watnall Road. The objectors have not demonstrated that there is any viable means of access to the site. In addition, if the remainder of the proposed Watnall/Nuthall development did not proceed, this site would be unlikely to be suitable for allocation in its own right as it would represent piecemeal encroachment of the green belt without proximity to good public transport or local facilities.
- (ff) Detailed changes should be made to the requirements of policy H2(I), relating to the 200m set back along the eastern boundary and requirements for recreation including a brick-built pavilion
68. The developers have raised an objection covering the justification for the 200m set back along the eastern site boundary, inconsistency in its width and specific requirements for recreation including the need for a brick-built pavilion. The developers have also proposed that the spine road should revert to the route shown in the first Deposit Draft or, failing this, it should take an alternative route cutting through the site, as shown on the plan accompanying objection 748/4712.
69. The objectors do not specify what changes they are seeking with regard to the set back or the recreation provision. However the set back is required in order to provide substantial planting and to protect residents from noise and pollution from the motorway. The Government Office has recently decided that Air Quality Management Areas do not need to be designated in Broxtowe, based on a report produced for the Council in October 2000 (entitled “Air Quality Review and Assessment - Stage 3 for Broxtowe”). This report was based in part on the explicit assumption that there would be no housing development at Watnall within 200m of the centre of the M1 (paragraph 3.1). Any housing development within this distance would raise concerns about potential impacts from nitrogen dioxide and particulate matter.
70. The inconsistency in the width of the set back is because part of it would be adjacent to housing, where people would be exposed to noise and pollution for longer periods, whereas part would be adjacent to the proposed business park, where exposure would be for shorter periods and where sensitivity to noise would be less. It is also easier for employment buildings, rather than dwellings, to be designed so as to counteract the effects of noise.
71. The Council considers that its requirements for recreation facilities, including a brick pavilion, are entirely reasonable for a development of this scale and nature. Given the extent of the playing fields and the lack of existing facilities, changing rooms will be required. The reference to ‘brick built’ is merely to demonstrate the importance of providing a substantial and high quality structure. Accepting that this may not actually need to be brick built, then a more appropriate description should be applied to this part of the policy and the development brief.

### **Inquiry Changes**

**The Council has recommended that the following changes should be made:**

IC77

- (a) **in the third paragraph of Policy H2(I), the reference to ‘brick built’ should be replaced with ‘high quality’;**

**IC78 (b) in the first paragraph of section (4) of Development Brief H, the reference to ‘brick built’ should be replaced with ‘high quality’.**

(gg) The reference to policy H2(k) is inappropriate

72. The developers have pointed out a typing error (H2k for H2l) in section 3 of the Development Brief, which the Council accepts and will correct.

(hh) The deleted phrase on the first page of the Development Brief should be reinstated

73. The CPRE considers that the sentence on the first page of the brief, which was deleted by revision R534, should be reinstated. However, the Council considers that the phrase was unhelpful and potentially misleading as it inappropriately suggested that there may be some significant doubt as to the areas which are allocated for development.

(ii) The development should involve the provision of public access to land around Temple Lake and south of the A610

74. One objector has suggested that it should be a requirement of the Plan that, as a result of the development, public access should be provided to land around Temple Lake and nearby land on the south side of the A610. However the proposed development has no connection with Temple Lake or nearby land and it would therefore be unreasonable for the Council to attempt to seek to obtain public access to this land in connection with the proposed development.

**Site boundaries**

(jj) The “white land” to the north of the housing on the first Deposit Draft should be reinstated

75. The developers propose that the area of white land shown in the first Deposit Draft should be reintroduced. The Council considers that the principle of white land has been fully aired at the Green Belt Round Table session, and would not wish to add further to its arguments against including any safeguarded land in the Plan.

**Phasing**

(kk) The development is unlikely to be completed within the plan period

76. This issue was referred to during the Housing and Employment Round Table Sessions. Both the Council and the potential developers are confident that the development is likely to be completed within the plan period. Appendix 2 consists of information about the likely timescale of development, provided by the developers.

(ll) It is inappropriate for some of the housing development to be included in phase one rather than phase two

77. This issue was discussed at the Housing Round Table Session. The Council considers that it is appropriate for a limited amount of housing on this site to be included in phase one in order:

- To help to ensure that the housing development will be completed within the Plan period;
- To ensure a reasonably even overall level of housing completions in the borough throughout the Plan period;
- To provide revenue to help to implement the associated business park and transport infrastructure.

