



The Planning Inspectorate

Room 406 / Kite Wing
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Temple Quay
Bristol BS1 6PN

Direct Line 0117-372 8902
Switchboard 0117-372 8000
Fax No 0117-372 6241
GTN 1371-8902
e-mail: chris.pritchard@pins.gsi.gov.uk
<http://www.planning-inspectorate.gov.uk>

Petar Kanuritch
Director of Environment and
Development
Gedling Borough Council
Civic Centre
Arnot Hill Park
Arnold
Nottingham NG5 6LU

Your Reference: Bob Wilson

Our Reference: DP000431/N3020

Date:

Dear Sir

Gedling Borough Local Plan Review

1. As you know, I was appointed by the First Secretary of State to hold a public inquiry into objections to the Draft Gedling Borough Local Plan Review. The Local Plan Inquiry began on 18 March 2003 and closed on 26 August 2003. The inquiry sat for 72 half-day sessions, although in some of these sessions, objections from more than one objector were heard. A pre-inquiry meeting was held on 13 December 2002. Before, during and after the Inquiry I made accompanied or unaccompanied site visits to all the sites that were the subject of objections.
2. The District Local Plan Review covers the whole of the Borough of Gedling. When adopted it will replace the Local Plan adopted in 1990. The review plan covers the period until 2011.
3. The Council supplied me with a database listing all the representations made on the Draft Local Plan, updated to the close of the Local Plan Inquiry. They also supplied me with a skeleton report that contained headings and listed all the objections with summaries. My report uses the structure of the skeleton report, which broadly reflects the structure of the Local Plan itself.
4. The Programme Officer, in conjunction with the Council's Planning Officers, have prepared Appendices to my report listing the objectors, those who appeared at the Local Plan Inquiry and the Core Documents used during the Inquiry. It is my understanding that these appendices have been supplied directly to the Council. A complete set of the documents submitted in connection with the Inquiry is held in the Local Plans Section at Gedling Borough Council, Civic Centre, Arnot Hill Park, Arnold NG5 6LU and may be inspected or referred to there.
5. A copy of this letter has been sent for information to:
 - the Government Office for the East Midlands;
 - the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister in London.



The Representations

6. As you know, the Nottinghamshire County Planning Authority did not issue a Statement of Conformity confirming that the Local Plan is in general conformity with the adopted County Structure Plan. However, I was able to consider the matters that are of concern to the County Council as objections to the Local Plan.
7. The Local Plan was placed on deposit twice, in 2000 and 2002, following the publication of an earlier consultation draft plan. As a result numerous representations were received from organisations and individuals. According to the Council's database there were 8640 objections to the Draft Local Plan, of which 1034 had been withdrawn by the end of the Inquiry. There were also 4211 representations supporting the Draft Local Plan, of which 125 had been withdrawn by the end of the Inquiry. These figures include some representations that the Council had originally classified as "comments" but which, on my insistence, were reclassified either as objections or as support.

The Phased Release of the Local Plan Inquiry Report

8. The government attaches great importance to speeding up the planning system in general and the plan-making process in particular. I am also aware there are important and difficult planning decisions to be taken in Gedling and that some of the developments that are needed require a long lead-in time. There is a pressing need to move forward.
9. For these reasons I have approached and organised my work by splitting it into two parts:
 - all the policies (and objections) in the Local Plan with a direct bearing on how much development is needed and where it should take place;
 - the other policies, which may be regarded as less pressing.
10. I am releasing the report to the Council in two parts, so the first part does not have to wait for the completion of the second part. I anticipate that the first part of my work will be the most contentious, although to some extent this is a guess because I have not begun work on the second part yet. However, I hope that delivering the report in two parts will give the Council more time to consider the most contentious matters, speed the process overall and bring forward the time when implementation can start.
11. The first part of my report contains the complete chapters on Housing, Employment, Transport and Community Services and selected policies in the Environment chapter. All being well, the rest will follow about two months after this.

Matters Taken into Account

12. In considering the objections, I have had regard to the submissions made by or on behalf of the various objectors and for the Council, and to all other material considerations, including current Planning Policy Guidance and Circulars where appropriate. I have also had regard to the representations made in support of the plan.
13. The Council will need to take into account any PPG, Circular or other government advice published after the delivery of my report. Unless otherwise stated, my references to government policy as set out in Circulars or PPGs relate to the versions that were current at the close of the Inquiry. The Council will

need to have regard to any subsequent revisions to government guidance or policy that occur prior to the adoption of the Plan.

14. I have not been able to have regard to any changes in local planning circumstances that may have occurred since I closed the Inquiry. The Council will also need to take any such changes into account when they consider my report.

General Approach

15. I have no illusions that my report will be popular, either with the Council or with the majority of objectors, although I believe that a better Local Plan will result. Because of the report's length and the numerous matters of detail it covers, I will highlight the key components of my thinking here.
16. I consider that broadly speaking the Council set itself the correct parameters for preparing the Local Plan because these were derived from the adopted Structure Plan. In general terms I endorse the Council's starting points regarding the number of new dwellings to be accommodated, residential density, the amount of employment land to be found and the general principles guiding locational choices.
17. However, there are five major issues on which I part company with the Council:
- the extent to which the delivery of dwellings at Gedling Colliery / Chase Farm can be relied on by the end of the plan (2011);
 - whether it is (yet) safe to allocate land for major areas of development in the Trent valley;
 - how urgent it is to identify an adequate and varied supply of developable land to enable an immediate and sustained increase in the rate at which new housing is being delivered in Gedling;
 - whether (more) land (than is needed for development) should be taken out of the Green Belt and designated as White or Safeguarded Land;
 - whether it is wise or helpful for the Local Plan to deal with developer contributions in the way it does.
18. Nearly all of the major modifications to the Local Plan I am recommending can be traced back to these main issues.

Land for New Dwellings

19. As I have said, I have largely accepted the case advanced by the Council concerning how much land will be needed for residential development to satisfy the requirements of the Structure Plan. What flows from this is the recognition that a considerable amount of greenfield land will need to be developed and that this will involve taking land out of the Green Belt.
20. I recognise that many members of the public (and groups) do not accept this but the evidence is clear that enough development land cannot be found unless considerable areas are removed from the Green Belt. I am satisfied this is both necessary and sanctioned by the Structure Plan. Some objectors believe that the latest government guidance (as in PPG3), in effect, prohibits development on greenfield sites but this is not so. Rather, it establishes that greenfield land should not be used if enough brownfield land is available. It is also sometimes overlooked that government guidance places a strong emphasis on the need to ensure there is enough housing land available to enable housing needs in the area to be met.

21. However, against this background it is also important that too much greenfield land is not made available for development because this could inhibit the use of previously developed land in the wider urban area in the short or longer term. This is why I have resisted pressure from house builders that even more land should be released.

Employment Land

22. Things are less clear cut in relation to land for employment. Again, I have accepted the Structure Plan as the starting point and am satisfied that some greenfield and Green Belt land has to be released for development. However, the evidence (from CPRE and others) that past demand for employment land has been far slower than the Structure Plan anticipated is persuasive enough for me to conclude that it is not of overriding importance that the Structure Plan guideline is met in its entirety. In any event, even if I started with the intention of identifying enough employment land to satisfy the Structure Plan guideline, the scope in practice is limited by the paucity of suitable sites.

The Principles Guiding the Location of New Development

23. The Council took the view that the bulk of the land for development should be identified using a three stage ranking of priorities. First land within urban areas, second land adjacent to the main urban area and lastly land in corridors well served by public transport (which in practice meant near Hucknall). The Council thought that it could find all the land that was needed in the first two priority areas and did not need to use land in the third category. This proved contentious for those objectors who thought that land near Hucknall should be allocated for development. They challenged the basis for differentiating between land adjacent to the main urban area and land adjacent to Hucknall, which is an urban area but not a main one.
24. However, I have come to the view that not enough readily developable land can be found in the first two priority areas and that land in the third category will be needed. So for practical reasons I have recommended allocating some land near Hucknall for development. This being the case I have not felt it was necessary to resolve the complex issue of whether it is right to give more priority to land adjacent to the main urban area than to land that is next to other (lesser) urban areas. As a result, the few people who have grappled with this issue may be disappointed not to have an answer but the majority will no doubt be thankful that they need not try to master its complexity.
25. Another cause of general debate about the distribution of development concerns how much land should be allocated in the villages and rural parts of the Borough. I will not go into detail here but I found this matter comparatively easy to resolve because nearly all the rural areas are in the Green Belt. Between them, Green Belt policy and the Structure Plan provide clear guidance as to how much rural development there should be. There is scope for limited development (but only limited) in the larger villages, scope for infilling (strictly defined) in the medium sized villages and only scope for development that has to be in the countryside beyond that.
26. Lastly, several objectors – especially in the Gedling and Arnold areas – take the view that the Local Plan's distribution of housing development is "unfair" because too much of it is near where they live. I was unable to discern exactly what would be a "fair" distribution for these objectors but to my mind simply spreading development evenly around the Borough would be a negation of the planning process. There have to be sound planning reasons to

choose or discard proposed sites for development and this is the basis on which I have done my work.

Gedling Colliery / Chase Farm (GCCF)

27. Despite the numerous objections to the proposed development at GCCF I have not recommended that this allocation should be discarded. It has been a constant element in the Council's intentions throughout the preparation of the Local Plan and in my view the Council has been absolutely right to stand by this proposal. Some of the site is previously developed land and it is widely accepted that this should be used productively. It may be necessary to include some greenfield land in the development area to help fund the project but this was significantly reduced between the First Deposit and the Second Deposit. The principle of securing development here if at all possible must be right and the consequences of failing to do so (in terms of the need to use land elsewhere in the Green Belt) would be very severe indeed.
28. Even so, although I support the GCCF development, I consider the Council has been over-optimistic about how quickly this area can be developed.
29. The GCCF development is and must be dependent on the completion of an expensive access road to the site. There is opposition to this in some quarters, usually because the proposed road is not as large as it is assumed the hoped-for and long-awaited Gedling Bypass would be. Others oppose any new road in this area or one of the possible alignments that have been suggested.
30. The bypass proposal has been protected in successive plans for the area over a long time and still shows no signs of attracting the public funds that would be needed to build it. So, in my view this is a case where a modest bird in the hand will be better than even the largest bird in the bush. More work remains to be done on the design and Environmental Impact of the GCCF access road but on the basis of the work so far I am satisfied that this should proceed on the alignment identified in the Second Deposit.

The Trent Valley

31. The Second Deposit version of the Local Plan allocated a considerable amount of land for employment and residential development in what could broadly be described as the Trent valley. (I mean Teal Close and associated areas.) Had I felt able to recommend the development of this land it would undeniably have had some advantages.
32. However, much of the land is in an indicative floodplain and is at risk of being flooded, albeit infrequently. The landowner and the Council have been pursuing a scheme to overcome this difficulty. However, following government guidance in PPG25 I have adopted a precautionary approach and relied on the advice of the Environment Agency on flooding issues. In view of this, and on the basis of the information presented to me at the Local Plan Inquiry, I am unable to recommend that this land is allocated for development in this review of the Local Plan.
33. Some of the land also has other problems (such as potential odours from nearby activities, loss of playing fields, impact on the Green Belt) and most of it would not be available for development until after NCC's A612 transport scheme is implemented. Whether this land will be suitable for development in the longer-term future I do not know and is not for me to say.

34. This means that the Borough is without any sizeable allocation of employment land and has lost a considerable amount the land allocated for housing in the Second Deposit.

Top Wighay Farm

35. The only practical alternative to the Teal Close employment area available to me is at Top Wighay Farm. I have therefore recommended that the employment allocation there that was in the First Deposit version of the Local Plan should be reinstated.
36. This being the case, the area also becomes more attractive as potential housing land because developing the two together creates the prospect of a balanced and sustainable community where the need to commute over long distances is reduced.

A Range and Choice of Housing Sites and Phasing

37. The process as I have described it so far explains how I have arrived at my recommendations on the only large employment allocation and the two largest housing allocations. But large sites are complex to plan and slow to start. And I am persuaded that housing development in the Borough has been held back (below the rate of development envisaged in the Structure Plan and what is needed to meet the needs of the area) by a scarcity of housing land. Thus there is in my view a need to identify a number of smaller sites across the Borough where development can be started more quickly. This I have done, trying to balance the comparative environmental and planning advantages and disadvantages of each site put before me by the Council or by objectors.
38. In the situation as I have described it, I see no place for a phasing policy.

Green Belt / Safeguarded Land

39. I have little doubt that this will be one of the most contentious parts of my work and I set out my reasons more fully in my report. The nub of the issue is how much land should be taken out of the Green Belt. One possibility is to limit the amount of land to be removed from the Green Belt to what is needed for the proven development needs that arise in this review of the Local Plan. This will increase the risk that the Green Belt will have to be reviewed again sooner rather than later. The alternative is to take more land out of the Green Belt now, with the intention that the Green Belt will not need to be reviewed again until well after 2011.
40. A related matter is the sort of planning policy that would be needed to protect such White Land or Safeguarded Land for the foreseeable future.
41. In reaching my recommendations on this matter I have been influenced by government guidance, especially in PPG2 on Green Belts. This leans strongly towards reviewing the Green Belt very infrequently and to identifying enough Safeguarded Land to provide for possible development needs beyond the lifetime of this Local Plan (2011). This is what I have recommended and I have drafted a policy that I consider is equal to the task.

Developer Contributions

42. Many objectors to allocations of (housing) land in the Local Plan said that the services in their area are already over-stretched and incapable of accommodating any pressures from new development. The services most commonly referred to were schools and primary health care. Similar objections arose in relation to highway capacity and public transport.
43. Although the Local Education Authority does have concerns about the capacity at some schools, they did not object in principle to any of the

allocations. The Health Authorities did not object at all. In most cases the Highway and Transport Authority considered that relatively minor highway or public transport improvements could overcome any problems that would be caused by development. The Council's general response on this issue is that developers will make contributions (of land and/or money) to remedy shortfalls in services caused by development.

44. The issue of contributions from developers towards infrastructure is therefore an important element of the Local Plan. However, in following up these objections I had great difficulty in finding where in the Local Plan the need for such contributions at each site is referred to. I consider it would be in the interests of the Council, the public and developers if these matters were dealt with much more fully and explicitly in the Local Plan and if there was at least one place in the plan that drew these matters together. Whether this would completely satisfy all the objectors I rather doubt but as things stand I can understand the basis for the objections.

Other Matters

45. There are many other matters of importance covered by my report (and yet to come in the second part of my work). I do not play down the importance of these other issues, especially for those who have objected. However, I hope that my brief introductory summary of the main issues will prove useful.
46. Attention is drawn to the fact that my recommended modifications to policies in the plan may necessitate consequential changes to the supporting text and/or the Proposals Map. These consequential modifications are not all noted in my report, and the Council will need to revise and update the supporting text and Proposals Map in the Local Plan during the final stages of the adoption process.

Thanks and Acknowledgements

47. I wish to place on record my thanks for the help and co-operation I received throughout the inquiry from a variety of people.
48. These include the Council's advocate Mr R Hanson. The Gedling Borough Council officers led by Mr R Wilson were all unfailingly courteous, considerate and helpful to me and to objectors, as were those who supported them from the Highway Authority. I recognise that for the Council's staff the Inquiry was a time of some pressure and stress. The same was true for others but I also found the objectors and those who appeared for them to be friendly and positive in their desire to bring my work to a successful conclusion. The accommodation for the Inquiry was also first class.
49. From within the Planning Inspectorate I was helped, particularly in relation to the Housing and Employment Round Tables, by Ms Susannah Guest.
50. Last, but by no means least, I was assisted throughout by the Programme Officer, Mr James Riddle, to whom I particularly wish to express my thanks for the good-humoured support, unstinting hard work and quiet competence with which he helped me and all those involved. I (and the Council) were lucky to have found such an experienced and competent Programme Officer for what was a large and complicated Inquiry.

INSPECTOR

1A.1 ENV1 DEVELOPMENT CRITERIA

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000180	000255	RSPB
000309	000427	House Builders Federation

Summary of Objection

Paragraph 1.2; the RSPB suggests an alternative wording in relation to Environmental Assessment.

Paragraph 1.2; the HBF considers the first sentence widens the scope for Environmental Assessment.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000405	000853	English Nature, East Midlands Team
001158	002491	Nottingham County Council (Strategic Property)

Summary of Objection

There is a need for a "Environmental Keynote" policy concerned with the protection of the environment.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001158	002491	Nottingham County Council (Strategic Property)

Summary of Objection

It is unnecessary to say in the policy that proposals should accord with other policies in the Local Plan. Criteria (a) and (b) are too vague and deal with matters of opinion. Generally policies relying on criteria should be avoided.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001158	002493	Nottingham County Council (Strategic Property)

Summary of Objection

Paragraph 1.13 is inadequate. It should be expanded to cover the comprehensive development of large sites and should refer to infrastructure provision, developer contributions (Circular 1/97), Development Briefs and Supplementary Planning Guidance.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001345	003136	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust

Summary of Objection

Paragraphs 1.10 and 1.11 should refer to the desirability of providing green spaces that are rich in wildlife within a reasonable distance of all residents in the Borough.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001664	003922	W Hardy & Sons

Summary of Objection

The policy and paragraphs 1.6 to 1.8 seek to establish the Council as final arbiter in design matters which is contrary to Government policy. The policy does not recognise the contribution that mixed uses can make to the reduction of crime. Mixed uses should be encouraged.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001948	004588	Aldergate Properties Ltd
001948	201932	Aldergate Properties Ltd

Summary of Objection

First Deposit; criterion (c) is poorly worded; an alternative form of words is suggested. In criterion (d) the meaning of "developable land" is not clear.

Second Deposit; criterion (b) should allow for the possibility that development could bring benefits (e.g. with a new road). The meaning of "adjoining development" is unclear, it should refer to the amenity of "occupiers"

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000999	002154	Mr M Bennett

Summary of Objection

The existing hedgerows on the boundary of Cranmore Close and Stockings Farm could be incorporated into future development as defensible space and landscaping.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
003981	201638	English Heritage
005017	201989	The Countryside Agency

Summary of Objection

In the Second Deposit the word "character" was removed from criterion (a) and paragraphs 1.7, 1.8 and 1.67, usually to be replaced by "appearance". This is objected to.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
004893	201462	County Land & Business Association

Summary of Objection

Second Deposit, Criterion (e) should only prevent development that would prejudice comprehensive development if there are plans to develop the wider area in the immediate future.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

General Objections to Policy ENV1

Paragraph 1.2 and Environmental Assessment.

1. The sentence that RSPB complain of was altered in the Second Deposit. Although the new wording does not adopt the form of words advocated by RSPB, I can see no harm in it and it is a fuller description than theirs.
2. As far as the HBF objection is concerned, the wording they complain of is purely descriptive and is helpful in setting a context for the chapter as a whole. I note that the HBF do not suggest an alternative form of words and I consider their suggestion that the whole paragraph is deleted would diminish the Local Plan.
3. Accordingly, I conclude that no modification is needed in respect of paragraph 1.2.

Paragraph 1.13 and Comprehensive Development

4. Objector 1158 says that this paragraph should be expanded to cover the issue of comprehensive development generally. I agree that the matters raised by the objector are important but are most likely to arise on large allocated sites. I consider that they are best dealt with in the parts of the plan dealing with allocations of land for development. I conclude that there is no need to modify paragraph 1.13.

Paragraphs 1.10 and 1.11 and Accessible Green Spaces

5. Objector 1345 wants a reference to accessibility to wildlife-rich green spaces inserted here. I consider this matter is more appropriately dealt with elsewhere in the Local Plan. I conclude the Local Plan should not be modified in response to this objection

An “Environmental Keynote” Policy

6. The Council responded to the call for a Keynote policy from English Nature by adding a new aim to the Local Plan concerned with the maintenance and enhancement of biodiversity and the conservation of natural resources. This does not appear to have satisfied the objector who has not withdrawn. In my view it is undesirable to cover the same ground twice and the concerns raised by English Nature are very broad. For this reason I consider these matters are best dealt with in the aims, rather than the policies, of the plan.
7. Similar considerations apply to objector 1158’s wish to amend the policy to make it an “over-arching” policy.
8. I conclude there is no reason to modify the Local Plan in response to these objections.

Character or Appearance

9. The First Deposit policy and text referred to the need for the design of development to have regard to the character of the area. In the Second Deposit the word “character” is deleted and usually replaced by the word “appearance”. English Heritage and the Countryside Agency seek the reinstatement of “character”. They say that the character of an area is important and relates to more than just its appearance.
10. In this context – policy ENV1 (a) – the issue relates to the design of development, although the area’s character is a matter that also arises elsewhere in the Local Plan.

11. My understanding is that what prompted the Council to make the changes they have, was the fear that retaining the “character” of an area as a requirement for development would make it harder to achieve the higher densities and windfall developments that are so important to the Local Plan. The Council is fearful that local residents (and others) would always oppose higher densities, redevelopment and intensification because these were not in character with the surrounding housing (which has usually been at lower densities than those now envisaged).
12. I consider the issues surrounding density later in this report but government guidance is clear that higher densities than in the past are preferred because this reduces the amount of greenfield land that has to be developed. Moreover, appeal decisions by the Secretary of State confirm that densities in the surrounding area are not a sufficient reason to allow low densities on sites that could accommodate more dwellings.
13. I accept that the character of an area can be an important matter but it is also a rather nebulous concept, which different people will interpret in their own way. It is clear from their representations that English Heritage are using the term to refer to issues of urban design, and building style rather than referring to density. The Countryside Agency refer to such matters as vitality, cultural heritage, historic context and natural features that may contribute to the character of an area (presumably without affecting its appearance). But others could seek to use the concept to oppose the achievement of higher densities irrespective of whether any real harm would be caused to the area's character or appearance.
14. For my part I find it difficult to think of practical examples of how the issue would become a real one, as opposed to a theoretical one. How could the vitality, cultural heritage, historic context, natural features and general character of an area be materially harmed (or disregarded) in a way that did not also affect the appearance of the area?
15. Of course in Conservation Areas the statutory duty to have regard to the character or appearance of the area would remain. So too would the planning policies covering the rural areas most of which are in the Green Belt in Gedling. And I find the need to increase the density of development in suburban areas in order to reduce the amount of greenfield development is a very compelling argument.
16. On balance I consider it safer (and less open to misinterpretation) to leave the Local Plan as it is in the Second Deposit. I therefore conclude that no modification is needed.

Other General Matters

17. Objector 1158 says that policies using criteria are to be avoided. But PPG12 paragraph 3.11 advocates the judicious use of such policies. I see no harm in this case. I conclude there is no need to modify the Local Plan in response to this objection.
18. Objector 1664 complains that the Council seeks to become the final arbiter in design matters. Yet the text goes some way to emphasise the limits the Council is accepting in this regard. I consider that the policy and text adequately reflect government guidance on this important matter and conclude there is no reason to modify the Local Plan.

19. The same objector also complains that the Local Plan does not acknowledge the contribution that mixed uses can make to the prevention of crime. But this is specifically mentioned in paragraph 1.12. However, government guidance places strong emphasis on the desirability of mixed use development and I conclude that a paragraph should be added to the text of the plan indicating the desirability of mixed use schemes.
20. Objector 999 says that the existing hedgerows on the boundary of Cranmore Close and Stockings Farm could be incorporated into future development as defensible space and landscaping. In my view this is too detailed a matter to be dealt with explicitly in the Local Plan, let alone in a general policy on controlling development. I deal with the matter of hedges at Stockings Farm in the relevant section of the Housing chapter and conclude that no modification is needed to this part of the Local Plan.

Criterion (a)

21. Objector 1158 says that this criterion is vague and relates to matters on which (professional) opinions may vary. They have not suggested how the wording could be improved. However, this is an important issue that in my view should be included in the Local Plan so I am not inclined to delete it. In my view the wording is acceptable and is not unlike many similar policies in other local plans. I conclude the Local Plan should not be modified.

Criterion (b) (First Deposit, now (c) in the Second Deposit)

22. Objector 1158 says that this criterion is vague and relates to matters on which (professional) opinions may vary. They have not suggested how the wording could be improved. However, this is an important issue that in my view should be included in the Local Plan so I am not inclined to delete it.
23. However, in my view the wording of this criterion is less than clear and could be interpreted in at least two ways. Is there, for example, to be adequate provision for everyone or only for the groups listed? Is there to be adequate access for all and provision to meet other – non-access related – concerns for the listed groups? I am also concerned that safety is not mentioned in this context. I therefore consider that a less ambiguous form of words is needed and I would suggest the following:

(c) development proposals are to include adequate provisions for the safe and convenient access and circulation of pedestrians and vehicles. In this regard particular attention will be paid to the needs of disabled people, cyclists, pedestrians and people with young children.

24. I conclude the Local Plan should be modified accordingly.

Criterion (b) (added in the Second Deposit)

25. Objector 001948 wants the possible benefits of development acknowledged in the policy. In my view this is unnecessary as the **net** effect will be assessed in any event. However, I agree with the objector that the meaning of “adjoining development” is unclear and that the words “adjoining occupiers” would be clearer. I conclude that in criterion (b) “adjoining development” should be replaced by the words “adjoining occupiers”.

Criterion (c) (First Deposit, now (d) in the Second Deposit)

26. Objector 001948 suggests an alternative form of words but in my view the meaning would not be materially different so there is no advantage in the suggested modification. I conclude no modification should be made.

Criterion (d) (First Deposit, now (e) in the Second Deposit)

27. Objector 001948 says the meaning of “developable land” is not clear. However, the phrase was removed from the wording in the Second Deposit and I consider that this objection has been met. I conclude that no further change is needed.
28. Objector 004893 is fearful that criterion (e) could prevent development that would prejudice comprehensive development whether or not there are any plans to develop the wider area in the immediate future. I do not share this concern because in discharging its development control function (and at appeal) the test would be whether or not the policy was being applied reasonably. That there was little or no prospect that adjoining land could ever be developed as part of a comprehensive scheme would have to be taken into account. On the other hand so would the potential harm, even in the longer term, of failure to secure a comprehensive development that was feasible. To alter the policy as the objector wants, would remove one half of the balance from the considerations. I conclude that the Local Plan should not be modified.

RECOMMENDATIONS

29. I conclude that a new paragraph should be added to the Local Plan after paragraph 1.13 setting out the merits of mixed-use developments and the government guidance on the topic.
30. I recommend that in criterion (b) the words “adjoining development” should be replaced by the words “adjoining occupiers”.
31. I recommend that criterion (c) is worded as follows:
- development proposals are to include adequate provisions for the safe and convenient access and circulation of pedestrians and vehicles. In this regard particular attention will be paid to the needs of disabled people, cyclists, pedestrians and people with young children;**
32. Otherwise, I recommend no modification to the Local Plan in response to these objections.
-

1A.2 ENV17 RAVENSHEAD SPECIAL CHARACTER AREA

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000268	000372	Ravenshead Parish Council
000351	000496	Mr R Foulds
000381	000532	Mrs H Knox
001023	002208	Mrs C Spacey
001739	004041	Mr M Bamford

Summary of Objection

The Ravenshead Special Character Area should be extended southwards to include the Leisure Centre, the Playing Field and all the land to Kighill Lane.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000768	001192	Dr A Middleton

Summary of Objection

Ravenshead Special Character Area should be extended westwards to include land west of Mansfield Road, whilst allowing one additional house at Gibbetdale Wood to improve the management of the area.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000770	001195	Dr D Middleton

Summary of Objection

Ravenshead Special Character Area should be extended westwards to include land west of Mansfield Road.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000436	000618	Mr F Shepperson

Summary of Objection

There are no unusual or special characteristics that distinguish the Ravenshead Special Character Area from the rest of Ravenshead. Paragraphs 1.45 and 1.46 are not necessary because other policies would prevent over-development and protect privacy / amenity

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001158	002514	Nottingham County Council (Strategic Property)

Summary of Objection

This criterion-based policy should be deleted from the Local Plan and the matter dealt with by Supplementary Planning Guidance.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

1. I note that, as presently defined, the RSCA is entirely within the boundary of the village and does not extend into the Green Belt. In my view this is appropriate for a policy that starts by indicating that development will be granted if certain conditions are met. In other words this is a policy to control the form and impact of development *inside* the village and any allocations.
2. In contrast most of the land onto which objectors wish to extend the policy are in areas where residential development will usually be inappropriate. In my view, without a considerable change to the wording and meaning of the policy, the application of the RSCA to land where no development is likely would not be appropriate and could weaken the clarity and implementation of other protective policies. This applies to most of the land to the south and west of the village. The land may be attractive and the objectors may be right to want to prevent its development but in my view extending the RSCA policy is not the best way to achieve this end.
3. This leaves two unresolved matters as far as the objectors who seek to extend the RSCA are concerned:
 - the first is the area south of Regina Crescent that I am recommending should be allocated for residential development. This land is not heavily wooded and lacks the distinctive character of the RSCA in general. In my view, therefore, it should not be included;

- the second is the suggestion that the policy should allow for a new dwelling in Gibbetdale Wood. But this site is in the Green Belt where development would be inappropriate in any event (except in very special circumstances that do not appear to apply).
4. I conclude that the proposed extensions to the RSCA would be neither justified nor desirable.
5. As far as the two objectors who wish to delete the policy entirely are concerned:
- the area is distinctive in forming a relatively wooded transition from the more open area to the west and the more heavily built up area to the east;
 - I see no harm in the inclusion of this criterion-based policy in the Local Plan because such policies are specifically allowed for in PPG12.
6. I conclude that the policy should be retained in the Local Plan.

RECOMMENDATION

7. **I recommend no modification to the Local Plan in response to these objections.**
-

1A.3 ENV26 CONTROL OVER DEVELOPMENT IN THE GREEN BELT GENERAL OBJECTIONS TO THE GREEN BELT POLICY

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000045	000048	National Farmers Union

Summary of Objection

Clause (a) and paragraph 1.61 should include and allow for farm diversification projects that would not detract from the Green Belt. Government policy and guidance support farm diversification.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000715	001058	Sport England

Summary of Objection

The use of the word "essential " in ENV26 (b) does not accord with paragraph 1.6 of PPG2 because it implies that sports facilities have to be essential to be located in the Green Belt.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001158	002523	Nottingham County Council (Strategic Property)

Summary of Objection

The policy repeats the categories of appropriate development in PPG2 without acknowledging that other material considerations may indicate a need to refuse planning permission for development which is otherwise "appropriate". The policy should be replaced by a simpler statement that national (and structure plan) policy will be followed.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001324	002777	Langridge Homes Ltd

Summary of Objection

The policy should include Park and Ride proposals as appropriate development in the Green Belt (or identify sites for Park and Ride and exclude them from the Green Belt). Park and Ride is an integral part of the Transport strategy for the area. There are also detailed objections to the Green Belt boundary around some villages.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001332	003014	Linby Parish Council

Summary of Objection

Clause (d) of the policy is superfluous. It should follow the definition given in policy 3/2 of the Structure Plan. There is concern about the domestication of parts of the Green Belt if land is included in gardens because it could be difficult to argue that a lawn would impact on the openness of the Green Belt more than a field. Paragraph 1.62 on referring departures to the Secretary of State is contrary to PPG2.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001340	003103	The British Wind Energy Association

Summary of Objection

Renewable energy development should be included as appropriate in the Green Belt. A presumption in favour should prevail unless the proposal would cause demonstrable harm to interests of acknowledged importance. The use is appropriate in rural areas. PPG22 is cited.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001664	003925	W Hardy & Sons

Summary of Objection

The extent of the green areas is questioned, given the level of existing development. (This is the full extent of the objection and all the information I have on it.)

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
003932	010765	R.J.B. Mining Ltd

Summary of Objection

The policy should acknowledge that mineral extraction need not be inappropriate development in the Green Belt, as is indicated in PPG2.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001335	003049	Ashfield District Council

Summary of Objection

At various points on the Gedling/Ashfield boundary the Gedling Green Belt boundary is shown within Ashfield District.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

1. If an objector is seeking a specific alteration to the extent or boundary of the Green Belt, I deal with this separately as an objection site below.

Farm Diversification

2. Farm diversification projects are supported in PPG7, especially as changed by the Ministerial Statement of 21 March 2001. Such schemes should be well conceived and consistent in their scale with their rural surroundings. Structure Plan policy 3/2 (e) also refers to "change of use of agricultural and other buildings to employment and tourism uses, which help to diversify the rural economy".
3. However, not all farm diversification schemes will be well conceived or consistent in scale with their rural location. Neither will all such schemes use existing buildings. Some diversification schemes could harm the Green Belt. In my view such schemes will need to be considered on their merits bearing in mind their circumstances and advantages and balancing these against any harm that would be caused to the Green Belt. It would not, in my view, be correct to sanction all diversification schemes in principle by classifying them all as appropriate development in the Green Belt, which is what the NFU seeks.
4. Agriculture and forestry activities would remain appropriate in any event and, as the Council points out, the issue of farm diversification is also dealt with in policy E9. Nevertheless the re-use of existing buildings for such proposals is sanctioned in the Structure Plan and I see no reason why this should not be carried forward into the Local Plan.
5. I conclude the Local Plan should be modified by the addition of a clause to this policy that says, "changes of use of agricultural and other buildings to employment and tourism uses, which help to diversify the rural economy".

Sports Facilities

6. As Sport England points out, open recreational uses are appropriate in the Green Belt. However, paragraph 3.4 of PPG2 does say that new buildings are inappropriate in the Green Belt unless they are (amongst other things) **essential** facilities for outdoor sport and recreation. It appears to me that there is some confusion between "development" and "new buildings" in the policy as currently worded, notwithstanding its origin in the Structure Plan.
7. This matter could be clarified if clause (b) of the policy were redrafted to say "the provision of outdoor sport and recreation facilities and the erection of essential new buildings in association with them". I conclude that the Local Plan should be modified accordingly.

Nottinghamshire County Council (Strategic Policy)

8. Objector 1158 complains that the policy merely duplicates PPG2. Whilst this may be true, in my experience it is not uncommon for local plans to do this. Although the public and others often refer to Green Belt policy it is also widely misunderstood. For this reason I consider there is some merit in setting out the policy in full. I also note that elsewhere this objector takes issue with policies that cannot be understood and

implemented without reference to other documents than the Local Plan. For these reasons I see no merit in replacing this policy with an apparently (but deceptively) simple statement that national and structure plan policy will be followed.

9. As to the suggestion that the policy should make clear that even appropriate development may be refused for other reasons, this is true of most of the policies in the Local Plan. It would be extremely cumbersome for every policy to carry the caveat that even proposals complying with the policy may be refused for other reasons.
10. I conclude that the Local Plan should not be modified in response to this objection.