**(mm) The phasing of education provision is inappropriately referred to in the Plan**

This paragraph covers two objections, one suggesting that education provision should take place earlier in the development programme, the other later.

78. One objector considers that the reference in the fifth paragraph on the third page of Development Brief H to the advice of the Education Authority is inappropriate and that the requirement for provision “at an early phase in the development” is insufficient. However, the Council considers that the advice of the Education Authority will be fundamental as only the Education Authority can determine the precise timing of the education provision. Details relating to this issue will be resolved when planning applications are submitted. Conversely, the developers have objected to the requirement for education provision at an early phase in the development and, although proposed changes are not specified, the implication appears to be that provision should be made at a later stage. In light of the advice of the Education Authority, the Council considers that this would be inappropriate, as discussions with the Authority have indicated that provision should be at an early phase.

**Conclusion**

79. It is important to appreciate that any environmental or other shortcomings of this mixed development allocation must be weighed against the economic benefits of this major injection of business park and other employment in this location. The Nottinghamshire Structure Plan in Policy 13/3 identifies the need for major development in this area, implicitly acknowledging the sensitivity on the issues of loss of Green Belt and higher grade agricultural land. These issues are common to any site which might have been chosen “in the vicinity of Junction 26”. The selected site at Watnall/Nuthall gives the opportunity to create a more sustainable development through the juxtaposition of housing and employment land alongside the business park, together with appropriate local facilities including a primary school and shopping to produce a more self-contained community.
80. Other potential business park sites in the vicinity of Junction 26 would have encroached upon the valuable Green Belt gap to the east of the motorway, between Nuthall and Nottingham. No other site would have satisfactorily offered the advantage of creating a mixed use development with its own facilities, without effectively abandoning this Green Belt gap altogether. The area to the south-west of Junction 26 is higher land and more attractive in landscape terms, and is wholly covered by a Mature Landscape Area designation.
81. Finally therefore the Council is satisfied that:
- (i) a business park is needed “in the vicinity of Junction 26” and that the long-standing acceptance of what is meant by this term is still the correct definition;
  - (ii) the Watnall site as allocated under policies H2I, EM2 and EM3f, plus its associated open space and local facilities, offers the best opportunity for a business park augmented with other uses to form a sustainable development;
  - (iii) the necessary infrastructure works will not prejudice the functions of the Green Belt and Protected Open Area that proposed routes traverse;
  - (iv) the proposed transport measures are appropriate to serve the development and to minimise impact on the existing highway network, as advised by the Highway Authority;
  - (v) the overall development is deliverable within the plan period and would be attractive and successful in economic terms;
  - (vi) any adverse impacts on the existing local environment would be compensated for by new opportunities created by the development, and should also be balanced against the

major economic advantages which the development will bring to Nottingham and its region.

### Inspector's Conclusions

1. All of the Council's proposed ICs appear sensible in themselves and meet legitimate objections from the County Council, the prospective developers and others and would otherwise be worthy of support. They do not address the County Council's concerns over the location of the proposed school in the RDDP or the need for the bus route in the Development Brief to join the A610. The latter is a minor point of omission; the former more a matter of degree. The new location almost adjoins the old; its still lies adjacent to the shopping centre and is closer to the existing settlement. It is more a matter for a detailed master plan. However, I recommend in Chapters 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 the deletion of Policies H2I, EM2, EM3f (part ), T10h, T4, T6, S5, RC2e, RC8k, RC7e, RC8k comprising the proposals for Watnall/Nuthall. In consequence, Development Brief h should also be deleted.

### Recommendation

2. I recommend that the RDDP be modified by deleting Development Brief h.

### **MISCELLANEOUS**

1. The bullet point concerning a primary school in the 'Other Facilities' section on the third page of Appendix 2H (Development Brief H) provides a reference to RC1.

### Inquiry Change

- IC111
2. **The Council has recommended that "RC1" should be replaced with "RC2" on the third page of Appendix 2H.**
  3. The change ensures factual accuracy.

### Inspector's Conclusions

1. This proposed IC now has no purpose in view of my recommendations above.

## **APPENDIX 4 - GUIDANCE ON PARKING**

### Objections

#### **A4 Appendix 4 - Guidance on Parking**

1166	2530	Mrs B Neville	Nottingham City Council. Development Department
1166	3549	Mrs B Neville	Nottingham City Council. Development Department
1213	3551	Ms F Forgham	Government Office for the East Midlands
1213	3579	Ms F Forgham	Government Office for the East Midlands

**Appendix 4 - R544 - Deletion of paragraph and addition of explanation of interim parking standards**

1213	5175	R544	Ms F Forgham	Government Office for the East Midlands
599	4503	R544	Mr G Foster	Nottinghamshire County Council
1166	5142	R544	Mrs B Neville	Nottingham City Council. Development Department

**Appendix 4 - R545-R574 - Delete - application of interim standards**

599	4504-15, 4467-74	R545	Mr G Foster	Nottinghamshire County Council
-----	------------------	------	-------------	--------------------------------

**Summary of Objection Issues**

**A4 Appendix 4 - Guidance on Parking**

1166/2530: Nottingham City Council

1. Scope and Origin Section, Car Parking - It is considered that the statement on “standards” be re-examined. In the light of the emerging Supplementary Planning Guidance it should be firmed up by the substitution of the words “likely to” with “will” in the final sentence. “Therefore this Appendix will be updated as a pre-inquiry modification in 2000 ...”.

*Council’s Response:*

2. This paragraph has been deleted in the Revised Deposit Draft by revision R544 and has been replaced with a new statement relating to the County Council’s interim standards.

1166/3549: Nottingham City Council

3. Parking standards SPG is being jointly prepared by the City and County Councils. Objection is made to the terminology of the introduction. Objection is made to the town centres section of the introduction. The interim Regional Transport Strategy does include more restrictive maximum parking levels for employment uses in town centres. Suggest a sentence to acknowledge this is likely to be included in the draft SPG. It should be made clear that the Local Plan will reflect the maximum parking levels for non-employment uses expressed in revised PPG13.

*Council’s Response:*

4. The Introduction has been changed significantly in the Revised Deposit Draft. It is not considered that any further expansion is required. The City and County Councils are still intending to prepare Supplementary Planning Guidance on Parking Standards, but no progress has been made on this since the production of the Revised Deposit Draft. In the meantime it is appropriate that the Borough Council continues to rely on the County’s interim standards (1998), taking account of advice in RPG8, PPG3 and PPG13.

1213/3551: GOEM

5. In the section headed ‘Flexibility’, the reference to ‘a case for a relaxation of standards’ does not seem to make sense, and should read ‘a case for a tightening of standards’.

1213/3579: GOEM

6. The Plan does not reflect Nottinghamshire County Council’s current parking standards, which are in line with national policy in identifying maximum levels of provision. The standards in Appendix 4 are based on those put forward by the County Council in 1993 and do not take account of subsequent shifts in parking policy at national, regional and county level. In current terms therefore they are over-generous in their provision for car parking but hardly adequate in their provision for

secure cycle provision.

1213/5175: GOEM

7. The first sentence suggests that the parking standards adopted might not be applied rigidly in every case, but the example in the second sentence does not support this. Suggest remove second sentence of section.

*Council's Joint Response:*

8. The Revised Deposit Draft has been amended to include a new statement relating to the County Council's interim standards (Revision R544). The standards themselves have also been amended to accord with the County Council's interim standards, dating from 1998, and expressed as maxima rather than minima.
9. Following further consideration the Council invites the Inspector to recommend an inquiry change on this matter, as set out below. The revised text is in accordance with government guidance (PPG13) and ensures consistency throughout the Local Plan.

**Inquiry Change**

- IC61 10. **The Council has recommended that the wording of the second sentence of the section entitled 'Flexibility' is amended to read, "For example, in major urban areas if a site is well served by public transport there may be a case for a tightening of standards".**

1166/5142: Nottingham City Council

11. The proposed revisions fail to reflect the current situation with respect to maximum parking levels. In particular, the position in relation to maximum parking levels for employment uses has moved on. Regional maximum levels for these uses are now being proposed in draft East Midlands Planning Guidance and endorsed by The Public Examination Panel. Appendix 4 should reflect this. The revisions to Appendix 4 have also failed to take on board the maximum parking level for residential uses set out in PPG3. The paragraph on the 'Application of Standards' is ambiguous. Further explanation is needed. It should be made clear that the maximum levels set out in draft PPG13 apply to large developments above the size thresholds set out in draft PPG13, and that the other maximum levels expressed in Appendix 4 from 'Class A1 - General Retailing' onwards are local maximum levels for development below these size thresholds.