Park and Ride in the Green Belt

11. Langridge Homes seek either the inclusion of Park and Ride facilities as appropriate development in the Green Belt or the definition of Park and Ride sites and their exclusion from the Green Belt.
12. My understanding is that the plans for new Park and Ride facilities are not far enough advanced to define all the sites and exclude them from the Green Belt even if this were thought the right thing to do.
13. The issue of Park and Ride facilities in the Green Belt is dealt with explicitly and in detail in PPG13 Annex E (published in March 2001, after the objection was made). From this it will be seen that it is not an entirely straightforward matter. Park and Ride may be appropriate in the Green Belt if certain conditions are met.
14. If the Council is intending to follow this guidance (and I would not recommend anything else), there are three options:
 - incorporate the text of PPG13 Annex E in the Local Plan;
 - cross-refer in the text of the Local Plan to PPG13 Annex E;
 - say nothing in the Local Plan but rely on PPG13 Annex E in any event.
15. The first option would be unwieldy and disproportionate. The last would not help the reader to understand the issues involved. On balance I prefer the second option.
16. I conclude that the text accompanying policies ENV26 and T4 should be expanded to include a reference to Park and Ride in the Green Belt and PPG13 Annex E.

Linby Parish Council

17. Clause (d) of the policy refers to other uses of land that does (sic) not conflict with maintaining the openness of the Green Belt. Apart from the questionable grammar of this clause, it has no equivalent in the Structure Plan and is potentially very widely drawn. The objector is concerned that it might lead to gardens being extended into the Green Belt on the grounds that a lawn is as open as a field, although GBC says it can control this by another policy in the Local Plan. GBC also says the clause is intended to reflect paragraph 3.12 of PPG2, although as drafted it could be interpreted more widely than this. The relevant part of PPG2 deals with changes of use and engineering works and says that such forms of development will be inappropriate in the Green Belt unless they maintain openness and do not conflict with the purposes of the Green Belt.

18. My main concern is that including the clause in the policy appears to sanction a wide (but unspecified) range of development as appropriate. This is because the clause is expressed in a positive way, whereas the equivalent wording in PPG2 is negative. (PPG2 says it is inappropriate unless certain conditions are met but the Local Plan says it is appropriate unless they are not.) This may be a subtle difference of tone but in my view it is important. For this reason I consider that this clause in the policy is an unnecessary and unwelcome hostage to fortune. Bearing in mind that the Structure Plan does not include any such clause, I consider it should be deleted from the Local Plan, leaving such matters to be resolved on their merits as and when proposals arise.
19. As far as paragraph 1.62 and the referral of departures from the Development Plan to the Secretary of State are concerned, I note that GBC rely on Circular 7/99. To that extent I am content. However, no doubt the Council would (have to) comply with whatever the current advice / guidance / directions were at the time a Departure arose. Partly for this reason I consider it is not appropriate for the Local Plan to go into procedural matters. I therefore conclude that the last two sentences of paragraph 1.62 should be deleted.

Renewable Energy

20. As with farm diversification, government policy is generally in support of renewable energy in principle. However, in this case government support in principle is not reflected in the Structure Plan's Green Belt policy (3/2). Again the Council says that the matter is dealt with in another policy in the Local Plan.
21. PPG22 paragraph 30 says, "In line with PPG2 very special circumstances are needed to justify development in the Green Belt, unless the particular proposal constitutes a use appropriate to a rural area. Any development should not injure the visual amenities of the Green Belt." In my view this does not directly say that wind installations are appropriate development in the Green Belt, although it could have said this if this was intended. Nor is it immediately obvious why all renewable energy installations should be regarded as appropriate in all rural areas.
22. Be that as it may, I have no information as to whether Gedling is likely to prove a suitable area for wind generated power. I am inclined to the view that the area is not high enough or exposed enough to be ideally suited to such development. But whether or not this is true, the most attractive sites, in terms of wind generation, are likely to be the tops of ridges where the wind is strongest. The local ridges are sensitive locations in planning terms, so much so that the Structure Plan identifies them as a major consideration in the current review of Green Belt boundaries. This suggests that there are likely to be fundamental planning difficulties in reconciling wind generation on any scale with Green Belt policy in Gedling.
23. For this practical reason I am not in favour of regarding renewable energy installations as appropriate development in the Gedling Green Belt as a matter of principle, which is what this objector seeks. I therefore conclude that policy ENV26 should not be modified in response to this objection.

The Extent of the Green Belt (W Hardy & Sons)

24. The objectors want a smaller Green Belt. I agree with them because the sum of my recommendations would have this result. But I conclude that no specific modifications arise from this in principle objection.

Minerals (R J B Mining Ltd)

25. As far as objector 003932 is concerned, the Council says that proposals to extract minerals would be considered in the context of Clause (d) of the policy – which I am recommending should be deleted. Be that as it may, I am of the opinion that this is not a Minerals Local Plan and need not, and should not, concern itself with minerals extraction. I therefore recommend no modification in response to this objection.

Ashfield Council and the Borough Boundary

26. GBC accept that the boundary of the Green Belt in this Local Plan and its Proposals Map should accurately reflect the exact position of the borough boundary. The position of the borough boundary does not appear to be in dispute and I suspect that I would not be the right person to decide on the matter if it were. In any event the boundary should be accurately portrayed on the Proposals Map and I conclude that any modifications that are needed to achieve this should be made.

RECOMMENDATIONS

27. I recommend that the Local Plan should be modified by the addition of a clause to this policy that says “changes of use of agricultural and other buildings to employment and tourism uses, which help to diversify the rural economy”.
28. I recommend that clause (b) of policy ENV26 should be redrafted to say “the provision of outdoor sport and recreation facilities and the erection of essential new buildings in association with them”.
29. I recommend that the text accompanying policies ENV26 and T4 should include a reference to PPG13 Annex E on Park and Ride.
30. I recommend that clause (d) of policy ENV26 is deleted from the Local Plan.
31. I recommend that the last two sentences of paragraph 1.62 are deleted from the Local Plan.
32. I recommend that the Proposals Map should be modified to reflect the borough boundary accurately.
33. Otherwise, I recommend no modification to the Local Plan in response to these objections.
-

1A.4 ENV26 CONTROL OVER DEVELOPMENT IN THE GREEN BELT REMOVE LAND FROM THE GREEN BELT CALVERTON HIGH STREET

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
003863	010595	Mr D Clark

(Objection adopted by Mr & Mrs Beeden with the Council’s agreement)

Summary of Objection

The Green Belt boundary behind Main Street Calverton is not sensible. It does not follow any physical feature and has been drawn in an arbitrary manner by someone who is not familiar with the area. It bisects the objectors’ property in a way that lacks logic.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

1. Mr and Mrs Beeden want the whole of their land removed from the Green Belt and included within the development boundary for the village of Calverton.
2. My understanding of the historical background is that the objectors’ land was once the walled kitchen garden of Calverton Hall (now demolished). However, the garden wall is still substantially in tact and it encloses the objection site, setting it apart visually from the agricultural land to the south. The objectors say that all their land has been within the curtilage of the their house since it was built (in the 1930s) and has been domestically rated for 23 years. Although they also say that the objection site was not originally in the Green Belt, all the evidence I have indicates that the adopted Green Belt boundary followed a line close to the back of their house with the effect that most of the objection site was Green Belt.
3. The Council accepts that there may have been some slight movement in the position of the Green Belt boundary because of “drafting error” or the “thickness of the pen”. However, it is still substantially in the same position as it was in the adopted Gedling Local Plan and in the Green Belt Local Plan before that. There has been one other material change introduced in this review of the Local Plan and that is that a smaller property has been built next to the objectors’ house. The Council has resolved that the Green Belt boundary should be redrawn to exclude the garden of this new property. The issue, therefore, is whether there are sufficiently compelling reasons to redraw the boundary as it affects the objectors’ land.
4. The objectors argue that the Green Belt boundary as it crosses their property is arbitrary and does not follow any feature that is visible on the ground. They point to the guidance in PPG2 that says Green Belt boundaries should be clearly defined – using readily recognisable features such as roads, streams, belts of trees or woodland edges where possible. This could be accomplished if the boundary followed the garden wall. Failing that, the stream that crosses the site just inside the wall (and is followed by the Green Belt boundary to the west) could be used. They say that to exclude the majority of their land could cause problems when they sell their property and that the line is too tightly drawn at the back of their house to allow reasonable house extensions. In any event the history of the site indicates that the wall is the established extent of the domestic use, which is a consideration that is used elsewhere in the village.
5. The Council says there is no need or reason to move the adopted Green Belt boundary. GBC is concerned that if the Green Belt boundary is pulled back to the wall or the stream, similar considerations might lead to the boundary also being pulled back

to the east to follow the stream there. But the major concern for the Council is that if the boundary is moved the land could be developed (with or without land to the east) for several additional houses. This would harm the form of the village, the adjoining conservation area and the Green Belt itself because of the visual intrusion of any new housing in this location. GBC would look sympathetically at any reasonable proposals to extend the existing house even if this involved some incursion into the Green Belt but the Council does not want to open the way to new residential properties.

6. Although the objectors could see no harm in the land behind their house being developed for housing, I share the view that this would harm the form of the village, the adjoining conservation area and the wider Green Belt to the south. It would, in my view, be particularly harmful if the land immediately to the east were also to be involved, although it has to be said that there is no objection that seeks to remove the adjoining land from the Green Belt in this review of the Local Plan.
7. It may be that access limitations would preclude the possibility of any substantial development at the back of the objection site whether or not it is in the Green Belt. But I view the possibility of additional houses here with such concern that I am unwilling to recommend that the site is removed from the Green Belt even to achieve a recognisable boundary feature on the ground or to include the whole of the domestic curtilage. In my view, the sensitivity of this location warrants this departure from the usual practices followed in defining Green Belt boundaries.
8. As to whether the boundary is so tightly drawn as to unreasonably restrict extensions to the existing house, I note what the Council has said about this. Anything but the most excessive and disproportionate extension would still be far removed from the back of the objection site, whereas new dwellings would sit much further back in the site. Given the depth of the site and the screening provided by the garden wall, I consider that even a substantial extension to the existing house could be designed to have little impact on the wider Green Belt. In view of the Council's assurance on this matter I am not persuaded that this is a sufficient reason to move the boundary to another arbitrarily determined position.
9. The difficulties that may, or may not, arise when the property comes to be sold, have not been substantiated in my view.
10. Taking all these matters into account, on balance I conclude that the Green Belt boundary should be retained where the Council resolved it should be in the Second Deposit version of the Local Plan.

RECOMMENDATION

- 11. I recommend no modification to the Local Plan in response to this objection.**
-

1A.5 ENV26 CONTROL OVER DEVELOPMENT IN THE GREEN BELT REMOVE LAND FROM THE GREEN BELT BROOKFIELD NURSERY

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001334	003029	Jaycee (Nottingham) Ltd.

Summary of Objection

Brookfield Nursery should be removed from the Green Belt. The Green Belt boundary should be amended to follow this site's southeastern and northeastern boundaries. The land should be allocated for residential development. The ridgeline is not material in considering the merits of the land as Green Belt. The existing garden centre is not an appropriate use in the Green Belt.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

1. For convenience and to avoid unnecessary repetition this objection is dealt with in the Housing section of this report.

RECOMMENDATION

2. For my recommendation on this objection, see the Housing chapter of my report (under policy H2 as an Additional Site).
-

1A.6 ENV26 CONTROL OVER DEVELOPMENT IN THE GREEN BELT REMOVE LAND FROM THE GREEN BELT ADJACENT TO BROOKFIELD NURSERY

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001938	004538	Mr D Frudd c/o FDP Savills

Summary of Objection

Land adjacent to Brookfield Nursery should be removed from the Green Belt to provide more housing land..

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

1. For convenience and to avoid unnecessary repetition this objection is dealt with in the Housing section of this report.

RECOMMENDATION

2. For my recommendation on this objection, see the Housing chapter of my report (under policy H2 as an Additional Site).
-

1A.7 ENV26 CONTROL OVER DEVELOPMENT IN THE GREEN BELT RESTORE LAND TO THE GREEN BELT BEECH AVENUE, RAVENSHEAD

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000050	000068	Mr V Clarke

AND ABOUT 30 OTHER INDIVIDUAL OBJECTIONS

Summary of Objection

Land at Beech Avenue should not be removed from the Green Belt. To do so would result in urban sprawl so that Ravenshead would eventually merge with Mansfield. Any relaxation would set a precedent for larger scale development, would threaten wildlife and lead to pressure on local services.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

1. There is a small pocket of housing north of Main Road Ravenshead between the Larch Farm and Silverland Farm. There are about a dozen houses fronting onto Main Road and about the same number behind, accessed from Beech Avenue. For the most part this is a compact area of residential development, although there are some long back gardens behind a few of the houses at the eastern end of the group.
2. Although this land was previously in the adopted Green Belt, the Review Local Plan Proposals Map now shows it as excluded from the Green Belt and inside the development limit for Ravenshead. The Council explains that its motive in seeking to remove the land from the Green Belt is to avoid the necessity for treating any large proposed house extensions as departures from the Development Plan. In the Council's view there is little likelihood of any additional dwellings because of the density of the existing development, although there may be some scope for new houses in the long back gardens I have already referred to if these are accessible from Beech Avenue. Be that as it may, although it is on the "wrong" (rural) side of Main Road, the group is well defined by the existing dwellings and their curtilages and is distinct from the surrounding countryside both in its use and its appearance.
3. The objectors are concerned that removing this small area from the Green Belt would open the floodgates and set a precedent for general residential development in the surrounding countryside to the north. However, the surrounding open land all remains in the Green Belt and is distinctively rural in character. My view is that the removal of this group of dwellings from the Green Belt is of no consequence to the wider Green Belt because the area involved is so tightly related to existing residential properties. Although there may be some small scope for additional houses in the long back gardens referred to above or for infilling, this would have little or no impact either on the visual impact of the existing group or on the surrounding countryside and Green Belt.
4. The objectors are also concerned that the removal of this area from the Green Belt would harm nature conservation and overload services in the area. In my view the changed designation is more a recognition of the existing situation than a harbinger of great change. The impact on nature conservation and services would therefore not be noticeable.

5. Having considered all the reasons for objection I can find none that are so weighty as to rule out the proposed change to the Green Belt boundary. Although the reason for the change may only be administrative convenience, it does reflect the existing situation. As the Green Belt boundary is being reviewed in this Local Plan, it is expedient to make the change now.
6. I conclude that the objections should not succeed.

RECOMMENDATION

7. I recommend no modification to the Local Plan in response to these objections.
-

1A.8 ENV26 CONTROL OVER DEVELOPMENT IN THE GREEN BELT REMOVE LAND FROM THE GREEN BELT EAST OF CALVERTON (BONNER LANE / CROOKDOLE LANE)

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001344	003122	Slack; Kirkham; Goldby; Grococks (Joint)

Summary of Objection

Land East of Calverton between Bonner Lane and Crookdole Lane should be removed from the Green Belt and allocated for housing development.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

1. This objection is considered in the section of the report dealing with policy H2 (Omission Site at Bonner Lane Calverton).

RECOMMENDATION

2. For my recommendation on this objection see under policy H2 (Additional Housing Site at Bonner Lane Calverton).
-

1A.9 ENV26 CONTROL OVER DEVELOPMENT IN THE GREEN BELT REMOVE LAND FROM THE GREEN BELT EAST OF BESTWOOD VILLAGE

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001774	004074	Mr R Hicks

Summary of Objection

An area of land to the east of Bestwood village should be excluded from the Green Belt to allow development. This would not obstruct the public footpath or harm the Country Park.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

1. I note this objection also seeks the allocation of land for development even though its subject is Green Belt policy. I will therefore consider both aspects of the objection here.

Villages in the Green Belt

2. The Local Plan treats the villages in the Green Belt in one of three ways:
 - it excludes (or “insets”) the built up area of the village from the Green Belt notation so that limited development may take place within the village;
 - it includes (“washes over”) the village in the Green Belt but defines an “infill boundary” within which infilling will be allowed (see policy ENV30);
 - it includes (“washes over”) the village within the Green Belt without any “infill boundary “ so that Green Belt policies apply throughout the village.
3. This approach is in accordance with the guidance from government in the current PPG2 (paragraph 2.11). I therefore consider that the approach is acceptable.
4. GBC collected data on the services and character of each rural settlement and has categorised the villages as follows:
 - ***Inset Villages:*** Bestwood, Burton Joyce, Calverton, Newstead and Ravenshead;
 - ***Washed over Villages with Infill Boundaries:*** Lambley, Linby, Papplewick and Woodborough;
 - ***Washed Over Villages Without Infill Boundaries:*** all the smaller settlements, including Stoke Bardolph.
5. Having studied the Council’s data and considered objections on the matter, my own view is that this categorisation is reasonable and justified. I reach this conclusion even though – in my view – Bestwood, Newstead and Woodborough are all middle order settlements with a rather limited range of facilities. This suggests they should all be treated as washed over villages with infill boundaries. However, I accept that the character and circumstances of Bestwood and Newstead are such that they would benefit from some limited development and diversification. In addition there are particular reasons why the housing allocations in Bestwood and Newstead have been included in the plan.

Bestwood

6. As I have indicated, in my view Bestwood is not an entirely satisfactory location for development. However, I am recommending that the allocation of land for residential development in the centre of the village is retained in the Local Plan, mainly in recognition of the fact that it is previously developed land. That site is nearly 5 ha in

extent and therefore fulfils any requirement or scope there is for limited development in the village. In these circumstances I consider it is unnecessary to allocate further land for housing in the village and that it would not be in accord with the principle of sustainability to do so.

7. For this reason I conclude that this objection site should not be allocated for residential development in the Local Plan.

Green Belt

8. As to whether the land should be removed from the Green Belt and designated as Safeguarded Land (see under policy H4), in my view there is only a need for a very limited amount of such land around Bestwood. This is because I do not envisage it ever being a centre for large-scale development.
9. In practice I have a choice between two objection sites at Bestwood for this purpose: the site north of the Spinney and this land at Broadvalley Farm. To remove both from the Green Belt is unnecessary in my view. Comparing the two potential sites, the Spinney site has several advantages as potential Safeguarded Land:
 - it is less obtrusive in the countryside;
 - it is better related to public transport services;
 - it is more compact because the Broadvalley Farm site is rather long and narrow;
 - it also preserves the compact form of the village more;
 - it was identified as relatively free from constraints in the Council's sieve map analysis of the Green Belt.
10. For these reasons, I conclude that the land north of the Spinney should be designated as Safeguarded Land in preference to this objection site.

Overall Conclusions

11. I note the claim that development of this site need not interfere with the footpath or harm the Country Park but this does not alter my assessment. I conclude that the Local Plan should not be modified.

RECOMMENDATION

12. I recommend no modification to the Local Plan in response to this objection.
-

1A.10 ENV26 CONTROL OVER DEVELOPMENT IN THE GREEN BELT RETAIN LAND IN THE GREEN BELT DARK LANE CALVERTON

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001641	003882	Mr K Horton

Summary of Objection

Development should not take place in the Green Belt particularly at Dark Lane, Calverton. This area should be kept in the Green Belt.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

1. In the First Deposit and Second Deposit the land at Dark Lane retains its Green Belt designation. I therefore regard this as a representation in support of the Local Plan as it now stands. However, I consider land at Dark Lane as a potential housing site as a result of an objection to policy H2, where I take this representation into account.

RECOMMENDATION

2. For my recommendations concerning land at Dark Lane Calverton see under policy H2 (Additional Site Dark Lane Calverton).
-

1A.11 ENV26 CONTROL OVER DEVELOPMENT IN THE GREEN BELT RESTORE LAND TO THE GREEN BELT GEDLING COLLIERY / CHASE FARM

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001021	002196	Hallam Land Management Ltd
001949	010876	c/o J H Walter Rural Consultants

AND 5 INDIVIDUAL OBJECTIONS

IN ADDITION MANY OBJECTORS TO POLICIES H2 AND H3 REFER TO THE GREEN BELT.

Summary of Objection

The site is in the Green Belt and should remain so. This is an attractive tract of farmland. Priority should be to develop brownfield sites. Also the impact of the access road on Gedling Wood is objected to.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

1. For convenience and to avoid unnecessary repetition these objections are dealt with in the part of this report on policy H3 (Land at Former Gedling Colliery and Chase Farm)

RECOMMENDATION

2. For my recommendations see under policy H3.
-

1A.12 ENV26 CONTROL OVER DEVELOPMENT IN THE GREEN BELT REMOVE LAND FROM THE GREEN BELT GEDLING HOUSE

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001944	004549	Lloyds TSB

Summary of Objection

Land at Gedling House should be removed from the Green Belt and Mature Landscape Area (MLA) with the intention of building one dwelling in the walled garden. The Gedling Relief Road (Gedling Colliery ./ Chase Farm Access Road – GCCF access road) will provide a long-term development limit in this area.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

1. Although this objection was recorded as relating to Green Belt policy it has two other aspects: the MLA and the proposed dwelling. I shall deal with all these matters here.

Green Belt

2. As far as the Green Belt is concerned, the land around Gedling House is part of the open gap between the built up area of the Nottingham suburbs and Burton Joyce. Whilst there may be a case for eroding the width of this gap by removing relatively small areas of land from the Green Belt at each end of the gap, to remove Gedling House and the land associated with it would very seriously compromise the gap and its effectiveness.
3. It may be that in the longer term the construction of the GCCF access road will provide a new and more clearly defined boundary between the built up area and the Green Belt. However, I am not sure that this will prove to be the case in this particular area. Much will depend on the level of the road and the associated earthworks and landscaping. It may be that the view will be taken that the road should pass through a green corridor at this point. Be that as it may, at the time of the Local Plan Inquiry the exact line of the access road was still subject to variation depending on detailed design and Environmental Impact work. I therefore regard it as an insufficiently clear and defensible boundary for the Green Belt at the moment, irrespective of what the longer-term assessment will be.
4. Without a fixed, clear and discernible road line on the ground, I consider there is no satisfactory feature available in this area to form a revised Green Belt boundary. This being the case I conclude that the Green Belt boundary should remain as it is shown on the Proposals Map.

Mature Landscape Area

5. Some of the same considerations also apply to the MLA. The land in question is part of an attractive tract of open land with a distinctive and historic character. Whether in the long term the proposed road will provide a new landscape and a new boundary for the MLA in this vicinity remains to be seen. But as things stand now there is no firm basis upon which to revise the boundary and I conclude that it should remain where it is.

Proposed Dwelling

6. As to the proposed single dwelling, I am wary of the suggestion that general planning policies should be altered to accommodate a single proposal, however special it might be. In any event other considerations may also arise, such as the impact on the listed

building. Be that as it may, it is a matter of such detail that I consider it falls beyond my remit as a Local Plan Inspector. In any event while the land remains in the Green Belt such a proposal would amount to inappropriate development that could only be justified in very special circumstances.

7. For all these reasons I conclude that I cannot make any positive recommendation in relation to the proposed single dwelling.

Overall Conclusions

8. I conclude that no modification to any part of the Local Plan should be made in response to this objection.

RECOMMENDATION

9. I recommend no modification to the Local Plan.
-

1A.13 ENV26 CONTROL OVER DEVELOPMENT IN THE GREEN BELT REMOVE LAND FROM THE GREEN BELT GIBBETDALE WOOD, RAVENSHEAD

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000768	001183	Dr A Middleton
000770	001186	Dr D Middleton

Summary of Objection

One dwelling should be allowed at Gibbetdale Wood even though it is in the Green Belt. The dwelling would be “eco-friendly”, landscaped, hidden from the road and would not create a precedent. There is also a lapsed planning permission at this site.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

1. It is not really my role to assess individual proposals for single dwellings.
2. However, looking at the policy context, the site is in the Green Belt. This means that except in very special circumstances new dwellings will not be allowed. The objectors are therefore either seeking a change to the policy or the removal of this site from the Green Belt.
3. Green Belt policy is a national policy applied locally. Indeed part of its strength lies in its national uniformity and in it being applied consistently. I am satisfied that the Green Belt policy in this Local Plan conforms to the national guidance and I cannot conceive of any way that it could be modified to allow for one dwelling on a particular site without departing from the national guidance. In any event I am not attracted to the notion that general planning policies should be altered to suit the particular circumstances of a one-off proposal.
4. Whether there are very special circumstances in this case is a matter to be tested by a planning application. However, none of the matters mentioned in the objections appear to me to amount to the sort of very special circumstances that would warrant setting aside the Green Belt policy at this site.
5. As to removing the site from the Green Belt, all of the land at Ravenshead to the west of the A60 is in the Green Belt. This road forms a clear and strong boundary between the Green Belt and the village development limit. There is no sound planning reason for removing this objection site (in isolation) or a larger area from the Green Belt.
6. If there was a planning permission on the site that has now lapsed any proposal to revive or renew it should be assessed in the light of the current Development Plan. Whether the Development Plan is the previously adopted Local Plan or this review of it, the Green Belt policy is still applicable.
7. I conclude that the Local Plan should not be modified on account of these objections.

RECOMMENDATION

8. I recommend no modification to the Local Plan.

1A.14 ENV26 CONTROL OVER DEVELOPMENT IN THE GREEN BELT REMOVE LAND FROM THE GREEN BELT GLEBE FARM, LAMBLEY LANE

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001090	002296	Alan Rowe Properties

Summary of Objection

Land at Glebe Farm should be allocated for residential development and the Green Belt boundary amended for this reason.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

1. This site is also considered in the Housing chapter of my report in relation to policy H3 and the Gedling Colliery / Chase Farm development. In that context I am recommending that the Green Belt boundary in this area should follow Lambley Lane, excluding all of this objection site from the Green Belt.
2. I conclude that this site should be removed from the Green Belt.

RECOMMENDATION

3. I recommend that this objection site should be excluded from the Green Belt.

1A.15 ENV26 CONTROL OVER DEVELOPMENT IN THE GREEN BELT REMOVE LAND FROM THE GREEN BELT KIGHILL LANE, RAVENSHEAD

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000521	000746	Miss L Nightingale

Summary of Objection

Land fronting onto Kighill Lane should be excluded from the Green Belt and included in an infill boundary to allow infilling. The objector's one-acre plot is the last one in Kighill Lane and should be developed to be in keeping with the existing properties in the road. Other areas with small vacant plots have infill boundaries.

ALSO CONSIDERED HERE IS AN OBJECTION TO POLICY ENV30 (INFILL BOUNDARIES FOR WASHED OVER VILLAGES IN THE GREEN BELT)

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000521	000747	Miss L Nightingale

Summary of Objection

Land fronting onto Kighill Lane should be excluded from the Green Belt and included in an infill boundary to allow infilling. The objector's one-acre plot is the last one in Kighill Lane and should be developed to be in keeping with the existing properties in the road. Other areas with small vacant plots have infill boundaries.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

1. I consider the block of land between Regina Crescent and Kighill Lane in some detail under policy H2 in the Housing chapter of this report. This objection site is part of that larger block and this objector does not raise any general planning considerations that I have not taken into account there.

2. Policy ENV30 concerns the medium sized villages in the Green Belt that are “washed over” but have infill boundaries. In fact Ravenshead is a larger village which has a development limit that excludes it from the Green Belt. It is not clear to me whether this objector seeks the inclusion of land at Kighill Lane within the development limit for Ravenshead or thinks that Kighill Lane should have its own infill boundary that stands alone. I shall therefore consider both possibilities.

Villages in the Green Belt

3. The Local Plan treats the villages in the Green Belt in one of three ways:
- it excludes (or “insets”) the built up area of the village from the Green Belt notation so that limited development may take place within the village;
 - it includes (“washes over”) the village in the Green Belt but defines an “infill boundary” within which infilling will be allowed (see policy ENV30);
 - it includes (“washes over”) the village within the Green Belt without any “infill boundary “ so that Green Belt policies apply throughout the village.
4. This approach is in accordance with the guidance from government in the current PPG2 (paragraph 2.11). I therefore consider that the approach is acceptable.
5. GBC collected data on the services and character of each rural settlement and has categorised the villages as follows:
- ***Inset Villages:*** Bestwood, Burton Joyce, Calverton, Newstead and Ravenshead;
 - ***Washed over Villages with Infill Boundaries:*** Lambley, Linby, Papplewick and Woodborough;
 - ***Washed Over Villages Without Infill Boundaries:*** all the smaller settlements, including Stoke Bardolph.
6. Having studied the Council’s data and considered objections on the matter, my own view is that this categorisation is reasonable and justified. I reach this conclusion even though – in my view – Bestwood, Newstead and Woodborough are all middle order settlements with a rather limited range of facilities. This would suggest that they should all be treated as washed over villages with infill boundaries. However, I accept that the character and circumstances of Bestwood and Newstead are such that they would benefit from some limited development and diversification. In addition there are particular reasons why the housing allocations in Bestwood and Newstead have been included in the plan.

Ravenshead

7. In any event Ravenshead – as one of the largest villages with a full range of services and facilities – is in my view correctly categorised as an Inset Village that is suitable for limited development. Against this background I am recommending that land south of Regina Crescent should be included within the development limit and allocated for housing and that a further area to the south of that should be taken out of the Green Belt and designated as Safeguarded Land. (For a fuller discussion of Safeguarded Land see under policy H4 in the Housing chapter of my report.) These recommendations make ample provision for “limited development” in Ravenshead both within this Local Plan period (to 2011) and beyond.

Kighill Lane

8. In my view the existing properties around the Kighill Lane / Longdale Lane junction are a rather loose-knit group of sporadic development in the countryside. Looked at **on their own** this group is too small and lacking in basic services (schools, shops and the like) to be regarded as a settlement where development should be allowed. They are (at most) a washed over settlement without an infill boundary. Furthermore, the buildings here are so loose-knit that if an infill boundary were to be established it might lead to a very considerable amount of development and redevelopment. This objector, for example, describes her objection site as a one-acre plot. In other circumstances a plot of this size might accommodate in the order of a dozen dwellings or more.
9. I therefore conclude that the Local Plan is correct not to identify a separate infill boundary or development limit for the Kighill Lane area.
10. The question then arises as to whether this area should be included **as part of the development limit for Ravenshead** as a whole. I accept that this area and this objection site are candidates for such treatment in the Local Plan. However, land to the north is better suited to this purpose and the further down Longdale Lane one travels the less suitable for inclusion the area becomes (because of the increasing distance from the village centre and because of increasing intrusion into the countryside). Moreover to include this area **instead** of land to the north would create a very irregular and intrusive boundary for the village to the detriment of the surrounding countryside and the Green Belt.
11. As established above, Ravenshead is a suitable location for development but only for limited development. All the immediate and long term needs for limited development in Ravenshead can be met on better placed land to the north of this objection site. There is therefore no need to remove this site from the Green Belt and to do so would harm the integrity of the Green Belt.

Conclusions

12. I therefore conclude that no modification to the Local Plan should be made in response to these objections. To do so could create either a major development area at Ravenshead and/or a most irregular and intrusive boundary for the village to the detriment of the Green Belt.

RECOMMENDATION

13. I recommend no modification to the Local Plan in response to these objections.
-

1A.16 ENV26 CONTROL OVER DEVELOPMENT IN THE GREEN BELT REMOVE LAND FROM THE GREEN BELT GEDLING WOOD FARM

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
003972	010831	Metro Jennings Ltd

Summary of Objection

Land north of Gedling Village (around Gedling Wood Farm) should be excluded from the Green Belt to enable housing development to fund the GCCF access road on a new alignment. Suitable planting would take place. This is a sustainable location for development. A substantial Green Belt would remain between Burton Joyce and Gedling to ensure no coalescence of the two areas.

ALSO DEALT WITH HERE IS AN OBJECTION TO POLICY ENV35 (MATURE LANDSCAPE AREAS)

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
003972	010832	Metro Jennings Ltd

Summary of Objection

The area around Gedling Wood does not contain any key features used to define MLAs that would be harmed by development. The area has changed over the past century and could be improved (visually?) by structural landscaping.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

1. The Green Belt objection was to the First Deposit. In the Second Deposit the GCCF access road was moved to a new alignment further from the existing built up area, although this route is still subject to detailed design and Environmental Impact Assessment. The precise alignment may change as a result of the detailed work. Whether the final outcome will be exactly the route suggested in this objection remains to be seen. Nevertheless it would appear that this objection has largely been met as far as the road alignment is concerned.
2. Pending detailed work on the road alignment, I consider it would be (at least) premature to alter the Green Belt boundary or to allocate land for housing development on the basis of the new route. A precise and clear boundary for the Green Belt is required and the current road alignment is not certain enough to provide this. I therefore consider that the Green Belt boundary should remain as it is in the adopted Local Plan (that is, drawn tightly against the existing built up area). (This is discussed in more detail in relation to the housing site "H2 Land South of Lambley Lane", where similar considerations arise and upon which I received more evidence.)
3. Much the same issues arise in relation to the MLA. This area is part of a larger MLA tract that should not be redrawn or reduced until the line of the road is known.
4. The issues of improvements by landscaping and the adequacy of the gap between Gedling and Burton Joyce are matters that should be revisited when the new road alignment is fixed and do not alter my view of the situation at the present time. The same is true of the claim that this is an edge of urban and sustainable location.
5. I conclude that the Local Plan should not be modified.

RECOMMENDATION

6. I recommend no modification to the Local Plan in response to these objections.

1A.17 ENV26 CONTROL OVER DEVELOPMENT IN THE GREEN BELT REMOVE LAND FROM THE GREEN BELT NORTH OF HUCKNALL

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001021	002195	Hallam Land Management Ltd

Summary of Objection

An area south of Newstead should be removed from the Green Belt instead of the area north of Hucknall. It would be better to extend Newstead southwards than to extend Hucknall northwards.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

1. This objection is considered in the part of my report dealing with an objection to Housing policy H2 (Additional Site South of Newstead).

RECOMMENDATION

2. For my recommendation on this objection see under policy H2.
-

1A.18 ENV26 CONTROL OVER DEVELOPMENT IN THE GREEN BELT REMOVE LAND FROM THE GREEN BELT MANSFIELD LANE CALVERTON

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000122	000154	Jon Walker Timber Products Ltd

Summary of Objection

The Green Belt north of Calverton unreasonably restricts the operation and future expansion of the woodyard at Mansfield Lane. The business is established in what were redundant farm buildings north of Mansfield Lane and promotes rural crafts and local employment that are very much needed in the area. The Green Belt boundary should be redrawn to exclude this existing enterprise.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000431	000613	Mr R Graham

Summary of Objection

The properties north of Mansfield Lane should be excluded from the Green Belt. The Green Belt is an unreasonable restriction on the operation and development of these businesses. Although the area was previously in agricultural uses, this is no longer relevant today because the land holdings are too small. More businesses could be created if this restriction were to be removed.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

1. Wherever the Green Belt boundary is drawn it is possible that some businesses will be included. Along the northern side of Mansfield Lane / Carrington Lane there are a variety of business and residential properties some occupying what were previously agricultural sites and buildings. The road frontage is a mixture of such uses and fields. All of this land is in the adopted Green Belt and remains in it on the current Proposals Map.
2. In drawing and reviewing the Green Belt boundary the guidance in PPG2 has to be taken into account and this says that a clear and “defensible” boundary should be

used. The line of Mansfield Lane / Carrington Lane is a good example of such a clear and defensible boundary. To the south the land is clearly built up and within the village. To the north the land is largely open, although there are some relatively small businesses interspersed with open land. The field pattern in the area is irregular with narrow fields of different lengths. To attempt to draw the boundary around the existing businesses would produce a very irregular and unclear boundary. There is no sensible and easily marked feature that could be used as a boundary between Mansfield Lane / Carrington Lane and Thorndale Plantation and Dover Beck. In all the circumstances, I consider that the Green Belt boundary shown on the Proposals Map is the only serviceable one that is available.

3. I recognise that this is likely to cause difficulties for the businesses that find themselves on the “wrong” side of the line. The objectors mention restrictions on open storage and building heights. New buildings and expansions may also be problematic. However, it seems to me that this is an unavoidable consequence of locating in a rural area and using converted agricultural premises. It is not that I do not sympathise with the business needs of the objectors or fail to recognise the importance of local employment. But I can see no realistic or workable alternative here. In planning terms the Green Belt boundary is definitely in the right place.
4. I conclude that the Local Plan should not be modified.

RECOMMENDATION

5. I recommend no modification to the Local Plan in response to these objections.

1A.19 ENV26 CONTROL OVER DEVELOPMENT IN THE GREEN BELT RESTORE LAND TO THE GREEN BELT MAPPERLEY GOLF COURSE

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001158	002498	Nottingham County Council (Strategic Property)

Summary of Objection

This site should not be removed from the Green Belt. The golf course use is appropriate in the Green Belt. Other policies should adequately control ancillary development so that the objectives of Green Belt policy are not compromised. There is no justification given for removing the site from the Green Belt, although special circumstances are required.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

1. For convenience and to avoid unnecessary repetition this objection is dealt with in the context of policy H2 (Additional Site – Mapperley Golf Course)

RECOMMENDATIONS

2. For my recommendations on Mapperley Golf Course see policy H2 (Additional Site – Mapperley Golf Course).

1A.20 ENV26 CONTROL OVER DEVELOPMENT IN THE GREEN BELT REMOVE LAND FROM THE GREEN BELT LAND ADJOINING MILLFIELD, BURTON JOYCE

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001645	003891	Miss J Stafford
001934	004516	Arriva Plc
003910	010718	Mr G Shaw

Summary of Objection

The land adjoining Millfield Close, Burton Joyce should be taken out of the Green Belt and allocated for residential development.

ALSO DEALT WITH HERE IS AN OBJECTION TO POLICY H2:

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001943	004550	Persimmon Homes (North Midlands) Ltd

Summary of Objection

Land adjacent to Millfield Close Burton Joyce should be allocated for housing. There is a need for more housing land in the borough. Burton Joyce and this site were identified by GBC as sustainable locations and suitable for limited development in the earlier work on the Local Plan. The Green Belt gap between Nottingham and Burton Joyce would not be prejudiced because the north side of A612 is already built up.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

1. Although the Council has recorded three of these objections as being only to the Green Belt policy, all the objectors also say this site should be allocated for housing. For convenience I shall deal with both aspects of the objections here.

Villages in the Green Belt

2. The Local Plan treats the villages in the Green Belt in one of three ways:
 - it excludes (or “insets”) the built up area of the village from the Green Belt notation so that limited development may take place within the village;
 - it includes (“washes over”) the village in the Green Belt but defines an “infill boundary” within which infilling will be allowed (see policy ENV30);
 - it includes (“washes over”) the village within the Green Belt without any “infill boundary “ so that Green Belt policies apply throughout the village.
3. This approach is in accordance with the guidance from government in the current PPG2 (paragraph 2.11). I therefore consider that the approach is acceptable.
4. GBC collected data on the services and character of each rural settlement and has categorised the villages as follows:
 - ***Inset Villages:*** Bestwood, Burton Joyce, Calverton, Newstead and Ravenshead;
 - ***Washed over Villages with Infill Boundaries:*** Lambley, Linby, Papplewick and Woodborough;
 - ***Washed Over Villages Without Infill Boundaries:*** all the smaller settlements, including Stoke Bardolph.
5. Having studied the Council’s data and considered objections on the matter, my own view is that this categorisation is reasonable and justified. I reach this conclusion even though – in my view – Bestwood, Newstead and Woodborough are all middle order

settlements with a rather limited range of facilities. This suggests that they should all be treated as washed over villages with infill boundaries. However, I accept that the character and circumstances of Bestwood and Newstead are such that they would benefit from some limited development and diversification. In addition there are particular reasons why the housing allocations in Bestwood and Newstead have been included in the plan.

Burton Joyce

6. In any event, the situation in Bestwood, Newstead and Woodborough has little bearing on which category Burton Joyce should be in and I consider it is properly classified as an inset village. This means that, in principle, it is suitable for limited development beyond infilling.
7. However, whilst the village may be suitable for limited development in terms of its size and facilities, to my mind there is no necessity to allocate land for housing in the village if suitable sites cannot be found and there is no demonstrable local need. If all my recommendations are followed that would be the outcome in Burton Joyce.
8. In my view there is scope in Burton Joyce for infilling and intensification whether or not sites large enough for allocation are identified in the Local Plan and several objectors (to the Park Avenue site) have said that this has been happening in recent years. I consider that more development only *has* to be located in Burton Joyce either to meet a particular local need or if enough housing land cannot be found in and adjoining urban areas.

The Objection Site and the Need for Housing Land

9. Whilst this site cannot be described as a major development opportunity, in my view particular reasons would be needed to justify its allocation for housing development and its removal from the Green Belt. Otherwise the general approach to the location of housing should prevail.
10. This land is in the narrow and sensitive open gap between the built up area of Nottingham and Burton Joyce and it performs the important Green Belt function of preventing the coalescence of settlements. The narrowness of the gap makes it vulnerable and development in it would reduce the visual impact it currently has. It is true that the Council has indicated it is willing to reduce the width of this gap with a housing allocation at Linden Grove but I do not recommend that proposed allocation either. In my view, the existing ribbon of development on the north side of the A612 does not reduce the importance of the gap or the contribution that this site makes to it.
11. I am told that during the preparation of the Local Plan, the Council's officers recommended the allocation of this site for housing but the members of the Council did not accept their recommendation, preferring an alternative site in the centre of the village. Although there are objections to the alternative allocation, it is closer to village facilities and is in a more sustainable location than this objection site. Accordingly, it is to be preferred to this objection site. (In fact I recommend the deletion of the site at Park Avenue but this can be seen as a technical change and I still anticipate that some development is likely to occur there.) Nevertheless I accept that Millfield Close is a sustainable location. However, I do not regard this by itself as a sufficient justification for development.

12. I deal with the general issue of how much land is needed for housing development elsewhere. I am satisfied enough land can be found in the borough without this site.
13. For all these reasons I consider that the objection site should not be allocated for residential development in this review of the Local Plan.

The Green Belt

14. As I have said, in my view the preservation of the open gap between Burton Joyce and the main built up area of Nottingham is an important consideration. On the face of it this indicates that this site should remain in the Green Belt. However, Burton Joyce is a village where limited development can take place and I have found no allocation site that is more suitable than this one. Looking to the long term it is possible that there will be a local need for housing in the village and that all the scope for infilling and intensification will have been exhausted. Therefore, and in line with my general approach to Safeguarded Land in policy H4, I consider it appropriate to identify some land between the village development limit and the Green Belt at Burton Joyce. This would not mean that the site will necessarily be developed in the long term. But it would mean that this site could be considered without the need to alter the Green Belt boundary if a compelling need did arise at the next review of the Local Plan. In my view this site is the best available for this purpose at Burton Joyce.
15. I note that the objection site has (and would continue to have) a clear, landscaped and defensible boundary. It generally performs well in relation to the criteria I have identified in policy H4 for selecting Safeguarded Land. I therefore consider that the objection site should be taken out of the Green Belt and protected as Safeguarded Land (see under policy H4).

Other Matters

16. It is said that this is a small parcel of land in a separate ownership from all the land around it. This makes it difficult to find a use for the land and it has been unused for many years. However, the same could be said of many sites in the district, perhaps especially in and around villages. To accept this as a determining consideration in the search for housing land could lead to a very dispersed and haphazard distribution of housing development that owed more to the historical accidents of land ownership than to a coherent strategy. I therefore attach little weight to this particular consideration.
17. At the hearing concerning this site some time was spent discussing the appropriate density for development. If the land were to be allocated, the Council would favour a high density in line with its general approach but the landowner advocated a lower density in keeping with the adjacent housing. In my view this discussion is largely irrelevant to deciding whether the land should be allocated for development or removed from the Green Belt. However, if the land were ever developed I would expect the best use to be made of the land.
18. It is agreed there is no highway objection to developing this site, which could be accessed from Millfield Close. However, this is not a sufficient reason to allocate the site for housing, although it is a contributory consideration as far as the identification of Safeguarded Land is concerned.

Conclusions

19. Overall, therefore, there are strong reasons for not allocating this site for housing in this review of the Local Plan and I conclude that the objection site should not be allocated for residential development.
20. Indeed, because of its contribution to the open gap between Burton Joyce and Nottingham, there are strong reasons for not removing this land from the Green Belt. However, in the longer term there may be an overriding need for more housing in Burton Joyce and this site would be a candidate. It is the strongest candidate in the village that has come to my attention. For this reason I conclude that the site should be removed from the Green Belt and protected as Safeguarded Land.

RECOMMENDATIONS

21. I recommend that this objection site should not be allocated for residential development in the Local Plan.
22. I recommend that the objection site should be removed from the Green Belt and protected as Safeguarded Land.

1A.21 ENV26 CONTROL OVER DEVELOPMENT IN THE GREEN BELT REMOVE LAND FROM THE GREEN BELT: NEW FARM

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001348	003324	Mr P Anderson-Price

Summary of Objection

New Farm is on the edge of the urban area and adjacent to a public transport corridor. It should be allocated for residential development

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
003827	010496	Nottingham City Council

Summary of Objection

Officers recommended an allocation of 200 dwellings on the southern part of New Farm. This should be reconsidered as it would help reduce the under-provision of dwellings. The site adjoins the urban area in accordance with policy 2/1 of Structure Plan. If it is not allocated for development, it should be White Land.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
003835	010533	R.A.G.E.

Summary of Objection

New Farm should remain in Green Belt. The attractive landscape would be destroyed and lost forever.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

1. I consider these objections under policy H2.

RECOMMENDATION

2. For my recommendations see under policy H2 (Additional Site New Farm).

1A.22 ENV26 CONTROL OVER DEVELOPMENT IN THE GREEN BELT RESTORE LAND TO THE GREEN BELT SOUTH OF LAMBLEY LANE

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001164	002556	Miss R Parkinson
001166	002561	Dr N Hawkins

Summary of Objection

Land south of Lambley Lane should be kept in the Green Belt. The land has become a haven for wildlife.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

1. These objections were to the First Deposit. In the Second Deposit the proposed housing allocation was deleted and the land restored to the Green Belt. I therefore consider these objections have been met and are representations in support of the Local Plan as it now stands. I take them into account under policy H2 where I consider an objection seeking the reinstatement of the housing allocation.

RECOMMENDATION

2. For my full recommendations concerning land South of Lambley Lane see under policy H2.

1A.23 ENV26 CONTROL OVER DEVELOPMENT IN THE GREEN BELT STOCKINGS FARM, ARNOLD

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001348	010874	Mr P Anderson-Price

Summary of Objection

Stockings Farm should be allocated for development, the land is on the edge of the urban area and adjacent to the public transport corridor.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
003835	010533	R.A.G.E.

Summary of Objection

Stockings Farm should remain in Green Belt. Development would harm the landscape.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

1. There are two sites known as Stockings Farm:
 - Stockings Farm (East); which is allocated for residential development in the Local Plan. I assume that objector 1348 supports this but that objector 3835 objects;
 - Stockings Farm (West)(also known as land off Lodge Farm Lane); which is kept in the Green Belt in the Local Plan. I assume that objector 1348 is against this but that objector 3835 supports.

2. In any event both these sites are subject to objections that have led me to consider them fully under policy H2. In considering these sites I have taken into account the Green Belt implications and these objections. For my conclusions and recommendations see under policy H2.

RECOMMENDATION

3. For my recommendations on the Stockings Farm sites see under policy H2 in my report.
-

1A.24 ENV26 CONTROL OVER DEVELOPMENT IN THE GREEN BELT RESTORE LAND TO THE GREEN BELT LAND OFF WIGHAY ROAD (TOP WIGHAY FARM)

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001949	004591	c/o J H Walter Rural Consultants

Summary of Objection

Land at Top Wighay Farm should not be removed from the Green Belt. Land to the south of Newstead should be removed from the Green Belt and allocated for development instead.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

1. This is one of a series of objections advancing the case for the development of land south of Newstead in preference to the claims of land at Top Wighay Farm. This matter is considered in depth elsewhere in my report – see especially under policies H2 and E1 for Top Wighay Farm and policy H2 for Land South of Newstead. In considering these sites I have taken into account the Green Belt implications and this objection.

RECOMMENDATION

2. For my recommendations on this objection see under policies H2 and E1.
-

1A.25 ENV26 CONTROL OVER DEVELOPMENT IN THE GREEN BELT WHITWORTH DRIVE

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000251	000350	Ranch Kennels

Summary of Objection

The proposed GCCF access road would harm wildlife, amenity, the safety of children walking to school and local residents. It would cause pollution and lead to the loss of playing fields.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

1. Although this objection says that it relates to policy ENV26, it is entirely concerned with the proposed GCCF access road and does not mention the Green Belt. The proposed access road is considered in detail under policy H3. This objection raises no new considerations that are not already considered there. I have taken this objection into account in making my recommendations under policy H3.

RECOMMENDATION

2. For my recommendations on the GCCF access road see under policy H3.
-

1A.26 ENV26 CONTROL OVER DEVELOPMENT IN THE GREEN BELT

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001767	004257	Mrs B Gant

Summary of Objection

The objector is disappointed some of the Green Belt will be lost (although she lives in Wood Lane she does not specifically refer to that housing allocation). She is also concerned about the impact of the GCCF development and access road on the countryside, wildlife and a footpath. Trees should be planted to replace those that will be lost and new housing should not impinge on major ridgelines.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

1. This objection raises several concerns. In as far as it relates to the housing allocations and to the GCCF access road it is considered under policies H2 and H3. As far as ridgelines, landscaping and trees are concerned, these topics are dealt with in policies ENV31, ENV2 and ENV40 to ENV44.
2. With regard to the loss of Green Belt land to development, I note (and share) the objector’s regret that this is necessary. But I am satisfied that it is both necessary and flows from the Structure Plan. The need for long-term protection of the remaining Green Belt is what leads me to recommend the designation of Safeguarded Land (policy H4) in Gedling, although I recognise this will not be popular.
3. The ridgeline policy is designed to protect the ridges and in my view will do so. However, building up to the ridgelines with bungalows will not always be the most appropriate response and I would not want to see this written into the policy.

4. In terms of encouraging tree planting, policy ENV40 sets out the intention to achieve this in the Greenwood Community Forest, which covers nearly all the rural parts of the borough. It does not seem to me that the Local Plan can go further than this.
5. Taking all these things into account I conclude that this objection does not give rise to a need to modify the Local Plan.

RECOMMENDATION

6. I recommend no modification to the Local Plan in response to this objection.
-

1A.27 ENV26 CONTROL OVER DEVELOPMENT IN THE GREEN BELT REMOVE LAND FROM THE GREEN BELT; WOODBOROUGH

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000392	000555	Mr R Holehouse

Summary of Objection

The Green Belt washes over Woodborough so there is no scope for extending the village, diversifying house types for local needs or sustaining the facilities in the village.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

1. This objection is dealt together with Mr Holehouse’s objections to policy H2 and H16. I conclude that the Local Plan should not be modified.

RECOMMENDATION

2. I recommend no modification to the Local Plan in response to this objection.
-

1A.28 ENV26 CONTROL OVER DEVELOPMENT IN THE GREEN BELT STOKE BARDOLPH SEWAGE WORKS AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000722	201292	Severn Trent Water Limited

Summary of Objection

The importance of Stoke Bardolph Sewage Treatment Works (STW) and the ongoing development of the works (in response to continuing growth of the Nottingham conurbation and tighter environmental standards) need to be recognised in the Local Plan. Further expansion into the Green Belt may be necessary. The text in the Local Plan should be expanded to reflect these considerations.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

1. I note that no modifications to the policy or to the extent of the Green Belt are suggested.
2. The Council does not consider it would be appropriate to deal with this matter in the text of the Local Plan, although it concedes that proposals at this installation may fall within the scope of the "national interest". GBC prefers any proposals that require planning permission to be considered on their merits.
3. I accept that the STW is a large and important facility that happens to fall in the Green Belt. I also accept (therefore) that very special circumstances may exist to justify proposals at the site or to extend it.
4. However, the bulk of the additional text suggested by the objector is descriptive and, although I find no fault with it, I do not consider it is necessary for it to be included in the Local Plan.
5. But the last sentence of the suggested text reads "Given the strategic importance of the STW **any** expansion would be regarded as a very special circumstance under policy ENV26" (my added emphasis). In my view this goes too far. I have in mind, for example, that there may be alternative ways to improve and develop the STW and that the impact on the Green Belt may be a legitimate consideration in choosing between alternatives. This sentence would appear to remove this consideration from the decision. I see no reason to do this in advance of any proposals.
6. On balance, therefore, whilst I accept that very special circumstances may arise at the STW, I consider that there is no merit in trying to anticipate them in the Local Plan. I conclude that no modification to the Local Plan is justified.

RECOMMENDATION

7. I recommend no modification to the Local Plan in response to this objection.

1A.29 ENV30 DEVELOPMENT WITHIN DEFINED INFILL BOUNDARIES OF GREEN BELT “WASHED OVER” VILLAGES: - GENERAL

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001158	002527	Nottingham County Council (Strategic Property)

Summary of Objection

The last part of policy introduces subjective text, which is inappropriate in a Local Plan. Delete the last part of the policy and amend the rest.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001948	201940	Aldergate Properties Ltd

Summary of Objection

The (Second Deposit) addition of “the residential amenities of neighbouring properties” is an unnecessary duplication of policy ENV1. Reinstate the original (First Deposit) wording but change “character” to “appearance”.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001682	201415	Mr J Lesquereux

Summary of Objection

The substitution of 'appearance' for 'character' should be reversed. The latter term is stronger and includes distinctive qualities.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
003981	201643	English Heritage

Summary of Objection

The removal of the reference to "character" in the policy and text paragraphs. Character encompasses more than just appearance and its protection is promoted in PPGs.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

1. The last part of the policy (First Deposit) refers to the effect of proposals on the character of the village. In the Second Deposit “character” is replaced by “appearance” and the effect on residential amenity in neighbouring properties is added as a consideration to be taken into account.
2. As currently laid out in the plan, one could be excused for supposing that this part of the policy was part of clause (b), although I consider it probable it is intended to refer to clause (a) as well. This would be made clearer if a blank line were inserted between clause (b) and the word “provided”.

Subjectivity and Repetition

3. In my view and experience, whether subjective or not, these matters are all capable of being material considerations and are often decisive in determining whether proposals are acceptable, especially small scale infilling and extensions. I therefore consider that this clause should not be deleted. Objector 1158 has not suggested how any of the wording in the policy or text could be improved or made less subjective and no such improvements spring to my mind.
4. As far as objection 201415 is concerned, it is said that residential amenity is already dealt with in policy ENV1. This may be true but it appears to me to be an especially useful and relevant consideration here also.
5. I conclude that no modification is needed as a consequence of these objections.

Character or Appearance

6. As far as character and appearance are concerned, I have already considered this matter fully in the context of policy ENV1. I shall not repeat my reasoning here but on balance I came to the view that things should be left as they are in the Second Deposit. It seems to me that the same considerations arise here as they do in general and that for the sake of consistency I should reach the same conclusion here.
7. I conclude that the Second Deposit should not be modified.

RECOMMENDATION

8. I recommend that consideration is given to the layout of the policy.
9. Otherwise I recommend no modifications in response to these objections.

**1A.30 ENV30 DEVELOPMENT WITHIN DEFINED INFILL BOUNDARIES OF
GREEN BELT “WASHED OVER” VILLAGES:
LINBY**

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000006	000006	Mr & Mrs R Johnson

Summary of Objection

The infill boundary for Linby is arbitrary. It should be extended to include more properties on the southern side of the village.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions***Villages in the Green Belt***

- The Local Plan treats the villages in the Green Belt in one of three ways:
 - it excludes (or “insets”) the built up area of the village from the Green Belt notation so that limited development may take place within the village;
 - it includes (“washes over”) the village in the Green Belt but defines an “infill boundary” within which infilling will be allowed (see policy ENV30);
 - it includes (“washes over”) the village within the Green Belt without any “infill boundary “ so that Green Belt policies apply throughout the village.
- This approach is in accordance with the guidance from government in the current PPG2 (paragraph 2.11). I therefore consider that the approach is acceptable.
- GBC collected data on the services and character of each rural settlement and has categorised the villages as follows:
 - Inset Villages:*** Bestwood, Burton Joyce, Calverton, Newstead and Ravenshead;
 - Washed over Villages with Infill Boundaries:*** Lambley, Linby, Papplewick and Woodborough;
 - Washed Over Villages Without Infill Boundaries:*** all the smaller settlements, including Stoke Bardolph.

4. Having studied the Council’s data and considered objections on the matter, my own view is that this categorisation is reasonable and justified, certainly as far as Linby is concerned.
5. The objectors also accept that the village is a small one – lacking services other than a public house and a school. It is therefore agreed that the settlement is too small to be a suitable location for development other than limited infilling.

The Objection Site

6. Given this background, the site is quite properly excluded from the village’s infill boundary. To include this site in the infill boundary would extend the built form of the settlement beyond its historic linear shape along the Main Street. The houses along Church Lane become progressively more spread out as one travels south and the Local Plan’s infill boundary is located to the north of the first substantial gap, although in my view a case could be made for placing it even further to the north. In any event, Church Lane is not so built up or its development so continuous that the boundary should be further to the south.
7. Development of this site would further erode the already narrow but important gap between the village of Linby and the more extensive urban area to the south (outside the Borough of Gedling).
8. Furthermore, the objection site is large enough to accommodate much more development than the two dwellings the objectors currently envisage building. The site cannot therefore be regarded as an infilling plot using the tight definition rightly used in the Local Plan. I appreciate that the objectors have family reasons for wanting to build two houses on the objection site but such personal reasons should not determine the future scale and pattern of development.
9. I also note that they feel the boundary is arbitrary and should respect the extent of their land ownership as they say is the case elsewhere in the village. However, such boundaries need, wherever possible, to follow clear features on the ground (such as hedges and walls) and to be tightly drawn around the gardens of properties. The fact that the appeal site is part of a field used for grazing the objectors’ horses does not make it part of their garden and does not indicate that the land should be included within the village and its infill boundary.
10. I conclude that the infill boundary is correctly drawn in the vicinity of the objection site and should not be changed.

RECOMMENDATION

11. I recommend no modification to the Local Plan in response to this objection.
-

1A.31 ENV30 DEVELOPMENT WITHIN DEFINED INFILL BOUNDARIES OF GREEN BELT “WASHED OVER” VILLAGES: KIGHILL LANE, RAVENSHEAD

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000521	000747	Miss L Nightingale

Summary of Objection

Land fronting onto Kighill Lane should be excluded from the Green Belt and included in an infill boundary to allow infilling. The one-acre plot is the last one in Kighill Lane and should be developed to be in keeping with the existing properties in the road. Other areas with small vacant plots have infill boundaries.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

1. This objection is considered under policy ENV26 in response to a similar objection from objector 521 concerning the same site.

RECOMMENDATION

2. For my recommendation see under policy ENV26 above.
-

1A.32 ENV30 DEVELOPMENT WITHIN DEFINED INFILL BOUNDARIES OF GREEN BELT “WASHED OVER” VILLAGES: WEST OF MANSFIELD ROAD, RAVENSHEAD

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000770	001188	Dr D Middleton
000768	001187	Dr A Middleton

Summary of Objection

A single dwelling should be allowed as infilling at Gibbetdale Wood.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

1. This policy is concerned with infilling in “washed over” villages. Ravenshead is not a washed over village. By no stretch of the imagination could this objection site be regarded as part of a settlement that is independent of Ravenshead. For these reasons it is my view that these objections to this policy are misdirected.
2. However, I have given full consideration to this site and all the matters raised by these objectors under policies ENV17 and ENV26.
3. I conclude that the Local Plan should not be modified in response to these objections.

RECOMMENDATION

4. I recommend no modification to the Local Plan.
-

1A.33 ENV30 DEVELOPMENT WITHIN DEFINED INFILL BOUNDARIES OF GREEN BELT “WASHED OVER” VILLAGES: LAMBLEY

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001664	003924	W Hardy & Sons

Summary of Objection

The Green Wash policy is an arbitrary device to prevent further development in a developed area. The position of the infill boundary in Lambley is disputed.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

1. The objector is right that policy ENV30 is a device to control development in villages where larger scale development would not be appropriate. Whether it is arbitrary or not depends on whether it is applied to the right villages and the position of the boundary in each case.
2. The Local Plan treats the villages in the Green Belt in one of three ways:
 - it excludes (or “insets”) the built up area of the village from the Green Belt notation so that limited development may take place within the village;
 - it includes (“washes over”) the village in the Green Belt but defines an “infill boundary” within which infilling will be allowed (see policy ENV30);
 - it includes (“washes over”) the village within the Green Belt without any “infill boundary “ so that Green Belt policies apply throughout the village.
3. This approach is in accordance with the guidance from government in the current PPG2 (paragraph 2.11). I therefore consider that the approach is acceptable.
4. GBC collected data on the services and character of each rural settlement and has categorised the villages as follows:
 - ***Inset Villages:*** Bestwood, Burton Joyce, Calverton, Newstead and Ravenshead;
 - ***Washed over Villages with Infill Boundaries:*** Lambley, Linby, Papplewick and Woodborough;
 - ***Washed Over Villages Without Infill Boundaries:*** all the smaller settlements, including Stoke Bardolph.
5. Having studied the Council's data and considered objections on the matter, my own view is that this categorisation is reasonable and justified. Certainly as far as Lambley is concerned, I consider it is correctly categorised. It is a small settlement with few facilities and is not an appropriate location for any development beyond infilling. The boundary around the village is quite tightly drawn to reflect this.
6. Although the objectors are not specific about where they want the infill boundary changed, I have looked in detail on the ground at the boundary on the Proposals Map and can find no fault in it. I am certainly of the view that it should not be extended to include any of the sporadic development around the village, Jericho Farm or the houses between the farm and the village.
7. I conclude that no modifications to the Lambley Infill Boundary are justified.

RECOMMENDATION

8. I recommend no modification to the Local Plan as a result of this objection.

1A.34 ENV30 DEVELOPMENT WITHIN DEFINED INFILL BOUNDARIES OF GREEN BELT “WASHED OVER” VILLAGES: CATFOOT LANE, LAMBLEY

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001950	004590	W T Martin & Son

Summary of Objection

Land and farm buildings at Catfoot Lane are inside the village infill boundary but not within a built up frontage. The site has potential for development, possibly as sheltered housing. The site currently has unsightly agricultural buildings on it so that redevelopment would not have a detrimental impact on the character of the village or the street scene. Accommodation for the elderly is needed locally.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

1. I am not entirely clear what modification(s) to the Local Plan the objector is seeking. One possible response to the objection would be to redraw the village infill boundary to exclude this objection site entirely, although I am sure this is not what the objector wants and the Council has not suggested it either.
2. Perhaps what the objector wants is to alter the status of the village from a “washed over village” to an “inset village”. This would have the effect of allowing more than infilling inside the village limit. However, as I have already indicated (see the immediately preceding objection – it is unnecessary to repeat the arguments here) I consider Lambley is correctly identified as a washed over village.
3. Or perhaps what is sought is an alteration to the wording of policy ENV30 to allow more than infilling in washed over villages. This would not be consistent with the reasons for categorising the villages as washed over and would conflict with the guidance in PPG2.
4. I have already remarked that it is not my role to assess individual proposals. Nor am I attracted to the notion that general planning policies should be altered to accommodate the special circumstances of a particular case. The Local Plan cannot anticipate and encompass every eventuality.
5. This is a difficult and sensitive site. Some considerations indicate that in principle it should be redeveloped. It is within the infill boundary, it has unsightly buildings on it that harm the appearance of the area, it is next to the Conservation Area and the objector may be considering sheltered housing that is said to be needed in the area. But it is also in the Green Belt albeit in a village where it is envisaged that infilling will occur. It seems to me that the resolution of these various considerations can best be achieved by negotiation between the Local Planning Authority and a developer during the design of a development scheme for the site. In my view it is beyond my remit and that of the Local Plan to try and resolve these matters now.

6. In any event, having considered all the possible modifications that might result from this objection, I conclude that none of them is desirable.

RECOMMENDATION

7. I recommend no modification to the Local Plan in response to this objection.

1A.35 ENV30 DEVELOPMENT WITHIN DEFINED INFILL BOUNDARIES OF GREEN BELT “WASHED OVER” VILLAGES: MAIN STREET, LAMBLEY

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000587	000836	Mrs R Groves

Summary of Objection

It is considered that the policy boundary is drawn too tightly to the built up area and should not include the area between the residence (10 Main Street) and the distinct ridge line to the southeast which visually separates the village from the open countryside. It is submitted that the Infill boundary should coincide with the Conservation Area boundary since this boundary recognises the natural ridge feature in the landscape. It is submitted that infill development on this site would not prejudice the objectives of the policy in preventing development sprawling in the open countryside.

ALSO DEALT WITH HERE IS AN OBJECTION TO POLICY ENV35 (MATURE LANDSCAPE AREAS)

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000587	000838	Mrs R Groves

Summary of Objection

The MLA boundary should coincide with the Conservation Area boundary.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

Infill Boundary

1. I have quoted objection 836 in full because I think that the word “not” is included in the first sentence in error. Certainly the rest of the objection suggests that what is being sought is an extension to the infill boundary to include the land behind 10 Main Street. This is how I am approaching the objection.
2. Paragraph 1.67 of the Local Plan defines infilling as “the development of a small gap in the existing built up frontage, it will only consist of one or two dwellings, and not all cases will be appropriate.” The objector does not dispute this definition and neither do I. It is what is normally understood by the term infilling.
3. Lambley is categorised as a “washed over village within a defined infill boundary in the Green Belt.” Again the objector does not dispute this and neither do I. Lambley is too small a settlement with too few services to be an appropriate location for development on a large scale.
4. It follows from the above that the objection site is not suitable for development. The objection site (which I take to be the area between the infill boundary as currently

drawn and the Conservation Area boundary) does not have a frontage to Main Street or any other highway. Development on this site would therefore not be infilling. The objection site is also too large to be regarded as an infill site. It could only be developed by backland development or by extending adjoining housing estates. This would be true even if the infill boundary were moved as suggested. However, since infilling on the site is not possible, no purpose would be served by moving the boundary.

Mature Landscape Area

5. As far as the MLA is concerned, this is intended to define a cohesive landscape type. The objection site is part of a much larger tract of similar landscape. It does not seem to me that inter-visibility within this tract is a decisive consideration. It follows that the boundary should not necessarily follow a ridge. That the protected landscape comes into the Conservation Area and up to the built up area of the village is not, in my view, a bad thing. No reasons are advanced for wanting to divorce this relatively small area from the larger tract with which it shares its character.

General Considerations

6. The situation may be complicated, especially as shown at the scale of the Proposals Map, because several policy boundaries nearly coincide at this point. But the different policies and boundaries have different purposes. The infill boundary is to limit the amount of development that may take place and to establish that, whilst infilling development may be appropriate, estate development will not be. The Conservation Area boundary is the area within which special attention will be paid to conserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the area. And the MLA boundary defines a landscape with distinct characteristics. Each has to be assessed and justified in its own terms (although the Conservation Area boundary is beyond my remit in any event). There is no reason or necessity for these boundaries to coincide exactly.
7. It may be that development on this site would not be visually prominent from the south and that it would not constitute urban sprawl. But it would not conform to the policy and would therefore harm the planning objectives for this settlement and the surrounding Green Belt.

Overall Conclusions

8. In view of all the above I conclude that the infill boundary should not be modified as suggested in this objection.

RECOMMENDATION

9. I recommend no modification to the Local Plan in response to this objection.
-

1A.36 ENV30 DEVELOPMENT WITHIN DEFINED INFILL BOUNDARIES OF GREEN BELT “WASHED OVER” VILLAGES: WEST VIEW FARM, PAPPLEWICK

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001939	004544	CWS Property & Development

Summary of Objection

West View Farm is located in the main body of the village and is likely to cease being used for agricultural purposes within the plan period. The owner therefore wishes to explore barn conversions and limited infilling. The present boundary bisects the farmyard which is not consistent with the approach for the remainder of the village where buildings with their curtilages are included within the infill boundary. The Infill boundary should accord with the Conservation Area boundary.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

1. It is agreed that Papplewick village is not an appropriate location for large-scale development and that only limited infilling should be allowed. As defined by the Council and as commonly understood, infilling is small-scale development of one or two houses that can be accommodated in a small gap in an otherwise developed frontage. To my mind this requirement can only be met on the front part of this farmyard site because the back of the site is not part of a built up frontage. The buildings at the back of the site are an intrusion of the built form of the village into the countryside. In my view these considerations are reflected in the location of the existing infill boundary as shown on the Proposals Map.
2. In any event, there does not appear to be any scope for infilling at the back of the site (which has large buildings with very limited space around them).
3. The considerations that would arise in relation to any proposal to either convert or replace these large buildings would be different from those that would arise in relation to infilling and would not necessarily be dependent upon all the land being included within the village boundary.
4. The definition of the Conservation Area is a matter quite unrelated to the scope for future development and the two should not be confused.
5. As far as the rest of the village is concerned, in my view the Council has applied consistent criteria pragmatically to fit the varying circumstances that arise given the varying shapes and sizes of domestic properties in a historic village.
6. Overall therefore, I see no planning reason (or need) to make the modification sought by the objector.