599/4504-15, 4467-74: Nottinghamshire County Council

12. The way in which the guidance on parking has combined the County Council's Interim Parking Standards (1998) with PPG13 (draft) and PPG3 is considered to be inappropriate and confusing. There are a number of occasions where the guidance conflicts with PPG3 and draft PPG13.

*Council's Joint Response:*

13. It is recognised that the text of Appendix 4 is in need of some modification, and these points are set out separately in the following paragraphs.
14. The last paragraph of the section entitled 'Scope and Origin' in Appendix 4: Guidance on Parking reads: "In the absence of a comprehensive review of parking levels, the Borough Council accepts the interim standards (1998) to be the most appropriate to use as a basis for assessment along with Annex B of the draft revised PPG13. If the final revised PPG13 is issued with different guidance before the inquiry into this Plan, there may be a further modification to this Appendix".



**Inquiry Change**

- IC60
15. **The Council has recommended that the following text is deleted from the last paragraph of the section entitled 'Scope and origin': "along with Annex B of the draft revised PPG13. If the final revised PPG13 is issued with different guidance before the inquiry into this plan, there may be a further modification to this Appendix"**.
  16. The text proposed for deletion has been superseded by the publication of PPG13.
  17. The paragraph entitled 'Town Centres' in Appendix 4: Guidance on Parking reads: "There are no specific parking standards for town centres. The County Guide includes an Appendix, which put forward suggested reduced town centre standards directly derived from those operated by the City Council, as listed in the February 1993 draft. These are not considered to be applicable to the borough's town centres, but there may be opportunities for developers in town centres to contribute towards integrated transport measures in lieu of providing spaces (see Policy T1)".

**Inquiry Change**

- IC62
18. **The Council has recommended that the phrase "in lieu of providing spaces" is deleted from the end of the final sentence of the section entitled 'Town Centres'**.
  19. The revised text is in accordance with government guidance (PPG13) and ensures consistency throughout the Local Plan.
  20. The paragraph entitled 'Changes of Use and restrictions on permitted development' in Chapter 4: Guidance on Parking reads: "Wherever possible, changes of use should meet the normal standards. Some relaxation may be acceptable where the proposed use is demonstrably less traffic intensive than the earlier approved use, or where the development relates to the re-use of buildings recognised as being of architectural or historic interest. In some circumstances, conditions may need to be imposed affecting permitted development rights. Restrictions would be considered where an otherwise permitted change of use could cause a material deterioration in local traffic conditions".

**Inquiry Change**

- IC63
21. **The Council has recommended that the sentence "Wherever possible, changes of use should meet the normal standards" is deleted from the section entitled 'Changes of use and restrictions on permitted development'**.
  22. The revised text is in accordance with government guidance (PPG13) and ensures consistency throughout the Local Plan.
  23. The paragraph entitled 'Motorcycles' in Appendix 4: Guidance on Parking reads: "Significant savings in land might be possible if separate provision is made for motorcycles as, clearly, requiring motorcycles to wait in car spaces is not an efficient use of land. Provision for motorcycle parking will be at the Council's discretion but should not be at the expense of more than 5% of the required car parking provision".