RECOMMENDATION

7. **I recommend no modification to the plan in response to this objection.**
-

1A.37 ENV30 DEVELOPMENT WITHIN DEFINED INFILL BOUNDARIES OF GREEN BELT “WASHED OVER” VILLAGES: WOODBOROUGH

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
003851	010570	Barratt (East Midlands)
003853	010576	Mr & Mrs R W Burton

Summary of Objection

Woodborough should be excluded from the Green Belt. Minor development in village would accord with PPGs, Structure Plan, and would not harm the village, Countryside/ Green Belt or sustainability objectives. Site would contribute to housing.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

1. This objection is dealt with at the same time as these objectors’ objections to policy H2. I conclude that the Local Plan should not be modified.

RECOMMENDATION

2. I recommend no modification to the Local Plan in response to these objections.
-

1A.38 ENV30 DEVELOPMENT WITHIN DEFINED INFILL BOUNDARIES OF GREEN BELT “WASHED OVER” VILLAGES: PRIVATE ROAD, WOODBOROUGH

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000193	000280	Mr & Mrs N Prestwich

Summary of Objection

The Infill boundary should be extended to include land adjacent to Private Road at the north of the village. This would allow limited development. The Infill Boundary is arbitrary and illogical. The objection site is part of the village and surrounded by residential properties. There would be no harm to the Green Belt and its openness if limited development were allowed.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001131	002345	Mrs H Moore

Summary of Objection

Land south of Plemont on Private Road has housing on three sides. Infill development on the objection site would not have a detrimental impact on the openness of the Green Belt or the character of the village. The site is contained and would not lead to other land being developed.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001954	004619	The Trustees of the Estate of D.Binch

Summary of Objection

All the land fronting onto Private Road should be included in the Infill Boundary. The land is part of the village. It is substantially developed and to infill the remaining plots would not harm the Green Belt.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

1. These three objections relate to land at Private Road Woodborough. They all seek the extension of the village Infill Boundary to include land fronting Private Road (or Broad Close) so that some “limited development” or “infilling” can take place. The first two

objections seek the inclusion of sites adjacent to the Infill Boundary already in the Local Plan, whilst the third objection seeks to include all the land fronting Private Road.

2. Because Mr and Mrs Prestwich came to the Public Inquiry and discussed their objection with me, I have more information about their objection than the other two. However, it seems to me that the objections are essentially similar and should be considered together.

Villages in the Green Belt

3. The Local Plan treats the villages in the Green Belt in one of three ways:
 - it excludes (or “insets”) the built up area of the village from the Green Belt notation so that limited development may take place within the village;
 - it includes (“washes over”) the village in the Green Belt but defines an “infill boundary” within which infilling will be allowed (see policy ENV30);
 - it includes (“washes over”) the village within the Green Belt without any “infill boundary “ so that Green Belt policies apply throughout the village.
4. This approach is in accordance with the guidance from government in the current PPG2 (paragraph 2.11). I therefore consider that the approach is acceptable.
5. GBC collected data on the services and character of each rural settlement and has categorised the villages as follows:
 - ***Inset Villages:*** Bestwood, Burton Joyce, Calverton, Newstead and Ravenshead;
 - ***Washed over Villages with Infill Boundaries:*** Lambley, Linby, Papplewick and Woodborough;
 - ***Washed Over Villages Without Infill Boundaries:*** all the smaller settlements, including Stoke Bardolph.
6. Having studied the Council's data and considered objections on the matter, my own view is that this categorisation is reasonable and justified. I reach this conclusion even though – in my view – Bestwood, Newstead and Woodborough are all middle order settlements with a rather limited range of facilities. This would suggest that they should all be treated as washed over villages with infill boundaries. However, I accept that the character and circumstances of Bestwood and Newstead are such that they would benefit from some limited development and diversification.
7. Be that as it may, these three objectors do not appear to contest the categorisation of Woodborough as a village suitable (only) for infilling – they simply want their land included within the village boundary. Thus, as far as Woodborough is concerned, it is accepted as being properly classified as a washed over village with a defined infill boundary, even though it was previously an inset village in the adopted Local Plan. I note that the infill boundary now proposed is largely the same as the previous inset boundary.
8. In view of the classification of the village I consider that it follows that the boundary should be tightly drawn around the existing built up area with no scope for more substantial development than infilling.

Private Road and the Surrounding Area

9. Private Road is a road laid out at right angles to Roe Hill. It has relatively long plots of land fronting each side, some of which have houses in them. The area has the layout of what is known elsewhere in the country as “plot land development”, although the dwellings are more substantial than those usually found in such areas. However, whatever the origin of this area of sporadic development, the resulting density is very low and would remain so even if every plot were to have one or two houses on it.
10. The objectors refer to infilling and limited development but the amount of land involved in these objections is considerable and could, taken together, accommodate tens of houses at present day densities. This is especially the case because access would be possible from Broad Close as well as from Private Road itself. Developing the land to its full potential would certainly amount to more than infilling. In my view the cumulative impact and likely longer-term consequences of including the land within the village boundary have to be taken into account.
11. If the principle of further development in this area is established, I consider that it would not be practical or desirable to seek to limit the layout/density/number of dwellings to a pattern established when the road was created. Indeed, both current government guidance and the Council's policies would suggest that if land is identified for development then as high a density as possible should be pursued. I see it as no part of good planning (or this Local Plan) to seek low densities in order to reflect and maintain the character of poorly planned sporadic development in the countryside that has taken place in the past.
12. For example, Mr and Mrs Prestwich's land and objection site, as indicated on the plan attached to the original objection form, is rectangular and extends from Private Road to Broad Close. It amounts to more than half a hectare and could be developed for several dwellings, certainly more than ten. Their objection site is also next to the objection site at the rear of Plemont. The long house plots to the west could also generate some developable land. Taken together there is thus considerable scope for development amounting to an estate of houses if the Boundary of the village is extended and the principle of development is established.
13. It is true of course that Mr and Mrs Prestwich's stated intention is to develop one large dwelling in the northeast corner of their site rather than to develop the whole of the site they own. But if consistent rules to control development in Woodborough (and elsewhere in the Borough) are to be applied, it is difficult to see how future owners of the land could be held to this. If one dwelling were to be allowed as infilling on the Private Road frontage there would be no good reason not to allow another one in the smaller gap that would result. Indeed there would be some logic in applying the same approach to all the remaining gaps in Private Road and then to the entire frontage of Broad Close.

Planning History of the Area

14. The background, as far as this part of Woodborough is concerned, is that when the Green Belt in this area was first designated the village was excluded from the Green Belt as an inset settlement. The boundary of that inset took into account planning permissions for housing, including some close to the objection site at the top end of Roe Hill. The boundary also, as far as possible, followed physical features, such as

garden and domestic curtilage boundaries. These objection sites were not included in the village inset.

15. As discussed above, in this review of the Local Plan the Council has decided that development in Woodborough should be limited to infilling. The objectors do not question this assessment of the village and its capacity and neither do I. As a result of this change in approach, instead of the inherited inset boundary the Local Plan now has a village infill boundary, although in practice the two are almost identical in extent. In any event these objection sites are still not included.

The Main Issue

16. Thus the main issue is whether there are sound and compelling planning reasons to extend the scope for development along Private Road (and probably all the way along Private Road to achieve a “logical” boundary). This is at a time when the Council is – as a matter of policy – seeking to limit the scale of development in Woodborough.
17. A prime consideration in assessing development in the Green Belt is protecting its openness. The gaps and spaces in Private Road are undeniably open land. They have not been previously developed and in some cases have never been included in an existing domestic garden or curtilage. By definition one, two or more new dwellings in each gap or backland space would reduce the openness of this area and thus the area generally. This is true whether or not the site would be prominent in long-distance views of the village and whether the new dwellings would be in keeping with the scale and character of existing properties in Private Road.
18. Looking at other parts of the village infill boundary in the Local Plan (previously the inset boundary) does not suggest that this area or these sites have been treated in an anomalous way once established uses and planning permissions have been taken into account. The long term use and management of this land may not be clear-cut but this is not a sufficient reason to allow the consolidation of development in the Green Belt outside the established boundary of the village.

Conclusions

19. Accordingly I conclude that there are no sound or compelling planning reasons to extend the village Infill Boundary to include any part of these objection sites. This conclusion applies with greatest force to the larger blocks of land involved because these could accommodate residential estates. However, it also applies if the more limited gaps fronting onto Private Road are viewed in isolation.

RECOMMENDATION

20. I recommend no modification to the Local Plan in response to these objections.
-

1A.39 ENV30 DEVELOPMENT WITHIN DEFINED INFILL BOUNDARIES OF GREEN BELT “WASHED OVER” VILLAGES: MAIN STREET, WOODBOROUGH

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000225	000321	Mr C Hanson

Summary of Objection

The Infill Boundary at the rear of 70 Main Street suggests that there may be a possibility of future development there. This could lead to overlooking and would interfere with the Green Belt.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

Villages in the Green Belt

1. The Local Plan treats the villages in the Green Belt in one of three ways:
 - it excludes (or “insets”) the built up area of the village from the Green Belt notation so that limited development may take place within the village;
 - it includes (“washes over”) the village in the Green Belt but defines an “infill boundary” within which infilling will be allowed (see policy ENV30);
 - it includes (“washes over”) the village within the Green Belt without any “infill boundary” so that Green Belt policies apply throughout the village.
2. This approach is in accordance with the guidance from government in the current PPG2 (paragraph 2.11). I therefore consider that the approach is acceptable.
3. GBC collected data on the services and character of each rural settlement and has categorised the villages as follows:
 - ***Inset Villages:*** Bestwood, Burton Joyce, Calverton, Newstead and Ravenshead;
 - ***Washed over Villages with Infill Boundaries:*** Lambley, Linby, Papplewick and Woodborough;
 - ***Washed Over Villages Without Infill Boundaries:*** all the smaller settlements, including Stoke Bardolph.
4. Having studied the Council’s data and considered objections on the matter, my own view is that this categorisation is reasonable and justified. I reach this conclusion even though – in my view – Bestwood, Newstead and Woodborough are all middle order settlements with a rather limited range of facilities. This would suggest that they should all be treated as washed over villages with infill boundaries. However, I accept that the character and circumstances of Bestwood and Newstead are such that they would benefit from some limited development and diversification. In addition there are particular reasons why the housing allocations in Bestwood and Newstead have been included in the plan.

Woodborough

5. In any event as far as Woodborough is concerned, this means that it is properly classified as a washed over village with a defined infill boundary, even though it was previously an inset village in the adopted Local Plan. I note that the infill boundary now proposed is largely the same as the previous inset boundary. Be that as it may, it is correct – given the classification of the village – that the boundary should be tightly drawn around the existing built up area with no scope for more substantial development than infilling.

The Council's Response to this Objection

6. The Council says:

- “Accept. For the sake of consistency the Infill Boundary (at this point) could be redrawn to follow the Conservation Area boundary. The development of the land to the rear of 70 Main Street (as currently included in the village Infill Boundary) would not accord with the definition of “infilling”.
- Proposed change: amend Infill Boundary to the rear of 70 Main Street so that it follows the Conservation Area boundary.

Conclusions

7. However, I can find no record of this proposed change having been formerly adopted or advanced by the Council even though the objection related to the First Deposit. Be that as it may, the Council's comments are consistent with my own view that a tight Infill Boundary is appropriate for Woodborough.
8. Although I consider that there is no logical necessity for the two boundaries to coincide, I conclude that the Infill Boundary for Woodborough should be modified to follow the Conservation Area boundary in the vicinity of the rear of 70 Main Street.
9. I note that there are places along the southern boundary of Woodborough where similar considerations appear to apply but I have no objections relating to these other sites. Equally on the north side of the village it is in some places the case that the Infill Boundary is tighter than the Conservation Area boundary, although I can understand why this is the case.

RECOMMENDATION

- 10. I recommend that the Infill Boundary for Woodborough should be modified to follow the Conservation Area boundary in the vicinity of the rear of 70 Main Street.**
-

1A.40 ENV31 PROTECTION OF THE RIDGELINES / URBAN FRINGE

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001128	002350	Mr M Bales
001215	004452	Mr P Grinnell

Summary of Objection

Clearly visible ridgelines are omitted from the Proposals Map, especially east to west ridgelines seen when looking north from Arnold Lane. The GCCF Access Road should be re-routed for this reason.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001158	002528	Nottingham County Council (Strategic Property)

Summary of Objection

The wording in the First Deposit is objected to and an alternative suggested.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001324	002778	Langridge Homes Ltd

Summary of Objection

Only prominent ridgelines should be protected. All reference to secondary ridgelines should be removed from the Local Plan and Proposals Map. The Structure Plan (policy 1/5) only refers to the major ridgelines. Protection of the secondary ridgelines, some of which are in housing allocations, may restrict the design of high quality integrated development schemes for proposed housing sites.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001937	004533	Mr N Foster c/o FPD Savills
001938	004539	Mr D Frudd c/o Anthony Asbury Associates

Summary of Objection

The protection of ridgelines is accepted in principle. However, the policy does not allow for the beneficial effects that development could have by enhancing important views, providing a setting for the town and enhancing the landscape through landscaping and planting. The objectors own sites at Mapperley Plains where such considerations could apply.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
003932	010763	R.J.B. Mining Ltd

Summary of Objection

The policy should be reworded so that planning permission would only be refused if development would have an "unacceptably adverse effect".

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
003972	010834	Metro Jennings Ltd

Summary of Objection

The need to protect the ridgelines north of Gedling village is accepted but this should not preclude development. The landscape could be enhanced through development with woodland planting. The ridges have not been correctly identified.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000708	001023	Ibstock Property and Minerals

Summary of Objection

There is no objection to the principle of a ridgeline protection policy. But the policy lacks a full explanation and justification as required by PPG7. The policy is too strict and absolute. It is misleading for the Proposals Map to show ridgelines crossing unrestored mineral workings that are holes in the ground (at Dorket Head).

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000777	200133	Mr D Lawson

Summary of Objection

The revised wording in the Second Deposit weakens the policy and is inconsistent with paragraph 1.70. The First Deposit wording should be reinstated.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001334	003032	Jaycee (Nottingham) Ltd.

Summary of Objection

This policy should not be seen as a blanket reason to refuse all development in elevated positions on the northeast edge of the district. Due consideration needs to be given to the character and quality of each part of each ridge. Only prominent development that would have a harmful visual impact should be of concern. Green Belt policy is separate and more stringent. The text in the plan should reflect this.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001334	201518	Jaycee (Nottingham) Ltd.

Summary of Objection

The objection is reiterated.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

Objector 1334

1. For convenience and to avoid unnecessary repetition I deal with the objections from objector 001334 (003032 and 201518) in the section of my report dealing with policy H2 (Additional Site: Brookfield Nursery, Mapperley Plains).

Policy Wording (Objectors 1158, 3932, 708 and 777)

2. The wording of the policy was changed in the Second Deposit. This removed the reference to positive enhancement of the landscape, which was the main reason for the 1158 objection. Although the wording in the Second Deposit is not exactly what this objector sought, it is closer to it in meaning and effect. I consider the Second Deposit wording to be acceptable and conclude there is no reason for further modification.
3. The wording change sought by objector 3932 was made in the Second Deposit and I conclude no further modification is needed.
4. I consider that the changes in the Second Deposit also meet the point on wording ("too absolute") made by objector 708 and conclude no further modification is called for.
5. Although the changes to the wording in the Second Deposit do not please objector 777, the policy is now generally more appropriate for inclusion in a Local Plan. However, the Council accepts that the word "unacceptably" is not consistent with other policies in the Local Plan and should be deleted. In my view it adds nothing to the meaning or effect of the policy, whilst introducing an unwelcome element of subjectivity. In my view the policy is not inconsistent with paragraph 1.70 in any important respect. I conclude that the word "unacceptably" should be deleted.

Ridges North of Arnold Lane (Objectors 1128 and 1215)

6. The policy of protecting ridgelines originates in the Structure Plan and for this reason it is acceptable in principle. Structure Plan policy 1/5 says that in reviewing the Green Belt, the **major** ridgelines and hills should remain in the Green Belt (my emphasis), although paragraph 1.90 allows for other ridgelines to be protected also.
7. It is true that not all ridgelines in the area are shown on the Proposals Map and have been taken into account in defining the Green Belt. But this is in accord with the Structure Plan, which puts emphasis primarily on major ridges. The Council asserts that it has included all the major ridges and this does seem to me to be the case.
8. It is not entirely clear to me from where in Arnold Lane the objectors wish me to look at the landscape. In some places the dense planting and earth embankments next to the road obscure the view north. But in general if one looks north from Arnold Lane the most prominent feature in the landscape (often forming the horizon) is the former colliery tip. When I considered the possible location of the Green Belt boundary around Gedling Colliery / Chase Farm (see policy H3), the existence of this major landscape feature was an important influence on my thinking. However, I am not convinced that it should be identified as a major ridgeline in the Local Plan for two reasons: it is not a natural feature and there is planning permission for it to be reworked. It is also the case that the landform is unlikely ever to return to its natural shape and the site is unlikely to be built on because of unstable ground conditions.

9. As far as the GCCF access road is concerned, the alignment was changed in the Second Deposit (these objections were to the First Deposit) and it is unclear whether this change meets the objections (although I suspect not). Be that as it may, I have considered the access road in detail under policy H3 and am not recommending a modification to the Second Deposit alignment.
10. For these reasons I conclude no modification is needed as a result of these objections.

Secondary Ridgelines (Objector 1324)

11. Langridge Homes object to the inclusion of secondary ridgelines in this policy and on the Proposals Map. They say that some are included in housing allocations. In other cases I observe that the location of a secondary ridge has affected the extent and definition of a housing allocation.
12. Although of secondary importance, I consider the lesser ridges are significant features in the local landscape. In my view they are quite properly to be taken into account both in decisions as to which land should be developed and subsequently in the design and pattern of development. This is allowed for in Structure Plan paragraph 1.90.
13. I also note that as framed the policy does not amount to an automatic bar to all development on all ridgelines because it relies on a test of whether or not there would be an adverse effect. In addition other policies and considerations may, at any particular site, be more important. But to remove the secondary ridgelines entirely from the Local Plan would, in my view, be wrong because to do so would ignore a real and visually important feature of the environment.
14. I conclude that this objection should not succeed.

Enhancement by Development and Mapperley Plains (Objectors 1937 and 1938)

15. I concede that it is theoretically possible to envisage that the rural landscape and the setting of the town could, in very peculiar circumstances, be enhanced by well-designed and well-landscaped development. But in practice it is extremely unlikely – so unlikely that I consider the Local Plan should not be modified on this account.
16. Certainly as far as these objectors' elevated and prominent sites are concerned, I cannot see how this could be the case. The sites are outside the existing edge of the urban area and development here would intrude into the countryside. The sites are rightly included in the Green Belt and their siting on the ridge reinforces that they should not be developed.
17. I conclude that no modification to the Local Plan is justified as a response to these objections.

Enhancement of Landscape by Development and Planting (Objector 3972)

18. As indicated above, I concede it is theoretically possible to envisage that the rural landscape and the setting of the town could, in very peculiar circumstances, be enhanced by well-designed and well-landscaped development. The same could apply to woodland planting. In practice it is extremely unlikely – so unlikely that I consider the Local Plan should not be modified on this account. In any event, I have considered this

objector’s proposed allocation elsewhere in this report and concluded that it is at best premature until the exact line of the GCCF access road is fixed.

19. As to the suggestion that the ridgelines are wrongly identified, I have no evidence on this and no indication as to where the objector thinks there are errors. As far as I can tell, there is no substance to this part of the objection.

20. I conclude that no modification is justified.

Dorket Head and the Justification for the Policy

21. As indicated above, the policy is derived from the Structure Plan. I cannot see that any great debate on the definition of ridgelines is needed. They are, in my view, self-evident. There may be some scope for debating which ridgelines should be included but not on identifying what constitutes a ridgeline.

22. Be that as it may, I have no doubt that the ridgeline passing through Dorket Head is very important and is properly included. Nor do I see any reason why the natural (original) alignment of the ridge should not be shown where it passes through the mineral workings and brick works. This accurately reflects the importance of the ridge in the wider landscape when seen from all directions and it is to be hoped that restoration will in due course reinforce the ridgeline in general views.

23. I conclude that no modification to the Proposals Map is justified.

RECOMMENDATIONS

24. I recommend that the word “unacceptably” is deleted from the (Second Deposit) wording of the policy.

25. Otherwise I recommend no modifications in response to these objections.

1A.41 ENV32 AGRICULTURAL LAND

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000309	000429	House Builders Federation

Summary of Objection

There may be circumstances where the use of grades 1,2 or 3a may be desirable. The policy should be reworded to allow for this.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001158	002529	Nottingham County Council (Strategic Property)

Summary of Objection

The policy introduces the test of whether a reasonable alternative location exists for a proposal made on the best and most versatile agricultural land. This is objected to. A re-wording is suggested..

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001324	002779	Langridge Homes Ltd

Summary of Objection

The objector seeks specific re-wording of policy and text.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001330	002981	Council for the Protection of Rural England

Summary of Objection

The wording of the policy is not in line with the Structure Plan, as the policy in Consultation Draft was. Revert to the wording in the Consultative Draft.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001345	003153	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust

Summary of Objection

Although the proposed protection of agricultural land is supported in principle, it is felt that the policy is not only relevant to the highest quality land, but should apply to all land used for agriculture. Measures to encourage wildlife should also be included.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
003851	010569	Barratt (East Midlands)
003853	010578	Mr & Mrs R W Burton

Summary of Objection

The policy does not reflect PPG7 paragraph 2.18. regarding the development of the best and most versatile agricultural land. The policy should be re-worded to allow for such development if there is an overriding need and no lower grade land is available.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

1. PPG7 was altered in respect of protecting the best agricultural land in a Parliamentary Answer on 21 March 2001. The main thrust of the revised guidance is to encourage a positive attitude to sustainable farm diversification. More generally the guidance says that the development of greenfield land, including the best and most versatile agricultural land (defined as land in grades 1, 2 and 3a of the Agricultural Land Classification), should not be permitted unless opportunities have been assessed for accommodating development on previously developed sites and on land within existing urban areas. Where development of agricultural land is unavoidable, Local Planning Authorities should seek to use areas of poorer quality land in preference to that of higher quality, except where other sustainability considerations suggest otherwise.
2. It is primarily on this guidance that I rely in assessing this Local Plan policy. In general terms I consider it is unavoidable that some agricultural land is taken for development in this Local Plan and that the opportunities for accommodating development on previously developed sites and on land within the existing urban areas have been adequately explored. I also take the view that, in the circumstances of this area, other sustainability considerations (and in particular the search sequence for residential sites) often do outweigh the agricultural considerations.

3. There are consultation arrangements in place for councils to obtain advice on proposals affecting agricultural land and I assume GBC has used these where appropriate. I note in this connection that the GOEM objection to this policy in the First Deposit has been withdrawn.

The HBF

4. The HBF suggest the introduction of an additional clause to the policy along the lines of “unless on balance material considerations favour its use for development”. The Council takes the view that this is unnecessary because the existing wording does allow for the development of the best land in some circumstances. However, I agree that in view of the guidance quoted above something more is needed, although in my view the HBF suggestion is too general to be helpful. The guidance suggests an additional clause along the lines of “unless a more sustainable pattern of development would be achieved as a result of developing the better quality land”.
5. I conclude the policy should be modified accordingly.

Objector 1158

6. As far as objector 1158 is concerned, their suggested rewording is little more than a statement of intent that in my view is too general to be helpful. However, I sympathise with their view that a test of “no reasonable alternative” is both new and goes beyond the guidance I have referred to above. A wording along the lines of “except where the proposal cannot reasonably be sited on a lower grade of agricultural land” would be more in keeping with the guidance.
7. I conclude the policy should be modified accordingly.

Langridge Homes

8. This objector puts forward a re-wording of the policy and additional accompanying text. Having studied the two policy wordings, I do not consider there is a material difference in meaning or intent between the Council and the objector, although as indicated above I favour some modifications. As to the suggested addition to the text, whilst I do not disagree with what it says, it is largely historical and discursive and I can see no advantage in including it in the Local Plan.
9. I conclude the Local Plan should not be modified as a result of this objection.

CPRE

10. It is true that the wording of the Local Plan policy is not exactly the same as in the Structure Plan, although in my view it is not materially different in intent or effect. More importantly, however, the wording in the Structure Plan predates the latest government guidance and the opportunity now arises to take this into account.
11. I conclude that no modification is needed in response to this objection.

Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust

12. The NWT wish to extend the protection afforded by this policy to all agricultural land. This would clearly not be in accord with current guidance. Furthermore, in a situation in which some agricultural land has to be developed, the NWT approach would offer no useful guidance on selecting the land to be developed.

13. They also want a clause added to the policy concerning wildlife on agricultural land but in my view this would not be appropriate in this policy, which is concerned with selecting which agricultural land may be developed for other purposes.

14. I conclude that no modification is needed in response to this objection.

Barratt and Mr & Mrs Burton

15. I believe the changes to the policy I have identified above go some way to meeting these objections.

16. In addition I think it is relevant to say that the wording of this policy was not decisive in determining the outcome of the objections concerning land in Woodborough. The decisive considerations were the Green Belt and settlement policy. In as far as agricultural considerations were important, I consider that the objectors' case was hampered more by the absence of an independent agricultural assessment than by the wording of this policy.

17. I conclude that no modification is justified as a result of this objection.

Overall Conclusions

18. I therefore conclude that the policy should be reworded as indicated above. At the modification stage the Council should also take the opportunity to revise the text accompanying this policy so it refers to and reflects the latest guidance in the revised PPG7.

RECOMMENDATIONS

19. I recommend that policy ENV32 is reworded as follows:

Planning permission will not be granted for development that would result in a significant loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land unless:

(a) the proposal cannot reasonably be sited on non-agricultural land or a lower grade of agricultural land; or

(b) a more sustainable pattern of development would be achieved as a result of developing the better quality land.

20. I also recommend that the text accompanying the policy is revised so that it refers to and reflects the latest government guidance.

1A.42 ENV35 MATURE LANDSCAPE AREAS

GENERAL

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000045	000050	National Farmers Union

Summary of Objection

The NFU completely opposes this policy which is being used to prevent sensible diversification that would benefit the local economy. Most of the county is covered by MLAs, which are preventing all development in these areas. The policy should identify developments that will be permitted, such as diversification schemes.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000309	000430	House Builders Federation

Summary of Objection

The HBF is not convinced that the MLAs are a robust designation. Because the designations have not been tested, the justification in the Local Plan should be more explicit. The MLA identification work has not been subjected to public consultation.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001158	002530	Nottingham County Council (Strategic Property)

Summary of Objection

The policy is objected to because it sets tests that cannot be applied by reference to the policy and text alone. The policy is therefore inappropriate in a Local Plan. However, MLAs are important and a policy is needed. An alternative wording is suggested.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001324	002780	Langridge Homes Ltd

Summary of Objection

MLAs are not objected to in principle but the areas identified in the NCC study should not have been adopted in the Local Plan without further detailed work by GBC. It is difficult to justify MLAs in the urban fringe, especially in the east of the borough. The Local Plan's definition of MLAs is arbitrary and fails to acknowledge the broader influences that define an area's landscape character. MLAs are not permanent and a balance has to be struck between the wish to protect them and the need for housing and employment.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001340	003104	The British Wind Energy Association

Summary of Objection

In the second line of the policy, 'an adverse effect' should be changed to 'a significant adverse effect.'

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001345	003154	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust

Summary of Objection

The tone of the policy needs to be strengthened. It should refer to "a demonstrable and overriding need for development, or development that is appropriate to the area"

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
003932	010762	R.J.B. Mining Ltd

Summary of Objection

Amend the policy to include qualification that any harm caused to MLAs should be "unacceptable" before consideration is given to refusing planning permission;

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001325	201566	Papplewick Parish Council

Summary of Objection

The Parish Council objects to 'significantly effect' in the Second Deposit instead of 'an adverse effect' – the original in the First Deposit gives stronger protection.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
004893	201468	County Land & Business Association

Summary of Objection

The designation of MLAs is objected to, especially as the protection is almost as strong as for statutory designations. The policy should refer to "significant adverse impact".

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
005017	201992	The Countryside Agency

Summary of Objection

Considers the change made to this policy in the Second Deposit as retrograde because it could discriminate against enhancement proposals, which would have a positive significant effect. The amendment should therefore be reversed, or at least retain the reference to "adverse".

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

1. While I was writing my report, consultations began on a revision of the guidance on planning in rural areas (PPS7 to replace PPG7). Because this is in draft form I have given it little weight in comparison to PPG7 which is current government policy.
2. One aspect of the consultation PPS7 is the suggestion that local rural designations should no longer appear in Local Plans. If this guidance comes through the consultation process unscathed, it would have clear and dramatic consequences for this policy. However, as things stand this is not the current guidance, so I am not following it. In any event, before deleting this policy thought would need to be given to what form a replacement criteria-based policy should take. This could involve further work and consultation.
3. In the meanwhile, therefore, I am adhering to the guidance in PPG7 (paragraph 4.16). This says that local countryside designations should carry less weight than national designations and should not unduly restrict acceptable development by failing to specify the particular features of the local countryside they are designed to protect or enhance. They are only to be used where there is good reason to believe that normal planning policies cannot provide the necessary protection. Local designations are to be carefully scrutinised to ensure they are soundly based on a formal assessment of the qualities of the countryside.
4. In this regard I note that the Local Plan's MLAs are derived from the Structure Plan (policy 3/3) and a countywide survey carried out for the County Council in 1992 and reviewed five years later. This work was tested at the Local Plan Inquiry in relation to a few objection sites and on this basis I am satisfied that it meets the PPG7 requirement of being soundly based on a formal (one could even say over-formal!) assessment of the qualities of the countryside. The documentation also provides an indication of what is considered of value in each MLA.
5. I also note that although most of the MLAs are in the Green Belt, not all of them are. This means that the openness of all the MLAs is not protected by Green Belt policy. In any event open recreational uses are appropriate in the Green Belt and may not always be so in the MLAs. Golf courses, for example, have a marked impact on the character and appearance of the area in which they are located. Such proposals may be acceptable in the Green Belt but not in a particular MLA.

The NFU

6. Without some evidence (which is lacking) I am not inclined to accept the NFU's assertion that this policy is effectively preventing all development and diversification. I am sceptical about this claim partly because their other claim (that most of the county is covered by this designation) is questionable or misleading in the case of Gedling. The MLAs are a patchwork and I rather doubt whether many rural land holdings are completely within a MLA. If this is true, the impact of this policy is far more likely to be directing development towards locations outside MLAs than preventing it entirely. In any event, the vast majority of farmland in Gedling is also in the Green Belt and this must be having some influence on development as well – so it may be difficult to separate the two impacts.

7. Be all this as it may, the NFU’s “total opposition” to this policy invites me to take a view on the principle of the policy. For the reasons I have given in my introduction above, I am not inclined to discard the policy entirely while PPG7 is still operative.
8. A more specific grievance from the NFU is that the policy prevents sensible diversification schemes. Rural Diversification is dealt with specifically in policy E9. In my view this adopts a positive approach to such schemes provided the consequences of such development are not unduly harmful. Where a scheme arises in a MLA, the good and bad effects of the proposal would have to be weighed in the balance. This seems to me to be a reasonable and proper approach for the Local Plan to adopt. Any conflicts can only be resolved in the light of the details and merits of any particular proposal and its siting and not on the basis that one side of the argument should prevail every time.
9. For these reasons I conclude that no modification is justified by the NFU objection to this policy.

The HBF

10. As far as the HBF is concerned, some of what they say is concerned with procedures. Whilst at an earlier stage in the Local Plan process it was fair to say that the MLA designations had not been tested, this is no longer the case because of the Local Plan Inquiry. As things stand now all of the MLAs have been open to public scrutiny (twice), some have attracted objections and some objectors have pursued their objections at a public inquiry. I do not consider that the procedural point has any force now, even if it did have at the time the objection was made.
11. As to whether the Local Plan should include a fuller justification for the MLA policy, there is something of a dilemma here. I have already said that I consider that the body of work on this topic is sufficient to satisfy what PPG7 says about being soundly based on a formal assessment of the qualities of the countryside. Local Plan paragraph 1.80 draws attention to this work and summarises it, fairly in my opinion. To include all the back-up documentation in the Local Plan would increase the plan’s length inordinately and would (frankly) give undue attention to this topic. Paragraph 1.80 seems to me to be a reasonable compromise between the need to explain and the need for brevity.
12. I conclude that no modification is needed in response to this objection.

Objector 1158

13. It is not entirely clear to what aspect of the policy the objection relates. Whilst the alternative wording proposed by the objector has the advantage of brevity, I consider that the greater detail and specificity of the wording in the Local Plan has advantages. I conclude that no modification is needed.

Langridge Homes

14. I note that Langridge Homes do not object to the inclusion of a MLA policy in the Local Plan or to its current wording.
15. In effect this objection concerns the inclusion of several of the Langridge Housing objection sites in MLAs. In each case I deal with the issue in the appropriate part of my report on policy H2. However, even there I deal with the MLA aspects of each site very

briefly. This is because the MLA designation was not the decisive consideration at any of the Langridge housing objection sites. In every case, even if the MLA designation had been removed, the outcome (not to allocate) would have been the same for other (in my view more compelling and insurmountable) reasons connected with Green Belt policy. This being the case I consider it is unnecessary to go into great detail on the MLA issues here.

16. In general terms I do not agree with the objector that GBC should have re-examined the MLAs arising from NCC’s work. The strength of the policy lies in the consistency and wide applicability of that work. Even where the objector criticises the quality of landscape that is included in the MLA (for example at Spring Lane) there is no suggestion that things have changed to a material degree since the last NCC review of the areas. In any event, if the proposed allocation is not to proceed for other reasons, the imperative to amend the boundaries is reduced. I see no reason to alter the MLA boundaries at this time.
17. I conclude that the Local Plan should not be modified in response to this objection.