**Inquiry Change**

- IC64**
24. **The Council has recommended that the phrase “but should not be at the expense of more than 5% of the required car parking provision” is deleted from the end of the final sentence of the section entitled ‘Motorcycles’.**
  25. The revised text is in accordance with government guidance (PPG13) and ensures consistency throughout the Local Plan.
  26. Class A1 - General Retailing, of Appendix 4: Guidance on parking; Garden Centres reads: “Staff 1 space per 100m<sup>2</sup>”.
  27. The final four lines of Class A2 - Financial and Professional Services reads: “County Guide Standard:1 space per 25m<sup>2</sup>. This can be used as a general indicator of likely demand, but depends on location and appropriateness of providing specific parking provision, hence the Borough Council prefers individual assessment”.
  28. Class C1 - Hotels and Hostels (including Guest Houses) reads “Other Staff 1 space per 3 staff and Conference Rooms, 1 space per 3 seats or 1 space per 6m<sup>2</sup>, whichever is the greater if open to non-residents (\*REDUCE)”
  29. Class C2(iii) - Residential Institutions: Residential school, college or training centre reads: “Other Staff 1 space per 3 staff”.
  30. Class C3(i) - Dwellings, General needs housing, reads: “1-3 bedroomed dwellings 2 spaces”.
  31. Class C3(ii) - Dwellings, Flats reads: “Flats would normally be expected to make parking provision as above, but a relaxation may be considered acceptable where flats are provided over shops in recognised shopping areas”.
  32. Class C3(vi) - Dwellings, Sheltered housing reads: “Other Staff 1 space per 1 staff”.
  33. Class C3(viii) - Dwellings, Student Halls of Residence reads: “County Guide standard (range): 1 space per 2-4 Students”.
  34. Class D1(iii)(c) - Non-residential Institutions, Places of Education: Nurseries, Playgroups, Crèches reads: “Parents 1 space per 6 children for picking up/setting down”. The first sentence following this reads: “The requirements for parents’ parking may be relaxed depending on the nature of the adjoining roads”.

### **Inquiry Change**

35. **The Inspector is invited to recommend that the following amendments are made to the guidance on parking for various classes of development.**

**Class A1 - Insert “(\*DELETE)” after Garden Centre Staff 1 space per 100<sup>2</sup>.**

**Class A2 - Delete final four lines ie “County Guide ... hence, Borough prefers individual assessment”.**

**Class C1 - Insert “(\*REDUCE)” after Other Staff 1 space per 3 staff and Delete “(\*REDUCE)” after Conference Rooms.**

**Class C2(iii) - Insert “(\*REDUCE) after Other Staff 1 space per 3 staff.**

**IC65**

**Class C3(i) - Amend '1-3 bedroomed dwellings' to read 'dwellings' 2 spaces.**

**Class C3(ii) - Amend wording to read "Flats would normally be expected to make parking provision as above, but flexibility may be justified where flats are provided over shops in recognised shopping areas".**

**Class C3(vi) - Insert "(\*REDUCE)" after Other Staff - 1 space per 1 unit.**

**Class C3(viii) - Delete "County Guide standard (range): 1 space per 2-4 students".**

**Class D1(iii)(c) - Insert "(\*REDUCE)" after Parents 1 space per 6 children for picking up/setting down, and amend the first sentence to read; "Depending on the nature of adjoining roads, flexibility may be justified when assessing the parking provision for parents".**

36. The revised text is in accordance with government guidance (PPG13) and ensures consistency throughout the Local Plan.

#### **Further Proposed Inquiry Change:**

37. The section entitled "Development not Included in any specific use class ("sui generis")" of Appendix 4 lists at (iii) service/repairs. Recent case law indicates that this use should be categorised as B2 in the Use Classes Order. In order to correct this, an inquiry change is proposed below.

#### **Inquiry Change**

IC116

38. **The Council has recommended that 'service/repairs' are deleted from the 'sui generis' section.**

39. The change is proposed in order to ensure consistency with recent case law.

#### **Inspector's Conclusions**

1. R544 should have met the City Council's earlier objection. In the indeterminate circumstances at the time, there was little wrong with the Introduction in the RDDP. However, the situation is changing and a new Introduction is now called for reflecting the modifications that I recommend below. This could incorporate IC60.
2. The Council put forward a number of Inquiry Changes to the Parking Standards. They also put forward Inquiry Changes to some of the explanatory text. These were largely to meet objections from the County Council.
3. Although, IC61 addressed GOEM's understandable objection to the second sentence of the paragraph on Flexibility many of the other proposed IC s and other references in the original text still betray signs of the previous approach of seeking or requiring minimum rather than maximum standards, as the County Council pointed out.

4. PPG13 para 52 advises that development plans should set maximum levels of parking for broad classes of development. There should be no minimum standards other than parking for disabled people. RPG8 para 6.21 also advises that the previous practice of seeking minimum levels of parking merely re-enforces reliance upon the private car. They both advise that there is a need to apply maximum rather than minimum standards and that developers should not be required to provide more spaces than they themselves wish. Levels in excess of the maximum will only be required in exceptional circumstances, which are identified in RPG8 Policy 61. These apply on a localised and not on a LA wide basis. For retail and leisure developments in town centres or edge of centre locations they advise that LPAs should consider allowing (but not requiring) additional parking where they are satisfied that it will genuinely serve the centre as a whole.
5. The tone of Appendix 4 of the RDDP in the paragraph on Town Centres is still, even after IC62, one of seeking a minimum level of parking rather than a maximum level, post PPG13. A similar tone arises in the section on Changes of Use, even after IC63. The rest of the section still points to attainment of a prescribed level of parking rather than regarding the standards as a maximum and that a developer may, quite legitimately, choose to make a significantly lower provision. The same could be said for IC65 in respect of C3 (ii) and D1 (iii)(c) uses. The footnote to General/Food Retail and the comment on Retail Parks/Stores larger than 4500 sq m do not reflect a maximum parking guideline approach; nor do the comments on Restaurants/Cafes, Transport Cafes, Class B1, B2, B8. The comments on Mixed Use BPs are also inappropriate, especially in view of the declared intention to seek reduced car usage and thus car parking through the adoption of green commuter plans. The comments relating to a relaxation on Flats, Multi Occupancy, Student Halls of Residence and Nurseries are inappropriate, as are references to parking provision being required, rather than to a maximum standard.
6. The standards themselves throw up problems. It is regrettable that agreed revised standards for the County and City were not available before the Inquiry closed despite the publication of the revised versions of PPG13 in March 2001 and of RPG8 in January 2002. Given the advice contained in these revisions, the situation presented by the Council was unsatisfactory. I note that the City Council's Draft Revised Local Plan (CD57) published in September 2001 included what appear to be more up to date guidelines that largely anticipated the revisions in RPG8.
7. There are a number of disparities between the maximum standards contained in the national and regional policy guidance and those in the RDDP even with the ICs put forward by the Council. The latter are more generous and allow for more car parking at a range of proposed uses. The RDDP uses are also more numerous and more detailed than the broad uses that PPG13 advocates.
8. I recognise that the City Council's Draft Revised Local Plan (CD57) also departs from RPG8 in some categories. However, in each of these cases the City Council appears to adopt a lower level of parking provision and thus seems to accord with the principles of PPG13 para 53.

9. The adoption of standards with a higher level of parking provision is less acceptable without special local justification, which is absent. I recognise that Appendix 4 is based upon former County Standards, but it is difficult to justify continuing with them following publication of PPG13 and RPG8 and more particularly the comprehensive review of all parking standards being undertaken by the County Council. RPG8 stresses in para 6.21 that a consistent approach to parking policy across the region is imperative if LAs are not to compete with each other for investment on the grounds of more generous provision. Hopefully then, agreed revised standards will shortly be adopted by the County, City, Borough and District Councils before publication of the Council's proposed modifications to this RDDP. In this case, the Council should substitute these for those in Appendix 4 in their proposed modifications. This would make IC64, IC65 and IC116 redundant.
10. In the unlikely event that the Councils concerned are unable to agree new parking standards in the many months that have elapsed, the Council has basically two choices. My preference is that they should withdraw Appendix 4 except for a brief note explaining that revised standards to be agreed on an inter authority basis would be adopted shortly as Supplementary Planning Guidance. Alternatively, the Council could in the interim delete Appendix 4 but revise all the standards presently contained in Appendix 4 as set out in their IC s. This should be subject to ensuring that these seek no more generous provision than those in RPG8. In the case of those uses not covered by RPG8, the Council could, if they wished to retain them, applying logical comparisons with those uses that are. For example, the standards for banks are similar to B1 offices. They should adopt this revised version as quite separate SPG pending the inter authority revisions. I see no advantage in retaining it as an Appendix to the adopted Plan. There would be little point in an out of date or a hybrid Appendix 4 with little life, as the County Council pointed out; it would have little practical value in the control of development. Also, as it will be some time to the next review, this could cause some confusion, whereas it would be much easier to publish revised SPG. Inclusion as an Appendix in the Plan affords little extra status. Its main purpose is to include matters in the one document so as to assist the reader and applicants. However, this ceases to be useful when it is out of date and reference is required to another document. Policy T11 and its supporting text would require modification to reflect the particular approach taken.