***Policy Wording – Significant and/or Adverse
(Objectors 1340, 1345, 3932, 1325, 4893 and 5017)***

18. In the First Deposit the policy referred to “an adverse effect”. In the Second Deposit this was changed to “a significant effect”, presumably to meet the objection from objector 1340. But this has given rise to objections seeking a reversal of the change. Objector 1345 wants the policy to talk in terms of “a demonstrable and overriding need for development, or development that is appropriate to the area”. Objector 3932 suggests “unacceptable”.
19. As objector 4893 points out a local policy such as this has to fit into a hierarchy of policies with a strength that is less than national designations. This is said to justify the word “significant” but goes against the “stronger” wording sought by objectors 1345 and 1325. But as objector 5017 points out the word “adverse” has to be included if the policy is not to operate against changes that would be beneficial. The word “unacceptable” in this context would be tautologous and would add nothing to the policy.
20. I note that the Council now wishes to revert to the original wording and I conclude that the wording in the second line of the policy should be “an adverse effect”.

RECOMMENDATION

21. I recommend that the wording in the second line of the policy should be “an adverse effect”. Otherwise I recommend no modification to the Local Plan in response to these objections.
22. But see below for a recommendation on listing MLA sites.

1A.43 ENV35 MATURE LANDSCAPE AREAS TRUMPERS PARK RAVENSHEAD

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000268	000372	Ravenshead Parish Council

Summary of Objection

The MLA at Trumpers Park south of Ravenshead should be extended to include land at Cornwater Fields.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001948	004582	Aldergate Properties Ltd

Summary of Objection

The MLAs are not listed in the plan or an appendix. However, the Proposals Map includes a MLA at Longdale Lane that does not warrant designation. The wooded area is protected by a TPO but the rest of the site has no distinguishing features worthy of protection. The site has no important visual quality.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

Objector 268

1. The Parish Council says land at Cornwater Fields has remained unploughed for some years and is taking on the characteristics of heathland and woodland. GBC says that whilst the small area at Trumpers Park (already designated as a MLA) has distinctive and mature landscape characteristics this is not (yet) the case at the larger objection site. Having seen and compared the two tracts of land, all the evidence I have supports the GBC position. I therefore conclude that no extension to the MLA south of Ravenshead is justified.

Objector 1948

2. As to the other objection, it is true the MLAs are not listed in the plan or an appendix but the Council had agreed to this in response to a County Council objection (now withdrawn). I conclude that a new appendix should be added to the Local Plan.
3. My understanding is that the County Council’s view of this site is equivocal. GBC says in evidence “The County Council have accepted that Trumpers Park does not have MLA characteristics in its current state.” Although the heathland may regenerate if appropriately managed, past management of the site has largely destroyed the special characteristics that gave rise to the original designation.
4. Without commenting on the motives of those involved or on whether “soil-scraping” requires planning permission, I can see no realistic prospect of more sympathetic land management in the future. I also note that the designated area at Trumpers Park was considered marginal in the past because of its small size. Whilst on balance the strong, healthy character of the acidic flora warranted MLA protection, this no longer applies with anything like the same force. However, I am reassured to note that the wooded part of the site is the subject of a TPO.
5. In all the circumstances I conclude that the MLA designation at Trumpers Park is no longer justified and that it should be deleted.

RECOMMENDATION

6. I recommend that the MLA designation at Trumpers Park should be deleted.
7. I recommend that the MLAs are listed in a new appendix in the Local Plan.

1A.44 ENV35 MATURE LANDSCAPE AREAS MAIN STREET LAMBLEY

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000587	000838	Mrs R Groves

Summary of Objection

The MLA boundary should coincide with the Conservation Area boundary.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

1. For convenience and to avoid unnecessary repetition this objection is dealt with under policy ENV30 along with another objection from Mrs Groves.

RECOMMENDATION

2. For my recommendation on this objection see under policy ENV30.
-

1A.45 ENV35 MATURE LANDSCAPE AREAS GEDLING WOOD

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
003972	010832	Metro Jennings Ltd

Summary of Objection

The area around Gedling Wood does not contain any key features used to define MLAs that would be harmed by development. The area has changed over the past century and could be improved visually (?) by structural landscaping.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

1. For convenience and to avoid unnecessary repetition this objection is dealt with under policy ENV26 along with another objection from Metro Jennings.

RECOMMENDATION

2. For my recommendation on this objection see under policy ENV26.
-

1A.46 ENV35 MATURE LANDSCAPE AREAS BONNER LANE

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001344	003123	Slack; Kirkham; Goldby; Grococks (Joint)

Summary of Objection

Land East of Calverton between Bonner Lane and Crookdole Lane should be removed from the Mature Landscape Area and allocated housing.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

1. This objection is considered in the section of the report dealing with policy H2 (Omission Site at Bonner Lane Calverton).

RECOMMENDATION

2. For my recommendation on this objection see under policy H2 (Omission Site at Bonner Lane Calverton).

1A.47 ENV35 MATURE LANDSCAPE AREAS DORKET HEAD

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000708	001024	Ibstock Property and Minerals

Summary of Objection

The MLA at Ibstock's Dorket Head site is inaccurate because it does not coincide with the approved quarry extension.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

1. The work done to identify MLAs was undertaken for the County Council using consistent criteria across the county. In my view this is one of its strengths. The work was first carried out in 1992 and was reviewed five years later (another strength). GBC says the review of MLAs concluded that the decision not to designate MLAs in areas already identified for development because of planning permissions should be reconsidered and the sites included so that any future planning decisions could take account of the special qualities of the area.
2. In view of this countywide decision I consider it would be inconsistent to exclude an area solely because it had planning permission for development. On all other criteria the Dorket Head site was designated. Maintaining the MLA designation will not invalidate the planning permission.
3. I conclude the Local Plan should not be modified in response to this objection.

RECOMMENDATION

4. I recommend the Local Plan should not be modified.

1A.48 ENV35 MATURE LANDSCAPE AREAS LAMBLEY LANE

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001090	002297	Alan Rowe Properties

Summary of Objection

A site at Glebe Farm Lambley Lane should be deleted from the MLA because it does not warrant MLA status. The south of site is allocated for residential development but retains its MLA. Designation, whilst the rest of the site has planning permission for commercial use.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

1. In the Second Deposit this objection site is crossed by the GCCF access road. Further to the southeast I have taken the view that the exact line of the route is still too uncertain for it to form the basis for decisions on the extent of the Green Belt and MLAs. The same consideration arises here but to a lesser extent.
2. The work done to identify MLAs was undertaken for the County Council using consistent criteria across the county. In my view this is one of its strengths. The work was first carried out in 1992 and was reviewed five years later (another strength). GBC says the review of MLAs concluded that the decision not to designate MLAs in areas already identified for development because of planning permissions should be reconsidered and the sites included so that any future planning decisions could take account of the special qualities of the area.
3. Immediately above (in relation to Dorket Head) I have said that in view of this countywide decision I consider it would be inconsistent to exclude an area solely because it had planning permission for development. Maintaining the MLA designation will not invalidate the planning permission.
4. In view of the above it would be inconsistent to take a different view on this site. On the other hand the small size of the objection site in relation to the proposed road (which I feel is bound to cross it) means that a decision to maintain the MLA designation may have little practical importance, other than by influencing the nature and extent of any landscaping. But there is also the land north of the objection site to consider, which at the moment is also still in the MLA.
5. On balance I conclude that the MLA designation should be retained.

RECOMMENDATION

6. I recommend no modification in response to this objection.

1A.49 ENV35 MATURE LANDSCAPE AREAS SOUTH OF WOODCHURCH ROAD

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001330	200944	Council for the Protection of Rural England
004082	200180	Mr J A Foster
004303	200475	97th Nottingham Brownies
004324	200505	Mr P Jacobs
004554	200866	Mr B Childs
004563	200875	Mrs D Crabtree
004564	200876	Mr A Crabtree
004578	200890	Bestwood St Albans Parish Council
004597	200909	KCA Press Agency

AND OVER 650 INDIVIDUAL OBJECTIONS

Summary of Objection

The land South of Woodchurch Road has been a Mature Landscape Area since 1992 and was confirmed in the 1997 landscape review. The land has been unchanged for 100 years and is part of the setting for Bestwood Lodge. Although neglected recently (by the Council) the site reflects, and is part of, the landscape of the wider area. Retain the MLA designation. Do not relocate Arnold Town Football Club to this site.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

1. The objection site is most of an area of open land to the south of Woodchurch Road. All this land was designated as part of a larger MLA (covering Bestwood Lodge) in the First Deposit. The northern part of the open land south of Woodchurch Road slopes down to the road and retains its MLA designation in the Second Deposit. However, the Second Deposit removed the designation from the southern part of the land. It is this change that gives rise to these numerous objections.
2. The level land that forms the objection site is a plateau that was originally a cricket field bounded by mature deciduous trees on its western and southern boundaries. It was part of what was a larger parkland, although it now has urban development on three sides and is, in my view, no longer rural in character. However, the parkland and MLA notation extend across Woodchurch Road to the north where the land is more rural. It is clear that the land north of Woodchurch Road is both more intrinsically attractive and retains more of its parkland character than the objection site.
3. There are two football pitches on the objection site, although the objectors say these are only a small part of the site's total area and are only in organised use for a small part of each week. The predominant use is as informal open space. Be this as it may, the issue to be resolved is whether the character and appearance of the objection site retains enough of its original character to warrant protection for **landscape** reasons. Whether it is rural or urban and whether or not it should be retained as recreational open space are not at issue here.
4. It is agreed that the Council was prompted to review the MLA designation on this land during its search for a stadium for a local football club. It has since decided that it no longer considers this site appropriate for that purpose. The land has also been considered for residential development in the past, although this is not a proposal in this Local Plan. Nevertheless, having been prompted to review the MLA in this area for reasons that may no longer be relevant, the Council still maintains that the landscape

quality of the objection site does not warrant the MLA designation. I think it is fair to say that the objectors do not trust the Council's motives and do not feel that the open nature of the site can be maintained in the long term without the aid of the MLA designation. The recreational open space protection policy in the Local Plan (R1) would allow development if adequate replacement football pitches were provided elsewhere.

5. The Council is concerned that retaining the MLA notation on land that does not warrant it would damage the credibility of the policy. It also considers that the combined protection offered by Local Plan policy R1 and the Tree Preservation Order covering the main areas of trees on the site is sufficient to keep the land open. However, the Council acknowledges that no material change has taken place in the essential character and appearance of the site since it was first designated as a MLA.
6. It is also acknowledged that MLAs are designated to protect landscapes that have remained relatively unchanged over time but not necessarily the most attractive landscapes. To quote from paragraph 1.80 of the Local Plan, final selection involves a judgement concerning an area's historical, ecological and physical features and the continuity of its landscape character and setting within the local context. It is not dependent on features or attributes that are specifically rural.
7. The issue before me therefore comes down to two considerations:
 - does the objection site make a valuable contribution to the character and appearance of the wider MLA in this area, and
 - how does the landscape character of the objection site compare to other areas that are being protected by the MLA policy?
8. As far as the first matter is concerned the objectors wanted me to look out from the objection site when standing at its centre and to look into it from the high land to the north of Woodchurch Road. They also wanted me to look at it from around its periphery.
9. As to the second issue, I need to compare this site with others that have either retained or lost their MLA status. In particular it was suggested that I should look at the Fire Brigade playing fields some distance to the north of the objection site that have been removed from the MLA and at other objection sites where this is an issue.
10. On the basis of these assessments, I come to the following conclusions:
 - when seen from the elevated position of Bestwood Lodge and its grounds, this site (and its openness) is an important component of the view. There is a cleared viewing area to facilitate the appreciation of the landscape in this direction. Any major change to the objection site would materially harm this public view and the character and appearance of the parkland and wider MLA. Retaining the sloping open land between the playing field and Woodchurch Road would not be sufficient to maintain the openness and attractiveness of the view from Bestwood Lodge;
 - comparing the objection site to the Fire Brigade playing fields to the north of this MLA is also instructive. Although the levelling that has occurred in both cases produces a rather artificial feature that does not sit entirely comfortably within the parkland landscape, this effect is far more pronounced in the case of the (larger) Fire Brigade site;

- as to comparisons with other MLA areas, although the objection site is less rural than many others, it is distinctive and does – as indicated above – make a visual and historic contribution to the wider Bestwood Lodge area of which it is part. However, its intrinsic qualities and attractiveness are less than the most attractive MLAs in the area.

11. In view of the above, my overall conclusion is that the objection site should retain its MLA designation in this review of the Local Plan. However, this assessment is made in the context of there being no need, plan or intention to develop the site. If, in a future review of the Local Plan, there were to be a compelling need to develop this land, the assessment might be different but this would depend on the circumstances and pressures that existed at the time.

12. I conclude that the MLA designation should be restored to this objection site in the Local Plan.

RECOMMENDATION

13. I recommend that the MLA designation should be restored to this objection site by a modification to the Local Plan.

1A.50 ENV38 FLOODING

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001158	002534	Nottingham County Council (Strategic Property)

Summary of Objection

The policy includes subjective as well as measurable technical tests and is therefore inappropriate in a local plan. It should be replaced by “The borough council will resist development proposals that would increase the risk of flooding.” Areas at risk from flooding should be shown on the Proposals Map.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000309	201502	House Builders Federation

Summary of Objection

(Second Deposit) The objection is to paragraph 1.85 and the requirement for sustainable drainage systems. There are practical problems with adoption and maintenance that need to be addressed.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000722	201983	Severn Trent Water Limited

Summary of Objection

(Second Deposit) Paragraph 1.83 should be amended to include “It is important to understand that EA’s Indicative Floodplain Maps do not take into account the protection to land that is afforded by existing flood defences. PPG25 sets out further guidance on the approach to flood risk assessment where development is proposed in defended floodplains”.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001948	201942	Aldergate Properties Ltd

Summary of Objection

(Second Deposit) The Local Plan should not show areas of ‘flood risk’. To show the ‘flood plain’ as defined by the Environment Agency on the Proposals Map is likely to cause unnecessary alarm. Only areas at real risk should be shown and not areas that are protected by flood defences.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
004893	201469	County Land and Business Association

Summary of Objection

(Second Deposit) The objector is concerned about the interpretation of paragraph 1.84 (concerning floor levels in areas of risk). A degree of flexibility should be allowed, especially for extensions to existing buildings in areas of risk.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions**Objector 1158**

1. It is not clear to me which aspects of the proposed policy the objector considers are subjective. In my view there is considerable merit in the policy going beyond a simple statement of intent. By indicating that it is not only whether a proposed development site is likely to be at risk but that development in one place may increase flood risks elsewhere, the policy aids understanding. This gives notice (properly in my view) of the breadth of issues to be taken into account.
2. I note that the Environment Agency has withdrawn its objections. I also note that areas at risk of flooding are to be shown on the Proposals Map (Second Deposit), which meets this aspect of the objection.
3. I conclude that there is no merit in the proposed wording change in this objection and that the Local Plan should not be modified on account of it.

Objector 309

4. The HBF alleges there is a requirement in paragraph 1.85 for developers to provide Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS). Yet the paragraph only says “Sustainable Drainage Systems are effective in reducing the impact of surface water drainage and

are significant in the process of delivering sustainable development.” I consider this to be some way short of a universal requirement.

5. The HBF says house builders are keen to incorporate SuDS in their schemes but that there are practical difficulties about maintenance and adoption. This may well be true but it seems to me that the HBF are using what the Local Plan actually says as a pretext to pursue issues that lay outside the remit of the Local Plan.
6. I conclude there is no need or reason to modify the Local Plan because of this objection.

Objector 722

7. As set out above, Severn Trent Water wants additional text added to (the revised) paragraph 1.83. Initially the Council thought this was unnecessary because the Second Deposit text had been agreed with the Environment Agency. My understanding from the written representations is that the objector and the Council have now agreed that the text in paragraph 1.83 should be amended to include a reference to “the balancing exercise to be undertaken in relation to the sequential approaches in PPG3 and PPG25”. However, the proposed wording has not been given to me. I note also from the written representations that the objector sees this as a matter that relates primarily to the proposed developments at Teal Close. This is something that the objector and the Council may agree about but I do not. In these circumstances I am reluctant to recommend a change to the text that I have not seen.
8. In addition, at the Local Plan Inquiry there was considerable disagreement as to what PPG25 meant when it referred to assessing proposals as if there were no defences. This is one of the matters on which I did not have the benefit of the EA’s views. Again I am extremely wary about agreeing an unseen text. For the same reason I am also wary about agreeing the text put forward in the original objection.
9. In any event I am not convinced that any such amendment would improve the Local Plan or prove helpful to its readers and users in general.
10. For these reasons I am unwilling to recommend a modification in response to this objection and conclude that no modification should be made.

Objector 1948

11. This objection is not entirely unrelated to the previous one. Showing areas of flood risk on the Proposals Map is at the behest of PPG25. We do not have sufficient information to enable us to map areas of “real risk” as suggested by this objector, which is why the EA’s “indicative areas” are used. I consider that the accompanying text in the Local Plan gives an explanation of the limitations of the data. I hope this will avoid causing undue alarm. In any event, as I have said, showing the indicative flood risk areas on the Proposals Map is advocated by PPG25 and in accord with current guidance.
12. I conclude that no modification should be made in response to this objection.

Objector 4893

13. GBC says paragraph 1.84 was added to the Local Plan at the request of the Environment Agency. GBC also says the paragraph does not apply to existing development in the flood plain, although I see no reason to suppose it would not apply to extensions to buildings.
14. Whilst a call for flexibility may appear entirely reasonable, it sits ill with the precautionary principle that underlies PPG25 and current guidance on matters relating to flooding. Of course every development proposal will have to be judged on its merits and there may be reasonable grounds to depart from any rule or guideline in a particular case. But in my view this does not justify attempting to write such exceptions into the rules or guidelines.
15. The objector is concerned about potential harmful effects on people and businesses if these guidelines are unreasonably enforced on extensions to existing buildings in areas of risk. But the potential impacts of flooding (on the site of any building and beyond it) are very great in terms of life and well being as well as in terms of convenience and economic advantage. Where necessary such difficult judgements should be made in relation to individual cases and in the light of all the facts rather than in the abstract.
16. Accordingly I recommend no modification in response to this objection.

RECOMMENDATION

17. I recommend no modification to the Local Plan in response to these objections.
-

2.1 H1 DWELLING PROVISION

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000309	000432	House Builders Federation
000309	201498	House Builders Federation
000466	003026	William Jones Settlement Trust
000717	001496	Nottinghamshire County Council
000721	001068	St Modwen Developments Ltd
000721	200274	St Modwen Developments Ltd
001021	002197	Hallam Land Management Ltd
001158	002402	Nottinghamshire County Council (Strategic Property)
001158	002403	Nottinghamshire County Council (Strategic Property)
001158	002404	Nottinghamshire County Council (Strategic Property)
001158	002405	Nottinghamshire County Council (Strategic Property)
001158	002406	Nottinghamshire County Council (Strategic Property)
001158	002407	Nottinghamshire County Council (Strategic Property)
001158	002408	Nottinghamshire County Council (Strategic Property)
001158	002409	Nottinghamshire County Council (Strategic Property)
001158	201954	Nottinghamshire County Council (Strategic Property)
001324	002781	Langridge Homes Ltd
001324	201315	Langridge Homes Ltd
001325	002845	Papplewick Parish Council
001325	002848	Papplewick Parish Council
001330	002926	CPRE
001334	003031	Jaycee (Nottingham) Ltd.
001334	201381	Jaycee (Nottingham) Ltd.
001336	003062	Hucknall Against Rural Development
001337	003067	Messrs J,N,C&T Cutts
001338	003081	Birch Homes Ltd
001344	003124	Slack; Kirkham; Goldby; Grococks (Joint)
001344	201411	Slack; Kirkham; Goldby; Grococks (Joint)
001345	003217	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust
001345	003250	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust
001664	003933	W Hardy & Sons
001937	004523	Mr N Foster c/o FPD Savills
001939	004540	CWS Property & Development
001942	004546	Dr Kapur
001943	004548	Persimmon Homes (North Midlands) Ltd
001945	004552	Mr N Puri c/o FPD Savills
001947	004557	Mrs D & D Pickerill & Purvis
001948	004580	Aldergate Properties Ltd
001948	201943	Aldergate Properties Ltd
001949	004597	The Marshall Family c/o J H Walter Rural Consultants
001955	004623	Gedling Labour Group
001955	004624	Gedling Labour Group
001955	004626	Gedling Labour Group
003835	010526	R.A.G.E.
003835	010528	R.A.G.E.
003851	010571	Barratt (East Midlands)
003851	201329	Barratt (East Midlands)
003853	010579	Mr & Mrs R W Burton
003853	201324	Mr & Mrs R W Burton

AND ABOUT 12 INDIVIDUAL OBJECTIONS

(SEVERAL OBJECTORS SEEK TO ARGUE FOR OR AGAINST PARTICULAR SITES IN THE CONTEXT OF POLICY H1. THESE SITE-SPECIFIC MATTERS ARE DEALT WITH LATER IN THIS CHAPTER – SEE UNDER POLICY H2.)

Summary of Objections

- The Local Plan does not allocate sufficient housing land to meet the Structure Plan requirement.
- The requirement in Policy H1 is too high and should be reduced in the light of the RPG annual target and revised population projections.
- Sites with existing planning permissions have not been identified and a non-implementation allowance should be applied to ensure the Structure Plan requirement is met.
- The Urban Capacity Study is based on a flawed methodology and its conclusions are over-optimistic.
- There is confusion in the terminology used to classify urban capacity and windfall sites.
- The Industrial Contingency allowance is not appropriate and should not be used to provide flexibility.
- A flexibility allowance should be added to the residual Structure Plan requirement.
- The search sequence is inappropriate; too much housing is proposed in Gedling Village.
- Policy H1 should refer to completions.
- There is confusion in the presentation of the housing land supply calculations – both with the figures and with the headings.
- The reference to 'public transport corridors' should not have been deleted.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

1. Two Housing Round Table Sessions were held, one to discuss housing land supply in general and the other to explore the timing and deliverability of the housing allocation at Gedling Colliery / Chase Farm (hereafter GCCF) in particular. I have taken into account the evidence I heard at these sessions and at other Inquiry sessions together with the written submissions of the objectors and the Council.

The Structure Plan Requirement

2. The Nottinghamshire Structure Plan Review (hereafter NSPR) was adopted in November 1996. Policy 4/1 of the Structure Plan says that provision should be made for about 8000 dwellings in Gedling Borough between 1991 and 2011.
3. The First Deposit provided for a shortfall of 485 dwellings on the NSPR requirement. There were many objections to the shortfall and the Local Plan's failure to justify it. In the Second Deposit the shortfall was reduced to 68 dwellings. To that extent it appears that many of the objections to the First Deposit had largely been met in the Second Deposit. However, I note that some of the reasons given for the original objections have not been addressed. In any event, most objectors who had originally said that the amount of land allocated for housing was too small continued to do so when they made further representations during the Local Plan Inquiry.
4. An exception to this was the County Planning Authority who objected to the First Deposit because of the shortfall in housing provision but is content with the figures in the Second Deposit. Local plans are required to be in general conformity with the Structure Plan.
5. Most parties accept that the NSPR provides the only reliable strategic housing requirement for the Local Plan. Guidance in paragraph 28 of PPG3 sets out the relationship between the regional, strategic and local levels of the plan led system. It is for Regional Planning Guidance to establish the housing provision for each Structure Plan area and subsequently the role of the Structure Plan to determine the requirement for individual districts.

6. Notwithstanding this guidance, CPRE, RAGE and others questioned the need to provide for 8000 dwellings in policy H1. These objections were mainly based on three arguments:
- revised regional guidance;
 - improved housing performance in Nottingham City and
 - the latest household projections.
7. More generally, several individual objectors at the Local Plan Inquiry argued that the figures were out of date and should be reduced in the light of current trends.

Regional Guidance

8. Revised RPG8 was published in 2002 some six years after the NSPR was adopted. CPRE suggest that using the Structure Plan requirement in the light of the new figures in the revised RPG could result in 8000 units being built by 2011 and then only 1000 units between 2011-2021. They consider it more sensible to average-out the provision between 2001-2021 based on the RPG annualised figures.

Nottingham City

9. Secondly, CPRE and others stress that NSPR is concerned with housing provision across the whole county, including the City of Nottingham where, it is said, the emerging Local Plan anticipates allocations of 8000 dwellings above the Structure Plan figure for that authority. CPRE claim that redistributing this figure around the other districts on a pro-rata basis could reduce Gedling's requirement to 6000 units.

Household Projections

10. The third argument centres on the Local Plan's failure to incorporate the 1999 revision to the household growth projections for the period 1996-2021. It is claimed that the figure in policy H1 is, therefore, based on out-dated population trends and statistics having been derived from the superseded predict and provide approach.

Conclusions on the Structure Plan Context

11. It is clear that to substantially reduce provision for the borough between 1991-2011 would take the plan out of general conformity with the NSPR. I have not seen or heard any evidence that would justify such an action. Certainly I am not in a position to recommend such action relying on emerging plans and guidance. As PPG12 indicates, the present system for planning is based on a hierarchy of plans from the regional to the local, with the immediate context for the Local Plan being supplied by the adopted Structure Plan. GBC have used NSPR (certainly in the Second Deposit) as their context for this Local Plan and in my view they are right to do so if the Local Plan is to avoid assuming a role beyond its competence.
12. Thus, whilst it is true that Regional Guidance has been revised since the latest version of the Structure Plan was prepared, this means the new guidance has not yet been incorporated in a plan at sub-regional level. I consider it would be premature for me to anticipate the long-term consequences of the regional guidance for Gedling until this has occurred. It may be that in the long term a slowing down in the rate of development in Gedling would be appropriate. But in the short term, the rate of development inherent in the older figures is not being achieved and there is some evidence that this is caused (at least in part) by an inadequate supply of building land. In the circumstances I consider that the extant Structure Plan should be followed.

13. My understanding is that the new Joint Nottinghamshire Structure Plan (joint between NCC and Nottingham City Council) has not yet been placed on deposit. Current information indicates an Examination in Public in June/July 2004, with the target for adoption in the summer of 2005. Subject to its own Local Plan progress and monitoring, GBC would then be able to seek either a modification inquiry or an early review of the Local Plan. Until a Structure Plan Examination in Public has taken place, when a new context will be debated, the adopted NSPR provides the most appropriate source of information available.
14. While it may be prudent to be aware of the situation in other districts in the county, it is not the role of this Local Plan to directly address the implications of any anticipated extra capacity in the City of Nottingham. This is especially the case when the figures being relied on by objectors are not part of an adopted local plan. The City of Nottingham's Local Plan Inquiry, which will test the validity and reliability of the City's Urban Capacity Study, will not produce results in time for me to take them into account. The next NSPR will address any new and additional capacity in due course and will determine the future distribution of housing provision between the districts, having taken full account of all the circumstances in each plan area at the time.
15. Whilst I appreciate some objectors' concerns about reliance on outdated projections, there are tried and tested methods for interpreting data, trends and statistics to inform the development plan process. The NSPR worked on such a basis, as information in the Technical Report 1 indicates. This provides a standard methodology for all the districts and there is value in maintaining a consistent approach in the determination of housing provision. It is the role of the Structure Plan and regional guidance to interpret any changing trends in population and household projections with a wider perspective than can be formed in an individual district. The Local Plan process should not seek to prejudge the outcome. On that basis, like GBC, I am content to rely on NSPR as the tested basis for the best demographic information available.
16. For all these reasons, and having regard to the guidance in PPG12, I consider there are no justified or exceptional reasons why Gedling Local Plan should depart from the general requirements set out in the adopted Structure Plan.
17. PPG3 is a complex document and it does not seek to ride roughshod over existing planning procedures. It is true that PPG3 seeks to reduce the use of greenfield land for housing but it is also concerned to maintain an adequate supply of housing so that people can be adequately housed. In my view it does not amount to a justification for a local plan ignoring the strategic requirement set by an adopted Structure Plan.

Has Enough Land Been Identified?

18. Unsurprisingly opposing views are also expressed on this. On the one hand it is argued that the Local Plan has failed to allocate sufficient housing land to ensure that the NSPR requirement can be met. On the other hand it is said that that more land than is actually required, even to satisfy the Structure Plan, has been allocated.
19. RAGE argues that every possible advantage should be taken of any leeway to under-provide. Both Policy H1 and NSPR Policy 4/1 use the word "about" and RAGE suggest at least a 10% reduction in the Local Plan's provision. NCC confirms that in their view a

shortfall of up to about 10% would not automatically trigger an objection on conformity grounds. However, government guidance indicates that local plans should aim to meet the strategic requirement. Some relevant guidance was published during the course of the Local Plan Inquiry, including the Chancellor's Budget Statement and the Ministerial Statement by Mr Keith Hill (17th July 2003). The former is clear that the planning system must provide an adequate supply of housing land and should not frustrate the realisation of approved strategic dwelling needs (2003 Budget Report Economic and Fiscal Strategy Report: paragraph 3.120). This should be read together with the advice in PPG3 paragraph 30 that local planning authorities should seek to identify sufficient land to meet the strategic housing requirement.

20. In my view local plans should not seek to intentionally under-provide against the approved Structure Plan figure. I believe to do so would be against the best interests of forward planning. It would not comply with PPG3 or the general direction of recent government guidance and could potentially create a hiatus due to long lead in times for large sites. It is not a prudent long-term approach especially as the mechanisms to deal with changing circumstances are provided through Plan, Monitor and Manage procedures. Notwithstanding this I agree in principle with Nottinghamshire County Council that a 1% under-provision (68 dwellings in the Second Deposit) is not significant in itself.
21. Moreover, the recent Ministerial Statement by Keith Hill (17th July 2003) reiterated the importance of a 10 year supply and that the supply of housing should not be frustrated. On the basis of the evidence supplied to me I am inclined to accept the view that the land supply situation in Gedling is rather perilous and has been for long enough to hold back the level of house building below the rate envisaged in the Structure Plan. The NSPR plan period ends in 2011. Taking the strategic requirement as the only available guidance, and assuming a final adoption date for this Local Plan of 2004, would only provide for approximately a 7-year supply. Even so, until such a time as the NSPR is reviewed and a context for determining what the 10-year supply should be, I consider we need to follow the guidance in PPG3 and the Structure Plan.

The Housing Land Supply Calculation – Component Parts

Completions and Commitments

22. From the written information and the debate at the Housing Round Table, the figures in the Local Plan for completions are uncontested. I have no reason to question GBC's completion figures. Various objectors challenged the commitment figures on particular sites but I am satisfied with the Council's explanations of why their figures varied from extant planning permissions where there is an apparent discrepancy.
23. Whilst the figures for commitments were generally established, the House Builders Federation and Langridge Homes in particular argued that the assumption of a 100% completion rate was unrealistic especially as the Council had recognised that many applicants only seek planning permission for valuation purposes. A 10% non-implementation rate was suggested. During the course of the Inquiry I have not been told of constraints on any particular site which would render completion of an extant permission unrealistic. Whilst I understand the argument about permissions for valuation purposes, I have no evidence on which to formulate a discount figure in which I would have any confidence. On balance, I am of the opinion that an arbitrary non-implementation allowance should not be applied to this element of supply.

Capacity of Allocated Sites Without Permission

24. The Council's deliverability assumptions were questioned on a number of sites. At the Housing (Land Supply) Round Table GCCF was highlighted by objectors as far and away the most significant example of the Council's unrealistic deliverability assumptions. The Council accepts that if deliverability assumptions on GCCF are incorrect, there would be serious ramifications in terms of meeting the NSPR requirement. I am of the opinion that the overall capacity assumptions for the site are realistic, but that matters of deliverability and timing are less certain.
25. I deal with this matter in more detail in the context of policy H3. Whilst I share the Council's objective that the GCCF development should be implemented as soon as possible, I recognise that the process will be complex. Even so, I do not say it is impossible for the GCCF development to be completed by 2011, although taking everything into account it seems unlikely. But for me what has to be decided is not whether the process **can** be completed by 2011 but whether it is wise to **rely on** it being done in this time. In my view the uncertainties are so great that it is not.
26. I consider it will be necessary for the whole project (that is all the 1120 dwellings) to be included in the Local Plan and committed at the outset, otherwise the whole project might be jeopardised. However, for the purposes of deciding how much housing land is needed elsewhere in the borough, I consider that it would be reasonable and realistic to assume that only 700 dwellings are likely to be completed by 2011.
27. Furthermore, I consider that the uncertainties and consequences are so great that delivery at GCCF should be closely and regularly monitored and especially at specified dates. The results of any substantial delay in delivery at GCCF will impact outside this site as well as within it. I am making recommendations concerning other sites that are intended to enable appropriate responses to be made if a substantial delay in implementation does occur (see policy H4 Safeguarded Land).
28. I therefore conclude that the Council's estimates on deliverability at GCCF are more optimistic than would be prudent taking into account that GBC acknowledges objectors' views that this site is of crucial importance to meeting the NSPR figure.
29. Otherwise I have no particular reason to assume that development will not take place quickly once the release of land has been secured. I have no reason, therefore, to reduce or discount any other figures included in this category. I am bolstered in this view by the observation from the Structure Plan Authority that the more one makes specific allowances for delay at particular sites, the less one needs to resort to general reductions overall.

The GBC Urban Capacity Study

30. Work on the original Gedling Urban Capacity Study (UCS) pre-dated the publication of PPG3 and Tapping the Potential. Whilst "Tapping the Potential: Towards Better Practice" through its title alone indicates that it is a guide to good practice rather than a proscriptive checklist, I attach considerable weight to its guidance.
31. I note that the 1999 UCS was later refined by the Council to take more account of the categories of urban sites not previously examined as potential sources of housing land supply. An Addendum to the UCS addressing windfalls was published in January 2002.

32. Whilst I acknowledge that NCC considers the Gedling UCS to be one of the most comprehensive in the South Nottinghamshire sub-area, nevertheless many objectors raised concerns as to its adequacy, methodology and conclusions. The methodological objections can be summarised as follows:
- lack of commercial testing for the marketability and deliverability of sites;
 - failure to explicitly outline the discounting assumptions;
 - reliance on trends of past rates of development rather than a survey based approach;
 - failure to identify and publish details of the sites considered;
 - and failure to undertake a corresponding assessment of the amount and quality of open space in the borough.
33. The combination of these flaws leads, the objectors claim, to a greatly exaggerated assessment of capacity.
34. It is an obvious failing of the methodology that the development industry was not consulted with a view to establishing the marketability and deliverability of sites. Government guidance, in PPG3 paragraph 45 and Tapping the Potential page 7, notes the benefits of working in constructive partnership. Involving the building industry could have provided additional robustness to the study. I would therefore expect the Council to adopt a more open approach in this respect in the next UCS. Notwithstanding these comments, the lack of consultation does not mean the Council's assumptions are necessarily incorrect. I do, however, recognise that the absence of discussion has led to questions regarding the accuracy of the discounting procedures.
35. On the matter of discounting, like several objectors, I found the process through which individual sites were discounted to be somewhat obscure. This was compounded by the fact that individual sites in the UCS had not been identified early in the process. The non-identification of sites led one objector to cast doubt on whether they exist and could be developed. The Council has clarified that a proportion of UCS sites were discounted by assessing each individual site (based on planning history, development control and other considerations). This is to be preferred to discounting a specified proportion of the overall number of sites using an arbitrary discount rate.
36. I am content that an element of discounting has occurred and that it was undertaken through a fairly rigorous and site by site methodology. Clearly outlining the process of discounting is a matter for the Technical Papers and not for the wording of the Plan, so I conclude it is not appropriate to amend the Local Plan as far as a description of the process is concerned. More importantly, being satisfied that there has been discounting on a site by site basis and noting the results of the GBC's monitoring (which they described as positive), it would amount to double-discounting to apply a proportionate reduction as well. I therefore consider it is unnecessary to alter the figures in the plan.
37. Turning to the individual elements of the UCS, my starting point for a more detailed consideration of the Study is to explore to what extent the elements identified in Tapping the Potential page 10 have been addressed. From written material, CPRE in particular focus on 5 elements which appear to have been omitted:
- subdivision of existing housing,
 - development of car parks,

- empty homes,
- flats over shops,
- intensification of existing areas.

38. I accept the Council's assessment that the nature of the borough's housing stock indicates that sub-division will not provide a significant number of additional dwellings. I am also satisfied that whilst there may be some potential for the redevelopment of car parks, this appears unlikely to be for housing. I also accept that new flats over shops are unlikely to make a significant contribution in suburban Gedling.
39. It is correct that a figure for re-used empty homes has not been included in the windfall total, although Tapping the Potential indicates that it should be. Whilst this may be another marker for how future work should be undertaken, all the indications are that this is not a significant consideration in Gedling. Pragmatically, therefore, I do not see this as requiring an alteration to the Local Plan.
40. It is also true that the figures do not include dwellings coming forward from the redevelopment of existing housing sites. The Council considers that any redevelopment would mainly be for single houses on large plots as has mainly been the case in the past. Although this may be changing, I do not have any data upon which to base a different assumption.
41. Thus, while it is clear the UCS has not addressed all the categories suggested by Tapping the Potential, in the main I accept the Council's reasons for this. Furthermore, whilst the inclusion of the five categories listed above might have provided some additional capacity, the change in the overall requirement would have been marginal. Monitoring will reveal whether these sources of additional dwellings are of greater significance and the Council will be able to address the implications in due course.
42. Although NCC (Strategic Property) did not attend the Round Table, they made similar objections and comments to those who did. For example, they also comment that policy H1 and the Urban Capacity Study does not follow Tapping the Potential closely enough, making it difficult to test and monitor the dwelling supply. The changes in the Second Deposit and the addendum to Technical Paper 1 go some way to addressing these concerns but in general I share this view. However, I recognise that this may be due to the study having been undertaken before the guidance was available.
43. I conclude that a full urban capacity study as indicated in Tapping the Potential has not been conducted in Gedling. However, I attach some importance to the NCC comparison table that indicates Gedling's UCS is the most comprehensive in South Nottinghamshire. I also note that the recent monitoring report indicates that 50 additional dwellings have been granted planning permission over the 171 anticipated.
44. I therefore accept that in general the inadequacies in the Council's UCS methodology are unlikely to alter the overall result significantly one way or the other. I also draw some comfort from the fact that the criticisms come from both sides and to some extent the pluses would cancel out the minuses.
45. So, notwithstanding its limitations, the Council's UCS provides the best information available. In all the circumstances I accept the conclusions of the study as fairly robust

and, subject to the caveats that I have stated, I am prepared to use them. After all, GBC can hardly be blamed for not using Tapping the Potential as a guide when it did most of its work before that document was published. However, in future more survey work and a more open process will need to replace the approach used until now.

Windfalls

46. CPRE drew attention to the historical importance of windfall sites in Gedling. Figures in "More Welcome Homes" (1997) indicate that between 1988 and 1996 of the 330 dwellings per year that were completed in the borough, approximately half were on windfall sites.
47. Changes were made in the Second Deposit to up-date the figures in Policy H1 and to clarify the way the information in the supporting text was presented. Policy H1 now identifies the types of supply that contribute to windfalls as urban capacity, commercial windfall allowance, lapsed permissions and conversions/change of use. The Council has also referred to an Industrial Contingency Allowance, which is separate from the housing supply figures and which the Council see as an additional flexibility allowance.

Unidentified Small Sites

48. As far as the category of unidentified small sites is concerned, many objectors suggest there is a finite supply of small sites and it is logical to assume that the more obvious and easier sites have already been developed, or soon will be. Moreover, they say it is wrong to assume that every small site is available for residential development because of increased competition from retail and leisure uses. Conversely it was said that the housing market had changed since 1990 and that there is now more pressure to redevelop industrial sites because housing land supply is tight. Moreover, if easily developable greenfield sites on the edge of the urban area are restricted, more urban windfall sites will come forward. My own view is that while several such theories can be argued, there is little evidence to support them in the Gedling context.

Urban Open Space and Windfalls

49. Many objectors complained that the UCS results rely disproportionately on urban open space. It was said that about 40% of windfalls were expected to be built on existing urban open spaces, which is equivalent to about 275 dwellings or about 9 ha of open space. The objectors regard these as greenfield windfalls that should be removed from the windfall allowance. It is further suggested that the figure should be heavily discounted to take account of increasing resistance from local residents to the development of such sites, especially where incidental open space is involved. This is seen as particularly important because the Council has not undertaken an audit of existing open space and paragraph 7.8 of the Local Plan acknowledges that there is a shortfall of 37 ha in the borough based on the NPFA standards.
50. However, the Council's analysis indicated that of the total of 685 windfall units, only 49 could be classified as greenfield windfall (7.2% of the total). PPG3 is clear that these should not be included in the figures and I consider they should be deducted. On the other hand, I agree with GBC in classifying private domestic gardens as previously developed land as this accords with PPG3.
51. As a result I conclude the figure for Urban Capacity sites should be reduced to 636 dwellings.

Commercial Windfall Allowance

52. In the Second Deposit a new category – the commercial windfall allowance – was introduced that is comprised of commercial windfall sites larger than 0.4 ha. This amounts to 213 units and is derived by applying a past delivery rate to sites currently in use and imminent sites, as well as former allocations accounting for 179 units.
53. Objectors say this allowance is unreliable and should be discounted to reflect this. The factors highlighted as contributing to its unreliability are that it does not take into account likely land assembly problems, the value of retaining the current uses or that in some locations a residential use would not be desirable or compatible with government guidance. It was also suggested that double counting is occurring due to the lack of a clear distinction between commercial windfalls and Urban Capacity sites generally.
54. The Council attempted to clarify the situation by saying that the commercial windfall allowance only includes sites larger than 0.4 ha. I acknowledge the concerns expressed in the representations and accept that the information is far from clear, either in the Plan or the Technical Paper and Addendum. However, I consider that the appropriate response is to make the Local Plan clearer. But in view of my conclusions regarding the Industrial Contingency Allowance (below) and on flexibility allowances in general, I am not persuaded that a specific non-implementation allowance should be applied to this element of supply.

Imminent Sites

55. Many objections were made to the category of “imminent sites” in the First Deposit. In the Second Deposit, those sites with planning permission were included in ‘existing planning permissions’ and the remainder combined with the commercial windfall figure. The contentious category was thus deleted, on the face of it, meeting the objections. In my view the attempt to define a distinct category in this way was an unnecessary complication. I am satisfied that, in making this reclassification, no double counting has arisen and do not believe a specific discount is any longer necessary.

Lapsed Permissions on Small Sites

56. Several objectors comment that this source of supply cannot be relied upon. The Council may be willing to renew a planning permission but that does not ensure availability or implementation. Objectors’ suspicions were again reinforced because the sites had not been individually identified for builders to verify.
57. The Council said that they were not including all lapsed permissions but only those they assessed still to be available where planning permission would be renewed if the current permission were to lapse. Furthermore, these sites were reassessed for the Second Deposit and discounted if they were no longer considered viable or the land had been used for another purpose. In these circumstances I am of the opinion that a further discount, as suggested by some objectors, is not required. I am also satisfied that lapsed permissions are a legitimate potential source of supply that should be taken into account in the Local Plan. Once again the failure to share and verify this information with the building interests contributed to the difficulties.

Conversions

58. Conversions were omitted from the original UCS in the belief that they were not commercially viable and that redevelopment was more common than conversions. The figure in the Plan for conversions and changes of use is therefore based on past rates. This figure has been increased from 11 dwellings per year in the First Deposit to 14 dwellings per year in the Second Deposit. This increase is mainly due to the recent conversion of one large factory building to apartments. I note the Council's intention that the supporting text in paragraph 2.10 deleted at the Revised Deposit stage will be reintroduced and updated for clarity.
59. NCC (Strategic Property) questions whether this category should have been separated from other windfall development as it increases the risk of double counting. I accept the Council's response that records show the movement between categories and that no double counting has occurred.
60. I have been presented with conflicting views as to what rate should be used for future conversions in the Local Plan. It is said that by restricting the amount of greenfield land available, conversions and changes of use will become more economically viable and more will come forward than previously. On this basis it was suggested that the total coming forward in the plan period should be increased to 200 dwellings. Conversely, others suggested that, due to the finite supply of suitable buildings and more restrictive policies coming into force, conversions will dry up and a total of 100 dwellings in the plan period would be more appropriate. In light of such conflicting views, the Council's approach based on past rates appears to be reasonable and sensible. I see no reason to apply a discount rate to a figure derived in this way.

Vacant Housing Stock

61. The NSPR assumed that vacancy rates would reduce during the plan period on the basis of a more efficient use of the housing stock. The HIP 2002 data indicates that vacancy rates continue to fall. However, this component represents a very small proportion of overall supply and I see no reason to make a separate allowance for it.

The Industrial Contingency Allowance

62. Objections to the First Deposit stated that the industrial contingency allowance was insufficient to compensate for the under-provision compared to the Structure Plan requirement. In view of the changes at Second Deposit significantly reducing that under-provision, I make no further comment on these earlier objections.
63. In the Second Deposit reference is made in paragraph 2.9 to industrial sites. The text says that because these sites are the most difficult to predict, the figure (estimated for them) is not included in policy H1. Because the Council only released details of these sites late in the day, in my view they attracted an undue amount of attention and debate. I say this because they hardly appear in the plan at all and do not contribute directly to the land supply identified in the plan. Although one can debate how realistic the Council is being in its assessment of industrial land becoming available for residential development, in the final analysis it does not have a direct bearing on the amount of land that remains to be found in the Local Plan from other sources. I am therefore inclined to deal with the matter briefly.

64. At the Second Deposit several objectors considered this allowance to be unreliable, at best, for the following reasons:
- the figures and assumptions lack transparency; any allowance is based on an unrealistic 100% capacity assumption and there has been no apparent discounting;
 - there appears to have been no assessment of each site's suitability for residential use;
 - the allowance appears to be contrary to the aims of Economic Development Strategy in the Plan (paragraphs 4.1-4.4);
 - the rate of sites coming forward will slow because the major economic transformation of the past 20 years is coming to an end;
 - releasing existing industrial land for residential development results in pressure to release greenfield land (in the Green Belt) for employment uses, producing unsustainable transport patterns.
65. One objector is of the view that the Local Plan should seek to retain **all** existing employment land in its present use, although this does not accord with current government guidance. Be that as it may, as the sites are currently in active use, the time scales to relocate businesses, close and clear sites, sell the property and so forth, could take all of the remaining plan period.
66. Whilst the Council considers the industrial contingency allowance provides a degree of flexibility, I take the view that in terms of PPG3 this source of supply is simply an element of all windfalls. The consideration of employment sites for housing accords with PPG3. To treat this allowance as a separate category, distinct from the general housing figure and windfall totals is inappropriate. I therefore consider that the figures for the industrial contingency allowance should be included with all other windfalls. However in taking this view, I do not suggest altering the overall windfall figure. I recognise that there is inevitably uncertainty in respect of all windfalls but especially those on land currently in use for another purpose. I therefore expect that the addition of the Industrial Contingency Allowance to the general pool of land available should make the projected windfall figure more robust and achievable but should not be seen as a reason to increase the overall figure expected.

Flexibility/Slippage Allowance

67. Some of the builders/landowners, while in the main accepting that 1% – in itself – is not a significant shortfall, also stress that the shortfall when combined with shortcomings in the Urban Capacity Study and unrealistic deliverability assumptions will result in a far greater and more significant shortfall. It is therefore suggested by some that a 10% flexibility allowance should be applied overall because it is unlikely that all the allocated and committed sites will be developed in the plan period. The principle and the 10% figure is derived from the Roger Tym report, 1991.
68. Others countered this by referring to the Ashfield Local Plan Inspector's Report. In broad summary, that Inspector recognised that an exact match with the Structure Plan was unattainable and took the view that PPG3 paragraph 30 was sufficient guidance to resist the concept of a general flexibility allowance. I have read the relevant parts of his report and found it helpful. However, each case must be judged on its merits and I am aware that his views were based on circumstances in Ashfield, where the Council was allocating more land than required by the Structure Plan.

69. Whilst GBC responded that the Industrial Contingency figure provides the required flexibility, I have already disposed of that in another direction. (I do not accept that this source will provide flexibility, although it may make the windfall total more robust.) Allocating more land to provide flexibility could result in the unnecessary development of greenfield (and in this borough Green Belt) sites and could reduce the impetus for focusing on urban areas. This would clearly be inappropriate. I also concur with the comment at the Round Table Session that it is easier to put sites in than take them out.
70. Be that as it may, I have already referred to recommendations later in this report to the effect that the whole of the GCCF allocation should be committed in this review of the Local Plan, even though I consider it unlikely that it will all be developed by 2011. I have also said that, for the purposes of deciding how much land should be found elsewhere, it should be assumed that only 700 dwellings will be completed at GCCF by 2011. In addition I am recommending specific monitoring dates and contingency arrangements in the event of a shortfall arising. I consider that all these measures, taken together, are a better way to deal with any uncertainty than adding a 10% flexibility allowance to all or part of the Structure Plan requirement.
71. I therefore agree with NCC (Structure Plan Authority) that the circumstances in Gedling do not warrant a non-implementation allowance at the current time. I believe the mechanisms I am recommending to deal with changing circumstances, bearing in mind the forthcoming Structure Plan review, are more in keeping with the spirit of the Plan, Monitor and Manage approach in PPG3 than a general flexibility allowance.

The Search Sequence

72. Several objections to policy H1 are concerned with the distribution of housing land within the borough rather than with the amount of land to be found. In my view these objections are, in the main, best dealt with under policy H2 in relation to the particular sites with which the objectors are concerned. I address these issues briefly here.
73. One objection says that the plan concentrates too much on urban areas, to the detriment of villages. However, both the Structure Plan and PPG3 give priority to urban areas and urban extensions in the search for housing land. Villages are, at most, considered suitable for only limited development.
74. The general argument that too much housing is proposed at GCCF and that this is unfair is addressed under policy H3.
75. Another area of objection relates to the lack of reasoning in the Local Plan to explain why some sites have been selected for development and not others. I accept that it is not always clear why the Council has chosen to allocate some sites and not others. This is compounded by the fact that the process occurred three times with different results each time. A comparative assessment of all the potential sites would have helped. Be that as it may, it is clear to me that public transport corridors should be taken into account in the site selection process as is indicated in the NSPR, PPG3 and PPG13. For more on this, see my own assessments of site-specific objections.

76. Objections referring to the (alleged) inadequacy of existing services (in relation to a large number of the plan's allocations, including GCCF) are also dealt with as they arise under policy H2 and again under policy C2.
77. Concerns about development in the Hucknall area are dealt with in relation to my assessment of Top Wighay Farm (policies E1 and H2).

Presentational Matters

78. I note that several objectors are concerned with the terminology used and the way the figures and supporting text are presented in policy H1. In response to an objection to the First Deposit by Nottinghamshire County Council, changes to policy H1 in the Second Deposit altered the layout to identify more clearly the NSPR requirement as the starting point from which the Local Plan requirement is calculated.
79. However, it seems to me that part of the way policy H1 is presented is misleading. The figure of 2903 dwellings in policy H1 is the residual housing allocation requirement and not the number of dwellings expected from allocated sites. Policy H2 identifies the capacity of allocated sites as 2835, giving a shortfall of 68 dwellings. If no other changes were being made, I would recommend a change of wording so that H1 reflected the actual allocations in H2. However, as I am recommending several changes to the allocations in H2, a more comprehensive revision of H1 will be needed.
80. NCC (Strategic Property) sought some detailed changes to the text in the Local Plan but in my view the Local Plan itself is not the place to provide detailed information on how the UCS was undertaken. Policy H1 is concerned with setting out the figures, providing a brief explanation of where the figures have come from and where further information can be found. I am content that the Plan has, albeit somewhat confusingly, achieved that. In my view some modest further editing would assist the reader but I am not convinced that the best way to achieve this is for me to comment in detail on the text that was included in the First Deposit.
81. NCC (Strategic Property) also notes that paragraph 2.6 makes no reference to individual sites and suggests a cross-reference to a separate schedule. (Sites with planning permission are listed in CD J9 Housing Land Availability.) In my view there would be very limited value in identifying such sites in a schedule in the plan when that schedule would rapidly become out of date. In the Second Deposit changes were made to add the permissions granted since April 2001 and identify the sites by name. As the information is already available and there is no need to include excessive detail in the plan, I conclude there is no benefit in the suggested schedule.
82. NCC (Strategic Property) also considers that the terminology of Policy H1 is confusing because urban capacity sites are listed as a sub set of windfalls and not the other way around. I appreciate that as it is currently written the Plan is somewhat confusing. One way to remedy this would simply be to delete the heading "windfalls" from both the housing land supply calculation and the supporting text. But I do not find any fundamental flaws and consider the internal consistency of the current approach is acceptable, if a little confused by the crossed-through text as a result of the two-deposit process. However, the crossed out text will be removed when the plan is adopted. I conclude that there might be merit in deleting the heading "Windfalls" but leave it to the Council to consider if there is any other way of making the plan clearer.

83. NCC and Mr Lesquereux object to the deletion of the reference to 'public transport corridors' in paragraph 2.5 in the Second Deposit. GBC responds that there is no need to allocate land for development in such locations because enough land can be found in urban extensions. However, some of the allocations I recommend are in public transport corridors and this is part of my reasoning for choosing them. It is also part of the guidance in PPG3 and the NSPR (Policy 1/3). Therefore I consider the reference to public transport corridors in paragraph 2.5 should be reinstated.
84. On another detailed point, one objector questioned whether Technical Paper 1 could accurately be said to "accord" with Tapping the Potential as paragraph 2.9 of the Second Deposit says. Because the UCS was completed before Tapping the Potential was published, it is not surprising it does not fully conform to the guidance in every respect. However, I consider this to be a matter of detail and take the view that the word "accord" does not detract from the general sense of the Plan or seriously mislead.
85. Objector 000721 suggests that, for the avoidance of doubt, the Plan should clearly state that the 8000 figure relates to **completions**. I understand their concern in this regard and recognise the importance of completing dwellings in order to fulfil the NSPR requirement. However, policy H1, as a whole, is relatively clear and Policy 4/1 of the NSPR does not specifically state 'completions'. On balance, I do not see any significant advantage in changing the wording of the policy in this way.
86. Finally, I see merit in the suggestion that the Plan could helpfully indicate whether allocated sites are greenfield, brownfield or a mixture and recommend this.

Overall Conclusions

87. In light of the information I have, I conclude that the amount of land identified for allocation in the Second Deposit is broadly right. I accept that the Council has sought to optimise the use of vacant urban land. However, because of the scale of the need for new housing it is necessary to allocate substantial areas of greenfield land (now in the Green Belt) for residential development. I make my assessments of the suitability of particular sites elsewhere in this report.
88. The Council has undertaken work to identify sources of capacity, and whilst the work is not without weaknesses, I accept the findings as usable and of the right order of magnitude. In general I prefer the use of more refined estimates and figures to applying flexibility and non-implementation allowances. (However, I would advocate the use of rounded figures.) Even though the Council's UCS is not what one would expect if the work were being done today, I find it to be generally reliable and comprehensive.
89. I conclude that the "Industrial Contingency" should be regarded as part of the general windfall figures. However, this does not alter the figures in the policy, although it may make them more robust.
90. I am satisfied that, with the introduction of the Plan, Monitor and Manage mechanisms I am recommending, any major shortfall in housing land supply can be addressed before the situation becomes critical.

91. I anticipate considerable redrafting of the text in the Local Plan will be needed either to reflect my recommendations or to up-date the figures or both. I have given guidance on the specific changes sought by objectors in my reasoning above. To avoid the impression of spurious accuracy, I intend to use rounded figures throughout.

RECOMMENDATIONS

92. I recommend that the “allocated sites” figure in policy H1 should reflect the sites actually allocated in policy H2 and the total in H1 is adjusted accordingly.

93. I recommend that the heading “Windfalls” is deleted from policy H1 and the supporting text. I also recommend that consideration is given to clarifying the information in policy H1 and the supporting text.

94. I recommend that rounded figures are used throughout the table.

95. I recommend that the figure for Urban Capacity is modified (so as to exclude greenfield windfalls) to read 640

96. I recommend that the deleted supporting text in paragraph 2.10 be reintroduced and updated in the interests of clarity.

97. I recommend that references to the Industrial Contingency Allowance are deleted from the Local Plan and that this source of land is regarded as being part of the general windfalls category.

98. I recommend that the reference to public transport corridors be reinstated to paragraph 2.5.

99. I recommend that allocated sites are identified in the Local Plan as greenfield, brownfield or a mixture.

100. I recommend that the Table in Policy H1 should be as follows:

	Second Deposit	Recommended	Change
Completions	2665	2670	
Existing Planning Permissions	754	750	
Additional Commitments	384	380	
Urban Capacity	685	640	- 50
Commercial Windfall Allowance	392	390	
Lapsed Permissions	74	70	
Conversions / COUs	143	140	
SUB TOTAL	5097	5040	

Allocated Sites to be identified in policy H2 to amount to about 2960

OVERALL TOTAL	8000	8000
----------------------	-------------	-------------

2.2 H2 DISTRIBUTION OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT GENERAL OBJECTIONS

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000309	000433	House Builders Federation
000309	000434	House Builders Federation

Summary of Objections

First Deposit paragraphs 2.21 and 2.22 (Second Deposit 2.23) refer to developer contributions. These should be negotiated and are thus not requirements. They can only cover matters directly related to the particular development. Any material in the Local Plan should conform to the guidance in Circular 1/97.

The importance of Development Briefs is recognised but they need to be produced quickly and after consultation with the developer at each site.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001158	002412	Nottinghamshire County Council (Strategic Property)
001158	002437	Nottinghamshire County Council (Strategic Property)
001158	002434	Nottinghamshire County Council (Strategic Property)
001158	002438	Nottinghamshire County Council (Strategic Property)
001158	002439	Nottinghamshire County Council (Strategic Property)
001158	002441	Nottinghamshire County Council (Strategic Property)
001158	201958	Nottinghamshire County Council (Strategic Property)
001158	002539	Nottinghamshire County Council (Strategic Property)

Summary of Objections

There is no evidence in the Local Plan as to how the capacity of each site has been arrived at. There may be double counting of sites near Gedling Colliery / Chase Farm.

Paragraph 2.13 is misleading because neither the Structure Plan nor PPG2 require a sequential approach to site selection.

Insufficient land has been allocated for housing to meet the Structure Plan requirement. Paragraph 2.20 in the First Deposit is also objected to because it seeks to justify the under provision of housing land in relation to the Structure Plan requirement. None of the stated justifications for the under provision are acceptable. (The contentious text is deleted in the Second Deposit.)

First Deposit paragraph 2.23 is objected to because there is insufficient commitment to the production of Development Briefs. A programme, timetable and consultation procedure is called for.

The requirement (paragraph 2.24, First and Second Deposit) for 10% of all allocated sites to be local public open space is arbitrary. This objector also objects to the Recreation policies. In any event this provision should be "sought" not "secured".

Setting a threshold for developer contributions will encourage partial implementation or the fragmentation of sites to avoid the threshold (paragraph 2.22 First Deposit, paragraph 2.23 Second Deposit).

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001324	002782	Langridge Homes Ltd

Summary of Objection

There is not enough land allocated for housing to meet the Structure Plan requirement. Some allocated sites are unsuitable and others will not deliver the amount of housing anticipated. Bearing in mind PPG3, there are better sites that should be allocated instead.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001325	002849	Papplewick Parish Council

Summary of Objection

The 10% open space requirement should be within each allocation. (paragraph 2.24, First and Second Deposit)

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001330	002928	Council for the Protection of Rural England
001791	004096	Ms J Cole
001955	004650	Gedling Labour Group

Summary of Objections

The First Deposit was prepared before PPG3 was revised. Parking standards should be lowered and densities increased.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001345	003177	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust
001345	003260	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust

Summary of Objections

In the light of recent guidance and projections less land is required for housing.

The 10% open space requirement is too crude a tool and could prevent higher densities being achieved (paragraph 2.24, First and Second Deposit).

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001349	003333	Mr J Smith

Summary of Objection

The Structure Plan allows flexibility of 10% and full advantage should be taken of this to reduce the amount of land allocated for residential development.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001664	003934	W Hardy & Sons

Summary of Objection

There is insufficient land allocated in villages to improve the viability of the housing stock, services and sustainability.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001955	004629	Gedling Labour Group
001955	004646	Gedling Labour Group
001955	004656	Gedling Labour Group

Summary of Objection

There is over-provision of housing in the Green Belt. A more rigorous application of PPG 3 would reduce the amount of Green Belt land needed.

Paragraph 2.18 (First Deposit) is superfluous after deletion of land near Hucknall.

Taking into account the Industrial Windfall Allowance, conversions and higher densities, there is no shortfall.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000309	201499	House Builders Federation

Summary of Objection

The phasing proposals are too rigid and not in accord with PPG12.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001344	201422	Slack; Kirkham; Goldby; Grococks (Joint)
001344	201541	Slack; Kirkham; Goldby; Grococks (Joint)

Summary of Objection

The housing sites are not realistic or appropriate. A site at Calverton is proposed.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000717	201431	Nottinghamshire County Council

Summary of Objection

There is a need to show that the Structure Plan requirement can be met within the plan period. Contributions are required for schools.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001324	201318	Langridge Homes Ltd

Summary of Objection

In the Second Deposit there is still insufficient land for housing. The densities assumed are unlikely to be achieved. Some sites cannot deliver within the plan period. The sequential test in PPG3 has not been followed.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001325	201573	Papplewick Parish Council

Summary of Objection

Developer contributions should be allocated to improve facilities in existing areas.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001330	201807	Council for the Protection of Rural England

Summary of Objection

Too much housing land is allocated and the assumed building rate is too high. The Local Plan should only allocate up to 2007. Allocations are suggested for deletion.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
003981	201644	English Heritage

Summary of Objection

Former industrial sites and collieries may have archaeological interest or may be contaminated.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

Introduction

1. Many of the matters raised here are more appropriately dealt with in detail elsewhere. If this is the case I will cross-refer and only report very briefly here.
2. Several objectors point out that the First Deposit was prepared before the major revision of PPG3 in March 2000. This, of itself, does not invalidate the plan or its policies and the Second Deposit came after the PPG in any event. Some things in the Second Deposit can be clearly traced to PPG3, although in my view the changes are not as radical as some objectors apparently thought they should be in their earlier objections. It seems to me that this is, in part, because there is not enough previously developed or urban land available in the borough to make the allocation of Green Belt land unnecessary. Be that as it may, I regard PPG3 as the prime source of guidance in considering policy H2. However, PPG3 is a complex document which is concerned with providing enough houses for people to live in as well as with minimising greenfield development.

How Much Housing Land?

3. Having explored numbers in considerable detail in the context of policy H1, I do not intend to revisit the detail here. There are, however, some general conclusions and principles that it is worth stating (or restating) here.
 - The adopted Structure Plan and its requirement to find land for 8000 dwellings by 2011 is the starting point for the Local Plan, notwithstanding any subsequent projections, information or plans relating to this area.
 - Broadly speaking, I accept GBC's background assumptions (on such matters as completed dwellings and windfalls) but not on the speed with which GCCF can be completed. This means that there is an outstanding requirement to allocate land for approximately 2960 dwellings by 2011.
 - There is some latitude (flexibility) allowable around the Structure Plan requirement. In my view this could encompass a shortfall as small as in the Second Deposit but not one as large as in the First Deposit. However, in my view there is no more reason to seek to under-allocate by a set amount (as some argue) than there is to over-allocate (as others argue).

Density and Site Capacities

4. The densities that can be achieved on allocated sites have far reaching implications for the amount of land that has to be found for development. I discuss this in greater detail under policy H6. Broadly speaking I accept the Council's general approach to densities, in as far as it affects how much land has to be found. In other words, I concur with the objectors to the First Deposit who said the proposed densities were too low and not with the objectors who say they are too high in the Second Deposit. I do not think it is necessary to go into greater detail here.
5. There is some complaint that the plan is rather opaque on the matter of how the density assumptions have been used to calculate the site capacities (in both Deposits). I accept that this is the case but do not think it is either necessary or appropriate for the Local Plan to go into such matters in detail. In my view there was enough information available by the time of the Local Plan Inquiry. I would not want to see the Local Plan burdened with a detailed exposition of how each site's capacity was calculated.

Where?

6. I leave the detailed consideration of particular sites until later (see below). I have considered all the objections suggesting that a particular allocation should be taken out of the Local Plan, site by site, as “Objection Sites”. I deal with all the objections that other sites should be allocated (either instead or in addition) site by site as “Additional Sites”. There are, however, some matters of general principle that arise from the objections.

Method and Explanation

7. The first complaint is that the plan does not provide any clear ranking of sites to enable comparisons between them in the round. Moreover, the prioritisation has changed not only between the First Deposit and the Second Deposit but also since the earlier consultation draft. (Whatever the merits of this changeability as a consultation process, it certainly seems to have maximised the number of objections.) I too would have found a formalised comparison useful. However, I do not think the plan can be rejected on this account, although individual sites can be criticised and rejected without there being a ready-made and robust response in the plan. I have therefore assessed each site on its merits, bearing in mind PPG3 and the Structure Plan and objectors have done the same. I dare say the answers we each arrive at would have been much the same even if there had been a clearer exposition of the Council's reasoning in the Local Plan.

Hucknall

8. The second complaint is linked to the first and concerns one of the stated guiding principles the Council has used to select sites. The issue is most acute in the case of potential sites to the north and east of Hucknall, where at least two objectors take issue with the way GBC has interpreted the Structure Plan and PPG3. The Structure Plan says (policy 1/2) that major new development will be concentrated within and adjoining the main urban areas and along public transport corridors such as Nottingham to Hucknall. PPG3 says that land should be allocated in a sequence starting with previously developed land in urban areas, then urban extensions and finally around nodes in good public transport corridors.
9. The Council has given priority to sites on the edge of the **main** urban areas in its part of Greater Nottingham. GBC says that, because Hucknall is not a **main** urban area, land there should receive less priority than land near, say, Arnold or Mapperley. The objectors say this is not justified either by the Structure Plan (which expresses no preference between the **main** urban areas and public transport corridors) or by PPG3 (which although it gives priority to urban areas over public transport corridors does not give any priority to **main** urban areas).
10. And this is of more than academic interest in the Second Deposit. The Council is content that it has found enough land around the main urban area and thus does not need to find any at all in a public transport corridor that is more remote. In other words, no development should be located near Hucknall because there is no need and it is too far down the pecking order.
11. However, because I am not convinced that enough readily available land can be found around the main urban area, for me it has become a rather sterile debate. I consider that some land will be needed near Hucknall whatever view I take on how the Structure Plan and PPG3 relate to each other and should be interpreted.

12. In practice in assessing each site a variety of factors has to be taken into account. What the Structure Plan and PPG3 say are two very important considerations but they are not always decisive. Also of importance are flood-risk, sustainability, mixed or balanced developments, highway safety and the ridgelines north of Nottingham. There are two large potential sites near Hucknall and, taking all these things into account, one performs better than the other. Indeed, in my view, one performs well enough to be allocated and the other does not. Whatever view I take on the Structure Plan and PPG3 does not alter my assessment of these sites and their respective merits.

Villages

13. Another general point that arises from the objections is the suitability of villages for (large-scale) development. The Structure Plan (policy 1/3) says that villages are only suitable for limited provision (which is more than small scale but this should be assessed cumulatively). PPG3 says that only a limited amount of housing can be expected to be accommodated in expanded villages. In fact all Gedling borough's villages are in the Green Belt, so PPG2 is also relevant.
14. The Local Plan treats the villages in the Green Belt in one of three ways:
- it excludes (or “insets”) the built up area of the village from the Green Belt notation so that limited development may take place within the village;
 - it includes (“washes over”) the village in the Green Belt but defines an “infill boundary” within which infilling will be allowed (see policy ENV30);
 - it includes (“washes over”) the village within the Green Belt without any “infill boundary “ so that Green Belt policies apply throughout the village.
15. This approach is in accordance with the guidance in PPG2 (paragraph 2.11) and I therefore consider that the approach is acceptable.
16. GBC collected data on the services and character of each rural settlement and has categorised the villages as follows:
- ***Inset Villages:*** Bestwood, Burton Joyce, Calverton, Newstead and Ravenshead;
 - ***Washed over Villages with Infill Boundaries:*** Lambley, Linby, Papplewick and Woodborough;
 - ***Washed Over Villages Without Infill Boundaries:*** all the smaller settlements, including Stoke Bardolph.
17. Having studied the Council's data and considered objections on the matter, my own view is that this categorisation is reasonable and justified. I reach this conclusion even though – in my view – Bestwood, Newstead and Woodborough are all middle order settlements with a rather limited range of facilities. This would suggest that they should all be treated as washed over villages with infill boundaries. However, I accept that the character and circumstances of Bestwood and Newstead are such that they would benefit from some limited development and diversification. In addition there are particular reasons why the housing allocations in Bestwood and Newstead have been included in the plan.

18. I therefore find no fault in principle with the way the villages have been treated in the Local Plan and, in particular, do not accept the argument that large-scale development should take place in any of them.