### Recommendation

11. I recommend that the RDDP be modified by deleting Appendix 4 and by substituting the revised parking guidelines currently being agreed by the LAs in Nottinghamshire. If these are not available in time, Appendix 4 should be deleted and revised guidelines could be published as supplementary planning guidance. Policy T11 and its supporting text should be modified accordingly.

## A9 - APPENDIX 9

### MISCELLANEOUS

1. The first page of Appendix 9 lists “Siemens sports ground and bowling greens, Beeston Rylands” as an area of open space to be safeguarded.

#### Inquiry Change

IC110

2. **The Council has recommended the deletion of the text “and bowling greens” from the first page of Appendix 9.**
3. The change ensures consistency with the proposals map.

#### Inspector’s Conclusions

1. This factual change should be supported.

#### Recommendation

2. I recommend that the RDDP be modified as set out in IC110.

## A12 APPENDIX 12: GLOSSARY OF TERMS

### Objections

599 4475 R596 Mr G Foster Nottinghamshire County Council

### Summary of Objection Issues

1. Following further consideration the Council wishes to recommend a change to the description of the term ‘Ancient Monument’ in Appendix 12. The revised text provides additional clarification and explanation as to how Ancient Monuments are designated.

#### Inquiry Change

IC66

2. **The Council has recommended that the description of Ancient Monument should be amended to read:**

**“Designated by the Department for Culture, Media and Sport on the recommendation of English Heritage as being of national importance by virtue of its historic, architectural, traditional or archaeological interest (see Appendix 6)”.**

599/4475: Nottinghamshire County Council

3. Revision 596, Transport Assessment (TA) - the text does not cover the full extent of the work that is required within a TA. It is also necessary to spell out that the TA must include assessment of the residual traffic impacts (after taking into account the modal share assumptions) and the nature of any off-site highway infrastructure improvements deemed necessary.

***Council's Response:***

4. The Glossary of terms is not intended to give a full explanation or description of a Transport Assessment (TA), and it would not be expected that those carrying out or assessing any TA would rely on the information contained therein. The Glossary merely aims to give a general indication of the meaning of words or phrases not in general use by the non-planning public. As such no further amendment is proposed.

**Inspector's Conclusions**

1. IC66 is factually accurate and meets NCC's objection. It should be supported.
2. Whilst I agree that the Glossary of Terms could not provide a full explanation or description of a Transport Assessment, it currently fails to refer to what in practice is one of the major concerns of the TAs submitted to the Inquiry; an assessment of the residual traffic impact on the highway network and any improvements needed to mitigate these. This is the substance of NCC's objection. These words should thus be added to the end of the definition in the Glossary.

**Recommendation**

3. I recommend that the RDDP be modified as set out in IC66. Also by the addition of the following to the definition of Transport Assessments in the Glossary: "and an assessment of the residual traffic impacts on the highway network and any improvements needed to mitigate these."

**TR1 AND TR5 - TECHNICAL REPORTS 1 AND 5****Objections**

**TR1**                      **Technical Report 1: Environmental Appraisal**  
1219    2904              Mr GED Woodhouse

**TR5**                      **Technical Report 5: Outdoor Playing Space**  
1385    3614              Mr B Neville                      Sport England (East Midlands)

**Summary of Objection Issues****1219/2904 - Mr G E D Woodhouse**

1. The appraisal is deficient and unfair in that it was carried out after the decision had been made to allocate land at Watnall for a business park, it does not conform to the good practice guide published by the DETR and it does not take account of ameliorative measures for site Nu6. An independent appraisal should be commissioned from consultants.

***Council's Response:***

2. A study of possible locations for a business park was undertaken by the county, city and borough councils in 1995/96 and all relevant issues were considered before a decision was taken on the Watnall site. The appraisal is closely based on the DETR's good practice guide and does take account of ameliorative measures for site Nu6 (pages 51-52). The Council does not therefore consider that an independent appraisal would be necessary.

1385/3614 Sport England (East Midlands)

3. The Report “is flawed in as much as it over-estimates the existing level of supply” and “is silent on any suggestion that it is underpinned by a detailed survey of all schools in order to confirm their public availability”.