Developer Contributions

19. I note that the Second Deposit text (paragraph 2.23) has added wording referring to circular 1/97. In my view this goes a long way towards meeting the HBF objection to the First Deposit. Provided this is retained in the appropriate part of the Local Plan, I consider that the HBF objection has been met.
20. However, I am of the view that more detailed information should be included in the Local Plan and that there should be a general policy on this matter. Although this arises at a number of points in the Local Plan, I deal with it fully under policy C2. I also deal with the NCC (Education Authority) comment about contributions for schools under policy C2.
21. It would be more in keeping with current guidance if the form of words used was in terms of “seeking” and “negotiating” rather than “securing” and “requiring”, although I am not inclined to the view this makes a great deal of difference in practice.
22. NCC (Strategic Property) is concerned that setting a threshold at which contributions become payable may encourage the sub-division of sites in attempts to avoid the contributions. However, the text of the plan says that contributions may be payable below that level, so I do not share their concern in this regard. In any event the approach in this Local Plan is, in my experience, quite common and the objector has not suggested a workable alternative.
23. The rules currently in place say that developer contributions must be related to the development in question. This rules out such funds being used for the general upgrading of facilities in existing residential areas as suggested by Papplewick Parish Council.

Development Briefs

24. The HBF says that Briefs (Second Deposit paragraphs 2.23 and 2.24) are needed speedily and after consultation with the developers of each site. Whilst I agree with this, the two comments tend to pull in different directions. Be that as it may, the objector has not specified what change to the Local Plan they are seeking. In considering developer contributions under policy C2, I take the view that there should be a policy on this matter in the Local Plan and that each site should be dealt with more explicitly. This would have the effect of removing one important area of potential dispute from Development Briefs.
25. NCC (Strategic Property) points out that the text only refers to the possibility of GBC preparing Development Briefs rather than saying this will be the case. I consider that the text could reasonably be modified to say that the Council “intends” to produce a Development Brief for each site with a capacity of more than 50 dwellings. I think it is unnecessary to list which sites are involved. I also consider it would go beyond the role of a Local Plan to specify a timetable and procedures for the production of such briefs.

Open Space

26. A repeated criticism of the requirement that 10% of any allocated housing site should be used for open space is that it is too rigid or crude. But I do not have an alternative approach suggested to me. In general terms a requirement for housing sites to include open space to serve future residents must be right. In the absence of any practical alternative wording to cover this point, I have no reason to reject what is in the plan at the moment. I recognise that in the particular circumstances of any one site there may be reasons to depart from the norm but as a general rule what the plan says seems to me to be both reasonable and acceptable.
27. Papplewick Parish Council is keen the open space should be within the development that gives rise to it. In the absence of any indication to the contrary, I am sure this is the intention. However, circumstances may arise where this is not appropriate and other arrangements will have to be made. All in all I see no need to alter the Local Plan.

Phasing

28. I discuss the matter of phasing fully in the context of policy H4. In short, I recommend the phasing policy should be deleted from the Local Plan. It follows that I recommend taking the phases out of policy H2.
29. I deal here with the CPRE objection that there should be no allocations beyond 2007. PPG3 says local plans should allocate land for at least 5 years in the first instance, which by the time this Local Plan is adopted will be nearly 2011. PPG12 (and later government guidance) talk about a 10-year supply. Limiting planning horizons to a short period could preclude the development of large and complex sites that need a lot of investment at the start. Developers might be unwilling to embark on such a project with only a short-term commitment. (I have in mind Gedling Colliery / Chase Farm and practically no-one is against any development taking place there at all.)

English Heritage

30. I am sure that English Heritage are right to say that former industrial sites and collieries may have archaeological interest or may be contaminated. The trouble is, they have not suggested what I should do about it in this Local Plan. Clearly to delete all allocations on collieries and former industrial sites would not be appropriate. Equally clearly, to include a general policy just in case it might apply to some (unspecified) allocations would also not be right. In the circumstances I consider the best way forward is to leave these matters to policies on archaeology and contaminated land.

Other Matters Raised by NCC (Strategic Property)

31. NCC is concerned there may have been double counting of sites at Lambley Lane and GCCF. I have no evidence to support this. Anyway, the allocation South of Lambley Lane is deleted in the Second Deposit and I am not recommending its reinstatement.

Redrafting the Text

32. Because the sites being allocated will change as a result of my recommendations, the text accompanying policy H2 should also be revised. I do not intend to specify in detail exactly what wording should be used. I believe this is best left to the Council so that they can take the latest information on each site into account. Nevertheless I consider that a general redrafting will be required.

33. At the first deposit objector 001955 sought the deletion of paragraph 2.18 because they considered it unnecessary to allocate land near Hucknall for development. This is what happened in the Second Deposit but my recommendations would reverse this. Accordingly something along the lines of the First Deposit 2.18 will be needed.

Overall Conclusions

34. I therefore conclude that the following changes to policy H2 and its text are needed:
- There is a need to allocate land for approximately 2960 dwellings for development by 2011 in policy H2.
 - There will be a need to allocate land for development in the Nottingham to Hucknall public transport corridor.
 - It is not appropriate to allocate substantial amounts of land for development in the Green Belt villages.
 - Developer contributions should be “sought” and “negotiated” rather than “secured” and “required”.
 - The Local Plan should say that GBC “intends” to prepare Development Briefs for sites with a capacity of more than 50 dwellings.
 - I have no reason to remove or dilute the requirement that each housing site should have 10% of its area as public open space.
 - The text accompanying policy H2 in the Local Plan should be substantially revised to reflect the sites that are being allocated. This will involve the reintroduction of a reference to the Nottingham to Hucknall public transport corridor, amongst other changes.

RECOMMENDATIONS

35. I recommend that there is a need to allocate land for approximately 2960 dwellings for development by 2011 in policy H2.
36. I recommend that there will be a need to allocate land for development in the Nottingham to Hucknall public transport corridor.
37. I recommend that it is not appropriate to allocate substantial amounts of land for development in the Green Belt villages.
38. I recommend that developed contributions should be “sought” and “negotiated” rather than “secured” and “required”.
39. I recommend that the Local Plan should say that GBC “intends” to prepare Development Briefs for sites with a capacity of more than 50 dwellings.
40. I recommend that the requirement that each housing site should have 10% of its area as public open space should remain in the Local Plan.
41. I recommend that the text accompanying policy H2 in the Local Plan should be substantially revised to reflect the sites that are being allocated. This will involve the reintroduction of a reference to the Nottingham to Hucknall public transport corridor, amongst other changes.

2.3 H2 DISTRIBUTION OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT GENERAL OBJECTION

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000717	001496	Nottinghamshire County Council

Summary of Objection

No detailed explanation is given why some sites have been selected in preference to others. Paragraphs 2.14 – 2.17 only give a partial explanation. There is particular concern that public transport accessibility and PPG13 have not been given enough weight. The final plan should include full reasoning. However, no specific objections are made to the inclusion or exclusion of particular sites.

(NB the form registering this objection states that the objection is to policy H1 and GBC recorded it as such. However, the objection is concerned with the distribution (rather than amount) of residential development and the evidence relating to this objection refers to the text in the Local Plan that accompanies policy H2. I therefore consider it appropriate to deal with this objection here.)

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

1. I invited the County Council to attend a Local Plan Inquiry hearing to discuss their objections to the Local Plan and its general conformity with the Structure Plan. This objection could usefully have been discussed at such a session. The County Council declined to attend, although I was grateful for their contribution to the Housing Round Table discussions.
2. I note that no objection is made to the inclusion or omission of any specific site as a residential allocation in the Local Plan. I also record that whatever is included in the Local Plan (or not) I have considerable evidence from GBC and others on site selection.
3. I am unclear what specific changes to the Local Plan the objector is seeking. Would the addition of a reference to PPG13 to the text of the plan meet this objection? As Highway, Transportation and Planning Authority does the County Council have nothing to say, or evidence to give, to help distinguish between the sustainability of the various sites under consideration? Well yes it does, but in relation to specific sites rather than at a general level. Yet the latter is what the objection appears to be seeking. I cannot make bricks without straw (or recommendations without evidence) and must not attempt to. If it is possible to rank and compare the sustainability of all the sites, I would need to be given the evidence to enable me to do so.
4. Nevertheless, my considerations of all the sites (objection sites where objectors want allocations deleted and additional sites that objectors want allocated) do include the issue of sustainability. However, this is not always the decisive consideration. The risk of flooding, for example, has been a decisive consideration in relation to several sites, whilst a ridgeline location has been important in others.
5. Sustainability underpins the general approach of seeking extensions to urban areas in general and the main urban area in particular. It also underpins the view that development should not be spread evenly through the borough (as some objectors appear to want) with everywhere (including villages) receiving a “fair” share. Also, once I had come to the conclusion that the largest employment allocation in the Local Plan had to be at Top Wighay Farm, sustainability considerations were decisive in my recommendation that there should be a substantial housing allocation there as well.

6. This objection seeks a redrafting of the text in the Local Plan that accompanies policy H2, although the objection is not very specific about what changes are sought. In general I am only recommending changes to the text in the plan where an objector seeks a specific change that I consider would improve the plan. However, I am recommending that GBC has some latitude to revise the text where, by the time of the modifications, it has either become out of date or no longer reflects the modified policies. I am not embarking on a comprehensive redrafting myself. Nor am I recommending that GBC do so as an end in itself. If, when updating the text accompanying policy H2, GBC finds this objection or my response to it useful I would not complain. But on the basis of the evidence before me I do not have any reason to recommend either a general redrafting or any specific changes.

7. I conclude no modification to the Local Plan is necessary in response to this objection.

RECOMMENDATION

8. I recommend no modification to the Local Plan in response to this objection.

2.4 H2 DISTRIBUTION OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT GENERAL OBJECTIONS

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000304	000415	Mr T Dowman
000305	000417	Mrs M Dowman
001901	004372	Mr G Smith
001903	004374	Mrs J Smith

Summary of Objection

There are too many houses allocated on one site – Gedling Colliery. Land that is not in the Green Belt and brownfield land should be developed first. Other sites are suggested to achieve a more even spread of development.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

1. Although GBC listed these as a general objections to policy H2, I regard them primarily as objections to the housing allocation at Gedling Colliery / Chase Farm. All the issues raised here are dealt with in this report under policy H3 (see below).

RECOMMENDATION

2. For recommendations on these objections see under policy H3, (Land at Former Gedling Colliery and Chase Farm).

2.4 H2 DISTRIBUTION OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT OBJECTION SITE: GEDLING COLLIERY / CHASE FARM

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000130	000163	Mr M Eaton
000179	000232	Mr J Hand

Summary of Objection

There are too many houses on one site and in one part of the borough. Retain as Green Belt. Local infrastructure and services are inadequate. Develop only the brownfield parts of this site. Look for other sites in the urban area and elsewhere and increase densities.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000559	000800	Dr P Martin

Summary of Objection

Too much traffic would be generated. Local services are inadequate. Retain the Green Belt and open spaces. Wildlife would be harmed. Find brownfield sites.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001021	002198	Hallam Land Management Ltd

Summary of Objection

Better public transport is needed and is available at other locations. The employment allocation is too small to allow people to live near to their work.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001158	2418	Nottinghamshire County Council (Strategic Property)

Summary of Objection

(The reasons for this objection are the same as for the objections to policy H3.)

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001326	002860	Mr F Rodrigues
001327	002873	Gedling Village Preservation Society

Summary of Objection

There are too many houses on one site and in one part of the borough. Retain as Green Belt, especially Chase Farm. Develop only the brownfield parts of this site. Look for other sites in the urban area and elsewhere and increase densities. This site is not urban fringe. The full Gedling Bypass would need to be built first.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001345	003212	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust

Summary of Objection

(The reasons for this objection are the same as for the objections to policy H3.)

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001193	010869	Mr M Hudson-Scott

Summary of Objection

Loss of wildlife and Green Belt. Traffic noise, pollution and disturbance.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001949	004599	c/o J H Walter Rural Consultants

Because of poor transport facilities this is not a sustainable location, look elsewhere.

AND AVER 130 INDIVIDUAL OBJECTIONS

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

1. For convenience and to avoid unnecessary repetition these objections are dealt with in the part of this report on policy H3 (Land at Former Gedling Colliery and Chase Farm)

RECOMMENDATION

2. For recommendations on these objections see under policy H3, (Land at Former Gedling Colliery and Chase Farm).

2.5 H2 DISTRIBUTION OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT: OBJECTION SITE: ASHWATER DRIVE / SPRING LANE, MAPPERLEY

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000186	000269	Mrs M Meadows
000247	000346	Mrs J Brookes
000265	000367	Mr K Brookes
001158	002423	Nottinghamshire County Council (Strategic Property)
001327	002867	Gedling Village Preservation Society
001345	003209	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust

AND ABOUT 40 INDIVIDUAL OBJECTIONS

Summary of Objections

The allocation at Ashwater Drive should be deleted from the Local Plan. The reasons for objection include increased vehicular and pedestrian traffic on Chedington Avenue resulting in congestion, noise and accidents. There are also fears of increased vandalism, crime and danger to elderly residents. There are too many houses allocated in the Gedling Area. There is inadequate infrastructure (roads, sewers and drainage and education facilities). The site contains wildlife. There would be harm to the rural character and appearance of the area. A Green Belt area would be lost. Other sites are considered preferable, especially previously developed land.

Other issues raised are that the site should include affordable housing as there is need in the area. But others say the location is unsuitable for affordable housing because of poor public transport.

ALSO DEALT WITH HERE IS AN OBJECTION TO
POLICY H6 (RESIDENTIAL DENSITY) RELATING TO THIS SITE

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000717	201433	Nottinghamshire County Council

Summary of Objection

Because of the increased density, this development is only acceptable with two accesses onto Spring Lane or an internal circuit route with a wide connection to Spring Lane. With this number of dwellings a full Transport Assessment will be needed. The Local Plan should specify these requirements.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

Introduction

1. This is greenfield land and I accept it would be better if there were enough previously developed land in the urban area to make the development of this site unnecessary. But this is not the case. I note that this land has been a consistent element of the Council's thinking on housing land throughout the plan preparation process.
2. The site is adjacent to the built up area and is therefore an urban extension. This is the type of site favoured both by the Structure Plan and PPG3. Furthermore, because the site is south of Spring Lane it would not intrude into the wider tract of open countryside to the north. In my view Spring Lane forms a clear and acceptable boundary for the Green Belt. Although the land is open, it is not especially attractive and has no special features that warrant its protection.
3. The Wildlife Trust draw attention to it as an interesting grassland habitat but it is not protected as such. I have no evidence that this land is sufficiently special as a wildlife habitat to warrant its protection from development.
4. For these reasons I consider the site is, in principle, suitable for housing development.

Access and Transportation

5. As far as the County Council's comments on the access to this site are concerned, these seem to me to be reasonable. However in my view, the detailed solution can be left to a later stage in the implementation of the proposal after a Transport Assessment has been undertaken. But the Local Plan should refer to the highway and transport requirements in general terms even though GBC thinks this can be left to a Development Brief.
6. I note the widespread fears that development of this site would lead to unsafe and congested traffic conditions on Chedington Avenue but do not see why this should be the case if one or more accesses is to be provided directly onto Spring Lane. In any event The Highway Authority is content that the proposed development is acceptable.
7. From the evidence I have this site is not particularly well served by public transport. It is possible that the Transport Assessment will identify how this can be improved. Be that as it may, this does not amount to an insuperable obstacle to the site's development, given its proximity to the existing urban area.

Other Matters

8. I see no reason to suppose that development on this land would be likely to lead to an increase in crime in the area or generally.
9. Some objectors point to the inadequacy of local services and say that the proposed development cannot be accommodated for this reason. I have three comments on these reasons for objection:
 - first and foremost, I have to rely on the relevant service providers in assessing such matters. For example, if the Local Education Authority does not say that the schools are full or the Health Authority does not say that medical services are over-stretched, it is difficult for me to conclude that they are;
 - second, the Authorities know that developers can be required to make contributions towards the provision of services if their development would overload the existing provision. The Local Plan makes reference to this in several places, although I am recommending this should be made clearer by drawing the material in the plan together and spelling out in more detail where and how it is likely to arise;
 - in any event, my task is to identify enough housing land to fulfil a requirement in the Structure Plan. If all the potential areas for development are over-stretched in one way or another (as some objectors would have me believe) this does not help in the choice of sites. Extra services are likely to be needed wherever the development goes.
10. For these reasons I do not consider that the adequacy of the existing services in the vicinity of this site are decisive in determining whether the land should be allocated for development.
11. This land is separated from the development area at Gedling Colliery / Chase Farm and accessed from a different direction. I consider it is stretching (an already weak) point to say that they should be regarded as constituting over-development in one part of the borough.

12. I note the disagreement between objectors as to whether the site is suitable for any affordable housing. Under the terms of the Local Plan this site (and all others) would be expected to accommodate a proportion of such dwellings. There is no reason to make an exception at this site.
13. I note that the Second Deposit capacity of the site has not been challenged (although the Highway Authority has pointed to the transport consequences of the increased density. I therefore have no reason to alter the proposed density and accept that it is about 140.

Conclusions

14. Having considered all the reasons for objection, I conclude that this site is suitable for residential development and that the allocation for this purpose in the Local Plan should be retained. I have no reason to alter the proposed density at this site.
15. I also conclude that the need for a Transport Assessment and two accesses onto Spring Lane should identified as requirements for the development of this site and should be recorded as such in the Local Plan.

RECOMMENDATION

16. I recommend that the allocation at Ashwater Drive for residential development should be retained in the Local Plan. The allocation's capacity is about 140 dwellings.
 17. I also recommend that the need for a Transport Assessment and two accesses onto Spring Lane should identified as requirements for the development of this site and recorded as such in the Local Plan.
-

2.6 H2 DISTRIBUTION OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT: OBJECTION SITE: CHARTWELL GROVE, MAPPERLEY

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001345	003214	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust
001589	003766	Mr J Leafe
003829	010517	Residents of Chartwell Heights & Grove

AND 7 INDIVIDUAL OBJECTIONS

Summary of Objections

The development is not necessary. It is an erosion of the Green Belt. Wildlife on the site would be harmed. The development would lead to traffic, congestion, access and parking problems. There is insufficient infrastructure to support development in an already congested area. The allocation does not comply with PPG3 because it is not previously developed land. The existing houses were purchased on the understanding that the adjoining land would not be developed. Sensitive treatment of the boundary would be needed. The number of houses would impact too heavily on Gedling Village.

ALSO DEALT WITH HERE ARE OBJECTIONS TO
POLICY H6 (RESIDENTIAL DENSITY) RELATING TO THIS SITE

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
003829	200601	Residents of Chartwell Heights & Grove

AND ABOUT 15 INDIVIDUAL OBJECTIONS

Summary of Objection

The revised density is too high. There are concerns about the increase in traffic, the effects on wildlife and the impact on the Green Belt.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
004909	201529	Standon Homes (1993) Ltd

Summary of Objection

Although it relates primarily to the phasing of development, GBC recorded this as an objection to Policy H6.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

Introduction

1. This is greenfield land and I accept that it would be better if there were enough previously developed land in the urban area to make the development of this site unnecessary. But this is not the case. I note that this land appeared in the First and Second Deposit versions of the Local Plan and appears to be a consistent element in the Council's thinking on housing land.
2. The site is adjacent to the built up area and is therefore an urban extension. This is the type of site favoured both by the Structure Plan and PPG3. Furthermore, because the site is well to the south of Spring Lane it would not obtrude into the wider tract of open countryside to the north. In my view Spring Lane and Lambley Lane form a clear and acceptable boundary for the Green Belt. Although the site is greenfield land, it has no special features that warrant its protection. The Wildlife Trust does not draw attention to any specific characteristics that set it aside as an important habitat. I have no evidence that this land is sufficiently special as a wildlife habitat to warrant its protection from development.
3. For these reasons I consider the site is, in principle, suitable for housing development.

Access and Transportation

4. As far as access to the site is concerned, I note the objections from the residents of the existing estate but also note the Highway Authority does not object to the allocation. The existing access has limitations and the situation is complicated because the GCCF Access Road would terminate near this site. However, it is my understanding that, although any development may have to await the completion of the GCCF Access Road, there is every prospect that a safe and satisfactory access will be possible. However, if the development of this site is dependent on the GCCF Access Road, the Local Plan should say so.
5. Whilst the objectors may also be concerned about the effect of the increased traffic on residential amenity, it does not seem to me that the amount of traffic using the existing road would be such as to cause undue disruption to residents. The combined size of the existing and new estates would not be so large as to be out of the ordinary.
6. There are no objections about public transport accessibility at this site and I therefore have no information about it. However, I note that Mapperley Plains is a bus route.

Density

7. The proposed density at this site is contentious, indeed I note that the increased density in the Second Deposit gave rise to more objections than the original allocation in the First Deposit. However, the Wildlife Trust did comment that the lower density in the First Deposit was wasteful.
8. As a matter of general policy PPG3 indicates that lower densities waste development land and thus lead to more greenfield land being taken for development than is necessary. I would need to have particular reasons for recommending that this site is treated as an exception to government guidance and to the general approach to densities in the Local Plan. In my view no such reasons exist. I have no evidence that the increase in numbers from 15 (First Deposit) to 43 (Second Deposit) would have a materially harmful impact. The Highway Authority is content that the higher numbers can be accessed safely. As recorded above the wildlife at this site is rather limited and the effect on it of a higher density is not a compelling reason for a lower density. As to the open land to the east of the objection site, I am recommending this should be removed from the Green Belt. But even if this were not the case it is not clear that a high density would have a materially more harmful impact than a low one.
9. I therefore consider that the higher density in the Second Deposit should be retained, although I prefer to talk in rounded figures. Even so an increase from 15 to 40 here means that land will not have to be found for 25 dwellings elsewhere, thus saving nearly a hectare of greenfield land.

Other Matters

10. Some objectors point to the inadequacy of local services and say that the proposed development cannot be accommodated for this reason. I have three comments on these reasons for objection:
 - first and foremost, I have to rely on the relevant service providers in assessing such matters. For example, if the Local Education Authority does not say that the schools are full or the Health Authority does not say

that medical services are over-stretched, it is difficult for me to conclude that they are;

- second, the Authorities know that developers can be required to make contributions towards the provision of services if their development would overload the existing provision. The Local Plan makes reference to this in several places, although I am recommending this should be made clearer by drawing the material in the plan together and spelling out in more detail where and how it is likely to arise;
- in any event, my task is to identify enough housing land to fulfil a requirement in the Structure Plan. If all the potential areas for development are over-stretched in one way or another (as some objectors would have me believe) this does not help in the choice of sites. Extra services are likely to be needed wherever the development goes.

11. For these reasons I do not consider that the adequacy of the existing services in the vicinity of this site are decisive in determining whether the land should be allocated for development.
12. This is in my view rather a small allocation. I consider it is stretching (an already weak) point to say that, with or without GCCF, it would contribute significantly to an over concentration of development in one part of the borough.
13. I note more than one objector says they moved to their home on the understanding there would be no more development in the immediate area. I do not know how they came to that view or who gave them such advice. Be that as it may, a considerable amount of Green Belt land is being taken for development in this review of the Local Plan and many residents could claim the same. If this were to be a decisive consideration in determining the amount and distribution of development, it would not be possible to meet the Structure Plan requirement to find more land for housing.

Conclusions

14. Having considered the reasons for objection, I conclude this site is suitable for housing development and that the allocation for this purpose in the Local Plan should be retained. There are no compelling reasons to alter the proposed density at this site. I therefore confirm the capacity of the site as 40 dwellings, in round terms.
15. I also conclude that, if the development of this site cannot start for highway reasons before the GCCF Access Road is completed, then the Local Plan should say so.

RECOMMENDATION

16. **I recommend that the allocation for residential development at Chartwell Grove, Mapperley is retained in the Local Plan.**
17. **I recommend that the capacity of the site is 40 dwellings, in round terms.**
18. **I recommend that, if the development of the site cannot start for highway reasons before the GCCF Access Road is completed, then the Local Plan should say so.**

2.7 H2 DISTRIBUTION OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT OBJECTION SITE: DARK LANE, CALVERTON

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000727	001088	Mr & Mrs T Allen

Summary of Objection

Development of Dark Lane would be detrimental to the historic character of village and the adjacent conservation area. Soil at Dark Lane is the Hodnet type suitable to grow a range of crops.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

1. This objection arose from the consideration of this site at an early stage in the preparation of the Local Plan. However, the site was not included in later versions of the Local Plan. On the face of it therefore, this objection has been met. Accordingly I recommend no modification to the Local Plan in response to the above objection.
2. However, Langridge Homes have objected to the Local Plan, seeking the allocation of this site for residential development. The objection from Langridge Homes is dealt with below. In the circumstances I regard any objection opposing the allocation as a representation in support of the plan as it now stands and will take it into account when I consider the objection from Langridge Homes.

RECOMMENDATION

3. I recommend no modification to the Local Plan in respect of this objection.
-

2.8 H2 DISTRIBUTION OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT OBJECTION SITE: FORMER EMEB SITE, COPPICE ROAD, ARNOLD

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001837	004144	Mrs P Elliott
003854	010577	Mr J Nightingale
003855	010588	Mrs J Nightingale

Summary of Objection

The proposed allocation in the First Deposit is objected to.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

1. This allocation in the First Deposit has since been deleted. This is because development has started and it is now treated as a completion in the Local Plan. In any event it is beyond the point where I could make any useful recommendation.
2. I conclude there is no need for me to consider this site and these objections further.

RECOMMENDATION

3. I recommend no modification to the Local Plan in response to these objections.
-

2.10 H2 DISTRIBUTION OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT OBJECTION SITE: FOXHILL ROAD, CARLTON

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001158	002416	Nottinghamshire County Council (Strategic Property)
001161	002550	Mr C Preston
003841	010559	Mrs P Garner

Summary of Objection

The proposed allocation in the First Deposit is objected to.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

1. This allocation in the First Deposit has since been deleted. This is because the development has taken place and it is now treated as a completion in the Local Plan. In any event it is beyond the point where I could make any useful recommendation.
2. I conclude there is no need for me to consider this site and these objections further.

RECOMMENDATION

3. I recommend no modification to the Local Plan in response to these objections.
-

2.9 H2 DISTRIBUTION OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT OBJECTION SITE: HOLLINWOOD LANE, CALVERTON

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000011	000011	Mr G Blant
000551	000785	Mrs C Chamberlain
000727	001089	Mr & Mrs T Allen
001026	002213	Mr V Morley
001028	002215	Mr R Morley
001029	002216	Mrs T Morley
001049	002242	Mr C Littlewood
001086	002289	Mrs C Bragg
001088	002291	Mr C Bragg
001714	003991	Mrs I Hallam
001716	003993	Mr T Hallam
001717	003994	Miss K Hallam
001955	004638	Gedling Labour Group
003959	010800	Mr N Burrows
003975	010833	Mrs P Nyblen
003980	010846	Mr R Hallam

Summary of Objections

These are objections to the housing allocation at Hollinwood Lane, Calverton that was included in the First Deposit. The reasons for objection include: loss of Green Belt, loss of wildlife habitats, loss of countryside, the distance to services, the number of dwellings proposed and the loss of agricultural land. There were also objections that the village's services are inadequate and that the traffic would cause problems. Other sites were preferred.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

1. These objections were made at the time of the First Deposit of the Local Plan. The Second Deposit of the plan deleted the allocation at Hollinwood Lane that gave rise to these objections. I therefore regard the objections as having been met. Accordingly I recommend no modification to the Local Plan in response to these objections.
2. However, there are objections from others seeking the reinstatement of the contentious allocation to the plan. When I am dealing with the other objections I shall treat these objections as support for the plan as it now stands and take them into account.

RECOMMENDATION

3. I recommend no modification to the Local Plan in respect of these objections to the already deleted housing allocation at Hollinwood Lane, Calverton.

2.10 H2 DISTRIBUTION OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT OBJECTION SITE: HOWBECK ROAD

Objections

OVER 100 INDIVIDUAL OBJECTIONS

Summary of Objection

The above objections are all to some aspect of the allocation of land for housing at Howbeck Road in the first deposit version of the plan. Most oppose the allocation in principle.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

1. These objections arose at the First Deposit of the Local Plan. In the Second Deposit this allocation was no longer included in the plan. On the face of it therefore, these objections have all succeeded. Accordingly I recommend no modification to the Local Plan in response to the above objections.
2. However, the landowner has objected to the second deposit version of the Local Plan, seeking the reinstatement of the allocation and also made an objection to the first deposit plan seeking a larger allocation. The objections from the landowner are dealt with below. In the circumstances I regard the objections opposing the allocation as representations in support of the plan as it now stands and will take them into account when I consider the objections to the allocation’s removal from the plan.

RECOMMENDATION

3. I recommend no modification to the Local Plan in respect of these objections to the (deleted) allocation at Howbeck Road.

2.13 H2 DISTRIBUTION OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT OBJECTION SITE: MAPPERLEY PLAINS / (NORTH OF) ARNOLD LANE

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000097	000127	3rd Woodthorpe (St Marks) Scout Group

Summary of Objection

The development would come too close to the adjacent Scout training ground and could interfere with Scout activities. A gap must be kept between the Scout land and housing to protect amenity. Security fencing should be erected by any developer for safety reasons. The open land should be retained for the benefit of young people.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000240	004328	Miss J Burrows
000241	004337	Mr B Burrows
000242	004345	Mrs S Burrows
000514	000729	Mr J Bentley
003900	010694	Miss L Gray

Summary of Objection

There would be too many houses on this site and in this area. The infrastructure is inadequate.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000548	000781	Mrs J Peace
000549	000782	Mr J Peace

001627	003852	Mr S Drewett
001628	003853	Mrs G Drewett
001897	004361	Mr & Mrs R Thorne

Summary of Objection

The increase in traffic would make conditions at this junction worse. Green Belt land would be eroded. Delete all three proposed housing areas near this junction.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001011	002177	Mr & Mrs R Mottram
001326	002855	Mr F Rodrigues

Summary of Objection

The increase in traffic would make the existing situation worse, causing pollution. The original Gedling Relief Road would have reduced fumes and noise. There would be too many houses on this site and in this area.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001895	004352	Mrs D Birch
003847	010566	Mr A Birch

Summary of Objection

Objection to loss of Green Belt. The local wildlife is important. Keep this area rural.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001896	004355	Mr & Mrs D P Williamson

Summary of Objection

This development would lead to the loss of an important long distance view across the Trent valley.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001921	004442	Mrs E Hall

Summary of Objection

Objection – no reason given.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

1. In the First Deposit of the Local Plan there were two relatively small housing allocations to the north and south of Arnold Lane at its junction with Plains Road / Mapperley Plains. It is not always clear to which of these allocations objectors were objecting, although some clearly object to both.
2. These objections were made at the time of the First Deposit. The Second Deposit of the plan deleted both the contentious allocations. I therefore regard the objections as having been met and I recommend no modification to the Local Plan in response to these objections.
3. However, there are objections to the Second Deposit seeking the reinstatement of the contentious allocations to the plan. When I am dealing with these later objections I shall treat the above objections as support for the plan as it now stands and take them into account.

RECOMMENDATION

4. **I recommend no modification to the Local Plan in respect of these objections to the already deleted housing allocation north of Arnold Lane (at its junction with Mapperley Plains).**

2.11 H2 DISTRIBUTION OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT OBJECTION SITE: PLAINS ROAD / (SOUTH OF) ARNOLD LANE

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000240	004329	Miss J Burrows
000241	004336	Mr B Burrows
000242	004343	Mrs S Burrows
000514	000729	Mr J Bentley
003900	010695	Miss L Gray

Summary of Objection

There would be too many houses on this site and in this area. The infrastructure is inadequate.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001011	002177	Mr & Mrs R Mottram

Summary of Objection

The increase in traffic would make the existing situation worse, causing pollution. The original Gedling Relief Road would have reduced fumes and noise. There would be too many houses on this site and in this area.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001896	004355	Mr & Mrs D P Williamson

Summary of Objection

This development would lead to the loss of an important long distance view across the Trent valley.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001921	004442	Mrs E Hall

Summary of Objection

Objection – no reason given.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

1. In the First Deposit of the Local Plan there were two relatively small housing allocations to the north and south of Arnold Lane at its junction with Plains Road / Mapperley Plains. It is not always clear to which of these allocations objectors were objecting, although some clearly object to both.
2. These objections were made at the time of the First Deposit. The Second Deposit of the plan deleted both the contentious allocations. I therefore regard the objections as having been met and I recommend no modification to the Local Plan in response to these objections.
3. However, there are objections to the Second Deposit seeking the reinstatement of the contentious allocations to the plan. When I am dealing with these later objections I shall treat the above objections as support for the plan as it now stands and take them into account.

RECOMMENDATION

4. I recommend no modification to the Local Plan in respect of these objections to the already deleted housing allocation south of Arnold Lane (at its junction with Plains Road).

2.12 H2 DISTRIBUTION OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT: OBJECTION SITE: MONSELL DRIVE, ARNOLD

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001345	003219	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust
002412	006184	Mr R Woolley
002828	007593	Mr R Stapleford
002829	007594	Mr R Stapleford
002830	007595	Mr J Sharp
002990	008084	Mr E Middleton
003017	008101	R Pearson
003820	010259	D Jenkins
003835	010543	R.A.G.E.

AND ABOUT 800 INDIVIDUAL OBJECTIONS

Summary of Objection

This allocation should be deleted from the Local Plan.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

1. These numerous objections arose at the First Deposit stage. In the Second Deposit this allocation was no longer included in the Local Plan.
2. My understanding is that this land is in educational use and cannot be released for residential development unless the Education Ministry sanctions its sale. I have been supplied with correspondence dating from 2002, which shows that ministerial clearance for the sale had not been obtained at that time. Because of this GBC is not pursuing the allocation, even though it says it may do if the site becomes surplus to education requirements in the future.
3. Be that as it may, the allocation is no longer part of the plan and all these objections have thus succeeded without any intervention from me. Accordingly I recommend no modification to the Local Plan in response to these objections.
4. However, there is one objection to the deletion of this allocation (from the Nottinghamshire County Council Education Department) which I deal with below as an "Addition Objection Site". I shall regard all these objections as support for the plan as it now stands and take them into account there.