*Council’s Response:*

4. As stated in paragraph 2.1 of the report, care was taken to check with all schools in order to ensure that school facilities have been included only where they are “as a matter of practice and policy available for public use” in accordance with the NPFA’s definition. The survey results appear in the Technical Report and those schools which did not have facilities falling within this category are not listed. This point was accepted by Sport England at a meeting held on 5 April 2000, although the objection has not been withdrawn. Further survey work is in hand to enable an updated version of the Technical Report to be available when the Local Plan is adopted.

**Inspector’s Conclusions**

1. Government advice is that an Environmental Appraisal should be carried out at each stage in the Plan process. The Council undertook a basic appraisal of the CDP in CD24. It followed this with an appraisal of the FDDP in TR1. I see nothing wrong with that. Indeed, I would have expected such an appraisal to guide the changes, along with an analysis of objections as part of the revisions contained in the RDDP. However, this is largely a matter of history now. This inquiry provided ample scope for a thorough analysis of all the Plan’s allocations and counter allocations, including mitigation measures. My conclusions and recommendations on these are set out in the appropriate detail elsewhere in my Report. I see no need for any other independent appraisal at this stage.
2. TR5 (CD21d) states that the study of open space lists education facilities, which were checked to determine whether or not they were available to the public. In view of this, I cannot understand how Sport England could object on such grounds.
3. Sport England also fails to provide evidence of any over estimation in the existing level of supply. Indeed, my own conclusions tend to point in the opposite direction. In particular, I have serious doubts about the logic of para 2.4 of TR5, which reduces the contribution of facilities on the urban edge by 50%. The issue is not simply whether a facility is “within a housing area” but whether it serves effectively the neighbouring community. There is no evidence of usage to support the Council’s reductions. Nor is there any analysis of whether the pattern of facilities satisfactorily serves the urban areas based upon some measures of accessibility, bearing in mind the age group of users and the nature of the facilities. Older users may be expected to travel further to the more specialised facilities than young children do to local play space. Not all users are dependent on walking and even those that are often walk further than say the 400 m adopted by the Highway Authority for the walking distance to bus stops. CD127 advises an acceptable walking distance of 800 m and a preferred maximum of 1200 m to



destinations including recreation and the LEA expects primary school children to walk much further distances to school.

4. Whilst it an ideal world it might be desirable for all open space facilities to be “close” to peoples homes, the reality is that the more specialised facilities require larger catchment areas. Also land in urban areas is under considerable pressure to accommodate housing and employment land requirements. In practice, most urban areas can only accommodate larger open space facilities on the urban fringe and in the Green Belt where they may not be inappropriate development.
5. The Council’s approach in reducing the contribution of urban edge sites by 50% would seem to imply that they should devote scarce resources to the provision of additional open space by way of compensation to make good what might be an artificial deficiency. Any additional open space that might be provided (probably) on the urban fringe would itself be discounted by 50% to follow the Council’s approach. The approach might also suggest that half of existing facilities on the urban fringe should close. In my view, this illustrates the illogicality of the Council’s arbitrary reduction. The main purpose of policies and standards is to guide administrative action and in this case would appear to point in the wrong direction.
6. Some have also suggested that existing open space facilities should be discounted due to their condition such as poor drainage. The sustainable response to these problems is to expend scarce resources on necessary improvements not to abandon these facilities and duplicate provision elsewhere, which would normally be a more costly option.
7. However, I do not suggest any changes to what are essentially survey documents. I have drawn my own conclusions upon them and these are reflected in my conclusions on a range of objections in other Chapters.

### Recommendation

8. I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP in respect of these objections.

## **PMn/s PROPOSALS MAP**

### **Objections**

<i>PMs</i>	<i>Proposals Map - South</i>
110 619	Mr K Scard

110/619 - Mr K Scard

1. The Trent Valley Way should be defined on the proposals map.

*Council's Response:*

2. The Plan does not contain any policies relating specifically to the Trent Valley Way and it would not therefore be appropriate to define it on the proposals map. However, policy RC15 provides protection for the Trent Valley Way and for all other footpaths, bridleways and cycleways.

**Inspector's Conclusions**

1. The Purpose of the PM is to identify the areas to which the policies and proposals of the Plan apply. It is not intended as a guide to the resources or facilities of the area. To show these would complicate and confuse its purpose. Other dedicated publications can perform this function better.

**Recommendation**

2. I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP in respect of this objection. The PM should however be modified to accord with my recommendations in other Chapters of my Report.