RECOMMENDATION

5. I recommend no modification to the Local Plan in respect of the (deleted) allocation at Monsell Drive.

2.13 H2 DISTRIBUTION OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT OBJECTION SITE: LAND NORTH OF PAPPLEWICK LANE

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000717	001503	Nottinghamshire County Council
001158	002424	Nottinghamshire County Council (Strategic Property)
001158	002435	Nottinghamshire County Council (Strategic Property)
001325	002847	Papplewick Parish Council
001325	002851	Papplewick Parish Council
001325	002853	Papplewick Parish Council
001330	002927	CPRE
001332	003020	Linby Parish Council
001335	003033	Ashfield District Council
001336	003063	Hucknall Against Rural Development
001339	003094	Environment Agency
001345	003206	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Group
001951	004607	Kirkby and District Conservation Society
001955	004641	Gedling Labour Group

AND OVER 100 INDIVIDUAL OBJECTIONS

Summary of Objection

The above objections are to the allocation of land for housing north of Papplewick Lane in the first deposit version of the plan.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

1. These objections were made at the time of the First Deposit of the Local Plan. The Second Deposit of the plan deleted the housing allocation that was the subject of these objections. I therefore regard the objections as having been met. Accordingly I recommend no modification to the Local Plan in response to these objections.
2. However, there is an objection from another objector that seeks the reinstatement of the contentious allocation to the plan. When I am dealing with this later objection I shall treat the above as support for the plan as it now stands and take them into account.

RECOMMENDATION

3. I recommend no modification to the Local Plan in respect of these objections to the (now deleted) allocation north of Papplewick Lane.

2.14 H2 DISTRIBUTION OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT OBJECTION SITE: NORTH OF PARK AVENUE, BURTON JOYCE

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000474	000666	Nottinghamshire Badger Group
000702	001013	Burton Joyce Parish Council
001345	003222	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust
000270	000374	Mr A Taylor
000576	000823	Dr R Kime
001643	003885	Dr P Toghill

AND ABOUT 110 INDIVIDUAL OBJECTIONS

Summary of Objections

The majority of the objectors seek the deletion of this allocation from the Local Plan. There are also objections to number of houses proposed.

ALSO DEALT WITH HERE ARE:

OBJECTIONS TO POLICY H6 (RESIDENTIAL DENSITY) RELATING TO THIS SITE

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000702	201277	Burton Joyce Parish Council
004007	200046	Burton Joyce Floodwatch Committee
001643	201426	Dr P Toghill

AND ABOUT 20 INDIVIDUAL OBJECTIONS

Summary of Objection

The density proposed for this site in the Second Deposit is too high.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

1. This is an irregularly shaped piece of backland that can be accessed from Park Avenue and/or Lambley Lane. The Second Deposit indicates that the site has a capacity of 78 dwellings. By the time of the Local Plan Inquiry the part of the site accessed directly from Park Avenue (about a third of the allocated area) had been granted planning permission for 10 houses. The number was restricted at the behest of the Highway Authority (NCC) because of the limitations of Park Avenue and its junction with Main Street. In the light of this the Council has reassessed the capacity of the whole allocation as 45 dwellings, or 35 more than the 10 already permitted.
2. I cannot influence what happens on the part of the allocation that already has planning permission and I do not intend to consider that land any further. However, whether assessed on its own or in conjunction with the permitted land, the remainder of the allocation is now a more modest proposal both in terms of its area and its capacity.

Villages in the Green Belt

3. The Local Plan treats the villages in the Green Belt in one of three ways:
 - it excludes (or “insets”) the built up area of the village from the Green Belt notation so that limited development may take place within the village;
 - it includes (“washes over”) the village in the Green Belt but defines an “infill boundary” within which infilling will be allowed (see policy ENV30);
 - it includes (“washes over”) the village within the Green Belt without any “infill boundary “ so that Green Belt policies apply throughout the village.

4. This approach is in accordance with the guidance from government in the current PPG2 (paragraph 2.11). I therefore consider that the approach is acceptable.
5. GBC collected data on the services and character of each rural settlement and has categorised the villages as follows:
 - ***Inset Villages:*** Bestwood, Burton Joyce, Calverton, Newstead and Ravenshead;
 - ***Washed over Villages with Infill Boundaries:*** Lambley, Linby, Papplewick and Woodborough;
 - ***Washed Over Villages Without Infill Boundaries:*** all the smaller settlements, including Stoke Bardolph.
6. Having studied the Council's data and considered objections on the matter, my own view is that this categorisation is reasonable and justified. I reach this conclusion even though – in my view – Bestwood, Newstead and Woodborough are all middle order settlements with a rather limited range of facilities. This would suggest that they should all be treated as washed over villages with infill boundaries. However, I accept that the character and circumstances of Bestwood and Newstead are such that they would benefit from some limited development and diversification. In addition there are particular reasons why the housing allocations in Bestwood and Newstead have been included in the plan.

Burton Joyce

7. As far as Burton Joyce is concerned, this means that I consider it is properly classified as an inset village, which is suitable for limited development beyond infilling. However, whilst the village may be suitable for limited development in terms of its size and facilities, this does not mean there is an overriding need to allocate land for housing in the village if no local need has been shown to exist and no suitable sites can be found. However, there is scope within the settlement for an intensification of the built up area by the development and redevelopment of underused land on a scale that could exceed the restricted definition of infilling in the Local Plan.
8. The Council says Burton Joyce is large enough, is sufficiently built up and has a range of services that make it a suitable location for limited development. The mixed age and styles of building in the village do not preclude new buildings on conservation grounds. In addition the settlement is well related to the main built up area, is relatively well served by public transport and is in a corridor where public transport is being improved. I therefore see no reason to conclude that Burton Joyce is incapable of absorbing some residential development. Furthermore this site is well related to the built up area of the village and conveniently located in relation to most local services. The fact that infilling and intensification (amounting to 50 dwellings) has been permitted in the village in recent years does not alter this assessment.

The Site

9. It is true that this site involves altering the inherited Green Belt boundary to a small extent but such changes are inevitable in the borough if the required number of new dwellings is to be accommodated. Development on this site would have very little impact on the wider Green Belt and would not erode the sensitive gap between the village and the main built up area or involve obtrusive encroachment into the countryside. In these respects this site is preferable to an alternative site in the vicinity

that was considered early on in the plan preparation process. The area involved here is small and is difficult, if not impossible, to see from any vantage point that is open to the public. The change would reflect the local topography. Accordingly I consider that the site should not be ruled out in principle for Green Belt reasons.

10. There are also a large number of objections drawing attention to the wildlife and trees on the site. However, the Council says that the site itself is not identified as especially important for these reasons, although the rising land to the north is both more important and more attractive to look at. The woodland to the north is more mature and a richer habitat. There is no indication that badgers live on the objection site, although they may live nearby and use this land for foraging. However, I have no evidence to indicate that the long term future of this, or any other, species would be threatened in this general vicinity if this land were to be developed. This is not to deny that wildlife uses the site at the moment but I believe that the local wildlife could and would adapt to a relatively minor incursion into its wider habitat. I do not, therefore, regard the wildlife or the trees on the site as being overriding constraints precluding development.

Access

11. Another major cause for concern and objection are the difficulties of accessing the site and its proximity to some important traffic generators in the village, such as the doctors' surgery. Leaving aside the land that already has planning permission (accessed from Park Avenue); the remainder of the land would be accessed by the removal of a house in Lambley Lane to create a new entrance. Although this would be opposite the doctors' surgery, it is on the outside of the bend in the road making visibility in both directions easier. The Highway Authority has been consulted and is satisfied that the access would be safe for the number of dwellings proposed, provided visibility splays can be created using some land from the front gardens on either side of the access. Lambley Lane is not a major through-route for traffic and I have no reason to disagree with the technical assessment of the proposed access. It is true that the site and its access are close to the busiest parts of the village but this is one of the site's advantages. With the numbers proposed, I see no reason to prevent development because of the access.

Services

12. Some objectors point to the inadequacy of local services and say that the proposed development cannot be accommodated for this reason. I have three comments on these reasons for objection:
 - first and foremost, I have to rely on the relevant service providers in assessing such matters. For example, if the Local Education Authority does not say that the schools are full or the Health Authority does not say that medical services are over-stretched, it is difficult for me to conclude that they are;
 - second, the Authorities know that developers can be required to make contributions towards the provision of services if their development would overload the existing provision. The Local Plan makes reference to this in several places, although I am recommending this should be made clearer by drawing the material in the plan together and spelling out in more detail where and how it is likely to arise;
 - in any event, my task is to identify enough housing land to fulfil a requirement in the Structure Plan. If all the potential areas for

development are over-stretched in one way or another (as some objectors would have me believe) this does not help in the choice of sites. Extra services are likely to be needed wherever the development goes.

13. For these reasons I do not consider that the adequacy of the existing services in the vicinity of this site are decisive in determining whether the land should be developed.

Flooding and Ground Conditions

14. Objectors also say that the site is low lying and is subject to flooding. It is certainly true that some of the site has a pond on it and there are extensive ditches. The rest of the site may also be poorly drained. Part of the site is in the indicative floodplain, although the Environment Agency does not object to the allocation because it does not fall within the 100-year flood risk area. Even so, a flood risk assessment is likely to be required before development takes place.
15. However, my clear overall impression (based on my site visit) is that the ground conditions are difficult and may impose limitations on the number and siting of dwellings.

Density

16. As far as the proposed density is concerned the situation that arises now that part of the site has planning permission, would go some way to meeting the objections. However, the Council's latest assessment still implies a density on the remaining part of the allocation of about 30 dwellings per hectare. This is in line with general guidance in PPG3, although the convenient location of the site indicates that a higher density could be appropriate. The smaller house types that are likely to arise from higher densities may also be what are needed in the village given the preponderance of large houses in the vicinity. I therefore have no objection to the proposed density in principle.
17. Be that as it may, the remaining part of the site is an awkward shape and the relationship of the site with adjoining properties may also impose limitations on its development. The ground conditions may also limit the practical capacity of the site. At this stage I have no reason to override the Council's latest assessment of the remainder of the site but I have strong practical reservations about the site's capacity. I say this even though I accept the desirability of higher densities in principle and in general.
18. I understand that there may have been restrictive covenants affecting this land in the past but I do not regard these as a decisive consideration in planning decisions.

Overall Conclusions

19. The conclusions I arrive at, therefore, are that I cannot see any planning reason to rule out the development of this site, although I have strong doubts about its capacity. Having investigated all the reasons for objection I do not find any decisive considerations to rule the site out. Residential land is needed in the borough as a whole and Burton Joyce is a suitable location for limited development.
20. My reservations relate more to the ground conditions on the site and the relationship with adjoining properties than to the impact on the wider surrounding area. (So my reasoning is not the same as that of most objectors to the allocation.) I would wish to

see a high density if this can be achieved and consider that the smaller house types this implies would be a useful addition to the local housing stock.

21. Given its change in status, it would in any event be correct to delete the land with planning permission as an allocation in the Local Plan. Moreover, it seems to me that little harm would be done by deleting the whole of the site as a housing allocation. This is not to say that development will not occur on that part of the site that does not yet have planning permission. But any proposal would be considered under the more general policies of the plan, recognising Burton Joyce's status as a village excluded from the Green Belt and the need to achieve higher densities where possible. The number of dwellings thus achieved may turn out to be as many as the Council now envisages but would count as "windfalls".
22. I conclude that the Green Belt boundary as shown on the Proposals Map should not be changed.
23. I see this largely as a technical alteration to the Local Plan that will have little bearing on the future of this particular site. However, it has a small impact on the need for residential land elsewhere.

RECOMMENDATIONS

24. **I recommend that the housing allocation on land north of Park Avenue, Burton Joyce is deleted from the Local Plan.**
 25. **I recommend no modification to the Green Belt boundary in the vicinity of this site from that shown on the Proposals Map.**
-

2.15 H2 DISTRIBUTION OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT OBJECTION SITE: SOUTH OF REGINA CRESCENT, RAVENSHEAD.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000268	000372	Ravenshead Parish Council (Clr J Lonegan)
000043	000046	Mr G Turner
000364	000513	Mr R Buckley (Traffic Objection)

Summary of Objection

The land should be kept in the Green Belt and not allocated for residential development.

AND ABOUT 100 INDIVIDUAL OBJECTIONS

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

1. The bulk of the objections to the allocation of land for residential development south of Regina Crescent were made at the time of the First Deposit. However, the Second Deposit deleted the allocation that had been the subject of the objections. I therefore regard the objections to the original allocation as having been met. Accordingly I recommend no modification to the Local Plan in response to these objections.
2. However, there are objections from others seeking the reinstatement of the contentious allocation and/or the removal of the land from the Green Belt. When I am dealing with these other objections (below) I shall treat the objections to the First Deposit as support for the plan as it now stands and take them into account.

RECOMMENDATION

3. **I recommend no modification to the Local Plan in response to these objections in respect of the (deleted) allocation for residential development south of Regina Crescent, Ravenshead.**
-

2.16 H2 DISTRIBUTION OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT OBJECTION SITE: LAND SOUTH OF LAMBLEY LANE

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001326	002857	Mr F Rodrigues
001620	003832	Gedling Liberal Democrats
001955	004634	Gedling Labour Group

AND ABOUT 50 INDIVIDUAL OBJECTIONS (SEVERAL NOW WITHDRAWN)

Summary of Objections

All of these objections were to the First Deposit. The majority of objectors wanted the allocation deleted. Some wanted the density increased.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

1. These objections were made at the time of the First Deposit of the Local Plan. The Second Deposit of the plan deleted the allocation that gave rise to the objections. I therefore regard the objections as having been met. Accordingly I recommend no modification to the Local Plan in response to these objections.
2. However, there is an objection from Langridge Homes that seeks the reinstatement of the contentious allocation. When I am dealing with the Langridge objection (below), I shall treat these objections as support for the plan as it now stands and take them into account.

RECOMMENDATION

3. I recommend no modification to the Local Plan in response to these objections.
-

2.17 H2 DISTRIBUTION OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT: OBJECTION SITE: STOCKINGS FARM, ARNOLD

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001158	002417	Nottinghamshire County Council (Strategic Property)
001345	003211	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust
003835	010541	R.A.G.E.
000091	000114	Mr P Heron
001958	004660	Ms A Lowe
002162	005344	Mr D Bingham
002412	005997	Mr R E M Wooley
002419	006004	Mrs M Heron
002496	006132	Mr F Osborne
002498	006134	Mrs C Osborne
002828	007307	Ms R Stapleford
002829	007308	Mr R J Stapleford
002830	007309	Mr J Sharp
002822	007301	Mr P King
002990	007974	Mr E Middleton
003017	008018	R Pearson
003018	008019	Mrs V Pearson
003244	008584	Mrs L McConnell
003245	008585	Mr P McConnell
003820	010397	Mr D Jenkins

AND OVER 1500 INDIVIDUAL OBJECTIONS.

Summary of Objections

The housing allocation should be deleted from the Local Plan. A variety of reasons for this are advanced, including: loss of Green Belt, the impact on the landscape, wildlife and agriculture, the impact of additional traffic, pressure on local services (including the local primary school) and conflict with other policies in the Local Plan.

ALSO DEALT WITH HERE ARE:

OBJECTIONS TO POLICY H6 (RESIDENTIAL DENSITY) RELATING TO THIS SITE

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
004029	200091	Mr C Moodie
(Headteacher, Richard Bonington Primary & Nursery School)		

AND ABOUT 20 INDIVIDUAL OBJECTIONS.

Summary of Objection

The proposed density is too high, especially in the Second Deposit. There is particular concern regarding the capacity of the Richard Bonington School Primary & Nursery School and because of the amount of traffic likely to be generated.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

1. Although this is evidently a very unpopular housing allocation, in general terms it performs well in relation to both GBC's and the government's priorities. By this I mean that it is an urban extension and it is relatively sustainable (because it is close to a good bus route). Nevertheless there are several reasons for objection and I shall look at each in turn.

Green Belt

2. Many objectors point out that this land is currently in the Green Belt and express the view that it should remain so. However, the removal of some land from the Green Belt is inevitable (and sanctioned by the Structure Plan) if sufficient housing land is to be found in the borough. This particular site is an extension to the urban area and is to be preferred for this reason to major development in villages or remoter rural areas. Development of this site would not erode a particularly narrow or sensitive tract of Green Belt. The Council identified this land as being relatively free from constraints in its early sieve map analysis of the Green Belt. Thus, whilst I accept that the loss of Green Belt land is to be regretted and should be kept to a minimum, this does not provide an overriding case for rejecting this particular site.

Housing Need

3. Many objectors also question the need to release this site for development on the basis that less land is needed in total or that other sites – and especially urban sites – can and should be used. These issues have already been addressed in relation to policy H1 and the overall conclusion is that more, not less, greenfield land has to be found. As to the availability of better greenfield sites, this has to be assessed in the light of the relative merits of all the sites concerned. In my view this site is to be preferred to all the potential sites that I am not recommending for inclusion in the Local Plan.

The Ridgelines and Landscape

4. It is true that the upper parts of this site are on the steeply sloping side of a prominent ridge. However, the extent of the allocation included in the Local Plan has been determined by a contour that would limit the visual intrusion of any development by keeping it away from the top of the main ridge running east to west. The visual impact of development would therefore be contained and would not “spill over” into the open countryside to the north. Although this would create what appears to be an arbitrary boundary in relation to the existing field pattern, once development had taken place the Green Belt boundary would be both clear on the ground and “defensible”.
5. Some objectors also refer to the subsidiary ridge that runs north to south to the west of the objection site. Again the development would be set back from the crest of this ridge. In my estimation this would mean that from the start of the footpath from Arch Hill the new housing would not be visible. Of course as one walked along the path the development would become visible until at the crest of the ridge one would be looking down onto it (and then the path actually passes through the allocation). However, from these vantage-points the allocation land is seen against the backdrop of existing housing in Arnold. Whilst there are panoramic views across the Trent valley (which would not be interrupted from the highest point) the intermediate landscape is neither rural nor particularly attractive. I therefore consider that the visual impact from the west would be contained and limited. I consider that it would not warrant keeping this as open land for landscape reasons.
6. For these reasons I consider that the damage to the landscape arising from this allocation would not be such as to necessitate removing it from the Local Plan.

Traffic and Transport

7. One of the most commonly expressed reasons for opposing this allocation is the impact the additional housing would have on traffic conditions in Arnold generally and

on the roads between the objection site and the centre of Nottingham. Arnold, its town centre and all the radial routes into Nottingham are already congested, especially at peak times. It is said that any additional traffic arising from this proposal would create completely unacceptable conditions. Shortcomings in the current bus services between Arnold and Nottingham are also referred to.

8. Whilst it cannot be claimed that this allocation could solve or improve current problems in the local traffic and transport situation, the Transport Assessment indicates that measures could be introduced (funded by the developer) that would ensure that existing traffic and transport conditions were not made materially worse. These would include junction improvements, traffic management and improvements to bus services. On this basis neither GBC (the Local Planning Authority) nor NCC (the Highway and Transport Authority) oppose the allocation.
9. It is also the case that an alternative site could affect the same roads or others equally under pressure. It may be that this proposal and the associated highway improvements would take up all the potential there is for road improvements in the area. But the Highway Authority says there is no realistic prospect of such improvement schemes being implemented in the absence of contributions from a developer.
10. Developer contributions could also bring about improvements to the existing bus services and bring buses into the site, thus making it sustainable in so far as residents in the development would have good access to public transport. Because some of the site (and to a lesser extent the surrounding area) are steeply sloping, this is not obviously good terrain for walking and cycling. Nevertheless footpath accesses and cycle-routes could be provided into the site and measures could be taken (and funded by the developer) to make cycling and walking safer on surrounding roads.
11. In view of the evidence I consider that concerns about traffic conditions in and around Arnold are not a sufficient reason to remove this allocation from the Local Plan.

Hedges and Trees

12. Many objectors, including the Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust, refer to the particular value of the hedges and hedgerow trees on the site. The Council takes the view that the hedgerows and trees on the site could and should be retained as part of the landscaping of any development. Although some objectors doubt the commitment and effectiveness of GBC in this respect, I see no reason why this should not be achieved. I consider it is too detailed a matter for me to attempt to specify in the Local Plan which trees and hedges should be retained.

Wildlife

13. All open land has some wildlife value as a habitat for plants, birds and animals. Notwithstanding the objection from Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (who acknowledge that the site has limited value as a habitat), and the views of many local residents, I have no evidence that this is an especially valuable wildlife site and certainly it is not identified or protected as such. I have already noted that trees and hedgerows could be retained as part of the site's development. In these circumstances this consideration does not preclude the site being allocated for housing.

Agricultural Land

14. Some of the land affected by this allocation is higher-grade agricultural land but by no means all the site. However, if no preferable alternative sites are available, such land may be allocated for development. There is no agricultural objection to the development of this site from the government department concerned. This consideration does not, therefore, preclude this land being allocated for housing.

Gas and Flooding

15. Objectors are also concerned about the possible underground migration of gas from the nearby landfill site. The Council says there is no evidence of such a danger at the present time but acknowledge that the situation will need monitoring and if necessary remedial action would be taken. Similarly the need to limit and deal with surface water run-off would be taken into account in the design of a drainage system for the site.

Services

16. Some objectors point to the inadequacy of local services and say that the proposed development cannot be accommodated for this reason. (I discuss the local school below.) I have three comments on these reasons for objection:
- first and foremost, I have to rely on the relevant service providers in assessing such matters. For example, if the Local Education Authority does not say that the schools are full or the Health Authority does not say that medical services are over-stretched, it is difficult for me to conclude that they are;
 - second, the Authorities know that developers can be required to make contributions towards the provision of services if their development would overload the existing provision. The Local Plan makes reference to this in several places, although I am recommending this should be made clearer by drawing the material in the plan together and spelling out in more detail where and how it is likely to arise;
 - in any event, my task is to identify enough housing land to fulfil a requirement in the Structure Plan. If all the potential areas for development are over-stretched in one way or another (as some objectors would have me believe) this does not help in the choice of sites. Extra services are likely to be needed wherever the development goes.

17. For these reasons I do not consider that the adequacy of the existing services in the vicinity of this site are decisive in determining whether the land should be allocated for development.

Density

18. Objections made concerning this site and policy H6 (Residential Density) are also dealt with here. The objections relate particularly to the higher density proposed in the Second Deposit.
19. The density of development is an important and contentious matter. The local school and others have objected to this aspect of the Second Deposit. The school is a successful community but is operating in crowded facilities. It is not only the number of classrooms that causes concern but cramped communal facilities (the hall, library and corridors). The headteacher and governors say the school cannot absorb more pupils from new housing, especially at the higher density now proposed. Additional

educational capacity would need to be provided before the new housing is built if the welfare and education of the children at the school are not to suffer. “Simply” adding demountable classrooms to the nearest school would not be adequate.

20. As discussed at the Inquiry hearing with the school, it emerged that:
 - the Local Education Authority (LEA) will have a key role in planning and co-ordinating any additional future school capacity;
 - it is expected that any developer at this site would make financial contributions towards the extension of education facilities arising directly as a result of their development;
 - however, at the time of the hearing, the way forward was not clear and several possibilities were still under consideration. These included measures to increase capacity at several schools, the re-definition of school catchment areas, complete redevelopment of the nearest school and building a new school partly funded by the developer of this site. These uncertainties were not entirely resolved by the late intervention of the LEA, although they now appear to be moving towards wanting an additional school.

21. According to the records of objections I have been supplied with, the Local Education Authority (LEA) was not a formal objector to the Local Plan as far as this site is concerned. However, rather late in the day I received a written representation from the LEA to the effect that, based on the likely number of children from 424 dwellings, they consider that an additional primary school would be needed to serve this development. They say a site of 1.1 ha should be reserved. This would, of course, reduce the capacity of the site by about 55 dwellings at 50 dph. I have no information as to whether a new school would still be needed after such a reduction – it could be a marginal decision because there was no similar objection to the 326 dwellings proposed in the First Deposit. (The County Council declined my invitation to attend a hearing during the Inquiry for a discussion of their objections.)

22. I have some doubts about the status of the LEA and whether it is in fact an objector in this matter, although this is for GBC to determine. Be that as it may, GBC have not said I should disregard the representation from the LEA and they can be regarded as supporting the objection from the local school. In any event, given the role, powers and importance of the LEA it would in my view be unwise to entirely disregard their views. I say this even though two local residents have written to say that to build a new school would be wasteful.

23. For the school it was said that theirs was not an objection in principle to the proposed development but they wished to ensure three things above all else:
 - the school needs to be deeply involved with the plans to cater for the children arising from this development;
 - attempting to deal with the capacity problems that are likely to arise by adding demountable classrooms to their site is not an adequate or acceptable solution;
 - they wish to ensure that any new provision is made before the additional children arrive.

24. Whilst I understand and sympathise with the school on all these matters, in my view they go some way beyond my remit and what can be included in the Local Plan. The Local Plan can, does and should include provisions that will ensure that the future educational (and other) needs arising from development are funded by the developer. It cannot go beyond this to determine what form the future provision will take and what administrative arrangements will be made to secure its planning and implementation. In this regard the school would be better advised to direct its attention to the Local Education Authority rather than the Local Planning Authority.
25. The Council's approach to densities on residential developments, and in particular the decision to increase densities in the Second Deposit, are in response to current government guidance. Higher densities in new residential development have the direct and tangible result that less greenfield land has to be developed. In this Local Plan this means less land has to be taken out of the Green Belt. Thus, in principle, the higher densities have some merit. But in practical terms, if a new school is to be accommodated on this site, the numbers envisaged by GBC are no longer realistic.
26. Because the developable area is constrained by the landscape and ridgelines I consider that the need for a new school would have to be met within the allocation and not by extending the boundary of the urban area beyond the land already allocated. Moreover, as a school is likely to require relatively level land, where the highest residential densities might otherwise be achieved, the impact may be greater than a reduction of 55.
27. Accordingly I consider that the Council's planned capacity for this site should be reduced from the 424 in the Second Deposit to (in round terms) 360.

Overall Conclusions

28. Before any Green Belt land can be released for development there needs to be compelling reasons. The Structure Plan provides such a justification and I am satisfied that the need exists in Gedling borough and that Arnold is, in general terms, a suitable location for development. I have examined all the specific reasons advanced as objections to this site and find that none of them are of sufficient weight or substance to override the need to find land for housing or the suitability of this location. In view of this I conclude that this allocation should be retained in the Local Plan.
29. In view of the need to make the best use of the land that is being developed (to minimise the total amount of greenfield land to be developed) I also accept higher density figures for this site in principle. However in view of the probable need to find a new school site, I conclude that the capacity of the allocation should be 360 dwellings.

RECOMMENDATION

30. I recommend the allocation for residential development at Stockings Farm is retained in the Local Plan but the capacity of the site is reduced to 360 dwellings.
31. I recommend that the requirement to provide a new primary school site within this allocation is added to the Local Plan.

2.18 H2 DISTRIBUTION OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT OBJECTION SITE: STOKE LANE ALLOTMENTS

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000609	000894	Ashley Travis Garage
000888	001629	Mr W H Moore
001326	002865	Mr F Rodrigues
001620	003831	Gedling Liberal Democrats

AND ABOUT 350 INDIVIDUAL OBJECTIONS

Summary of Objection

Stoke Lane Allotments should not be allocated for residential development but should be retained as allotments.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

1. These objections were made at the time of the First Deposit. The Second Deposit deleted the allocation that gave rise to the objections. I therefore regard the objections as having been met. Accordingly I recommend no modification to the Local Plan in response to these objections.

RECOMMENDATION

2. I recommend no modification to the Local Plan in response to these objections.
-

2.19 H2 DISTRIBUTION OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT OBJECTION SITE: TAMERIX CLOSE

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001345	003228	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust

AND 13 INDIVIDUAL OBJECTIONS

Summary of Objection

Land at Tamerix Close should not be allocated for residential development.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

1. These objections were made at the time of the First Deposit. The Second Deposit deleted the allocation that gave rise to the objections. I therefore regard the objections as having been met. Accordingly I recommend no modification to the Local Plan in response to these objections.

RECOMMENDATION

2. I recommend no modification to the Local Plan in response to these objections.
-

2.20 H2 DISTRIBUTION OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT OBJECTION SITE: TOP WIGHAY FARM

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001633	003873	Mr C Taylor

Summary of Objection

The scale of proposed residential development at Top Wighay Farm is inappropriate for Linby and Hucknall. The site is too far from Nottingham to be sustainable. Ecological, traffic, visual and Green Belt reasons for objection are set out.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

1. Since neither the First Deposit nor the Second Deposit included an allocation for housing at Top Wighay Farm, this objection amounts to support for the Local Plan as drawn up by the Council. (The representation presumably arises from consideration of the site at an earlier stage in plan preparation.) No modification to the plan is needed to satisfy this objection.
2. I will, however, take these matters into account when considering objections to the effect that an allocation for residential development at Top Wighay Farm should be added to the plan (see below).

RECOMMENDATION

3. I recommend no modification to the Local Plan in response to this objection.
-

2.21 H2 DISTRIBUTION OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT OBJECTION SITE: WOOD LANE, GEDLING

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000160	000209	Carlton Le Willows School

Summary of Objection

The increase in traffic on Wood Lane (caused by new housing) would endanger the many school children using this route.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001326	002864	Mr F Rodrigues
001327	002871	Gedling Village Preservation Society
001862	004297	Mr D Macknight
001596	004434	Mr R Wilson

Summary of Objection

The development of this site is opposed. The reasons include: the site is in the Green Belt, Wood Lane could not cope with more traffic, it would harm the setting of listed buildings, a protected tree could be lost, there is no need for sheltered housing locally, wildlife would be harmed (badgers and foxes) and local experience suggests nursing homes convert to flats.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001345	010883	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust

Summary of Objection

The site has not been surveyed but may have wildlife interest. Objection would be withdrawn if more information demonstrated there is no wildlife interest.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001682	201432	Mr J Lesquereux

Summary of Objection

The words in the First Deposit "subject to development being restricted to sheltered accommodation" should be retained.

AND ABOUT 30 INDIVIDUAL OBJECTIONS

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

1. There are several reasons for the objections to this site. I shall deal with each in turn.

Green Belt

2. The Council does not dispute that allocating this site involves removing it from the Green Belt but says the land was identified in its sieve map analysis as a candidate for allocation. The site is at the end of a finger of Green Belt where it protrudes into the built up area and visually the site is separated from the wider Green Belt by the adjacent school. Since the development of some Green Belt land will be needed if the Structure Plan housing requirement is to be met, this site seems as suitable as any other and its development will do less harm to the Green Belt than would be the case at most other sites. I conclude that the current Green Belt status of the objection site is not a sufficient reason to rule out development.

Access

3. The access via Wood Lane and the shared use of this road by school children is the most contentious issue here. It is acknowledged by the Planning and Highway Authorities (GBC and NCC) that for this reason the site should not be developed for housing in the usual way. But it is considered that it is suitable for sheltered housing. This is presumably because the occupants of sheltered housing own fewer cars than most people, make fewer trips and generate fewer trips altogether. Moreover such trips are not likely to be heavily concentrated in peak hours, thus avoiding most of the comings and goings at the school.

4. I find the logic of this compelling and consider that provided the development is restricted to sheltered housing the impact on traffic and highway safety would be acceptable. In any event, on this basis I have no objection from the Highway Authority and I have no technical evidence to the contrary from any party. On the basis of the evidence, therefore, I consider that if the site is reserved for sheltered housing the allocation is acceptable in terms of highway safety.

Listed Buildings and Protected Trees

5. The objectors mention three buildings of particular merit: Gedling Manor and 11 and 15 Wood Lane. Whilst Gedling Manor is close to the objection site the others are across the road and on higher ground. The proposed development and access may have some impact but I do not consider that the character or settings of any of these buildings would necessarily be harmed. This is dependent on the siting and design of the proposed housing and this can be left to the detailed design stage.
6. Similarly, objectors fear that a protected tree could be lost, although in my view this would again depend on the siting and design of any building. The best trees could be incorporated into the design for the site and made a feature of it. Again, I take the view that this can be dealt with at the detailed design stage.

Need or Demand for Sheltered Housing

7. The objectors assert that there is no local need for sheltered housing. On the face of it this is surprising, although the Council does not produce any evidence to the contrary. However, I note that as well as the 30 objections there are over 180 representations supporting the allocation provided it is limited to sheltered housing. I take this to indicate there is a public perception of a local need for such accommodation. Be that as it may, if in spite of my expectations, no developer (public or private) can be found for such housing, then the Local Plan as it stands would not sanction a more general housing development. I consider that the views of the objectors on this matter are not convincing and should not be decisive.

Wildlife

8. Although the objectors refer in general terms to the site being used by wildlife (badgers and foxes are mentioned), I have no evidence that the site is an essential part of the habitat of any species. The Badger Group, who might be expected to know, says there is no evidence of a sett on the site and foxes and their dens are not protected. I also note the Council says that if a sett did materialise on the site, the badgers would be accommodated one way or another at the time of development. However, the same could be said of any site. On the basis of the evidence presented to me I have no reason to treat this site any differently from all other potential allocations.

Other Matters

9. The objectors also say that on the basis of local experience they fear that nursing homes can be converted into flats. Even if this is true, I do not equate or confuse sheltered housing with nursing homes.
10. Between the First Deposit and the Second Deposit the wording referring to this site was changed from “subject to development being restricted to sheltered

accommodation” to “sheltered housing”. This has attracted one objection. However, I consider that the meaning and intent of the Local Plan is clear and unchanged.

Conclusions

11. Having considered the reasons for the objections I conclude that there is no compelling reason why this land should not be allocated for residential development with the proviso that it is to be used only for sheltered housing.

RECOMMENDATION

12. I recommend no modification to the Local Plan in response to these objection.
-

2.22 H2 DISTRIBUTION OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT OBJECTION SITE: LINDEN GROVE

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000702	201116	Burton Joyce Parish Council

Summary of Objection

Development to the east of Linden Grove would encroach on the Green Belt and reduce the open gap between Gedling and Burton Joyce. The land is contaminated and unsuitable for domestic purposes. No further housing development should be allowed between Gedling and Burton Joyce.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000717	201436	Nottinghamshire County Council

Summary of Objection

The site has archaeological implications. (A late representation indicated that that extra educational facilities, including a new primary school, would be needed partly to service this site.)

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000717	201495	Nottinghamshire County Council

Summary of Objection

Access cannot be achieved without prejudicing bus priority proposals on A612. It may be possible to develop a smaller number of dwellings with access via Linden Grove itself but property acquisition would be involved. (Now confirmed access can be secured, objection conditionally withdrawn.)

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001158	201955	Nottinghamshire County Council (Strategic Property)

Summary of Objection

Objection because of flood risk, proximity of the site to the sewage works, over concentration of development and the loss of open land. Too little housing to constitute mixed development. Replace by Top Wighay Farm.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
004032	200097	Mr T Wagg
004033	200098	Mrs C Crix

Summary of Objections

Access cannot be taken from Linden Grove. The County Council says access cannot be from A612. The allocation should be deleted and the land kept open.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
004134	200488	Mr A Swain

Summary of Objection

The land is Green Belt and should be kept open. Development would harm the amenity of existing residents. It is an important open gap between Nottingham and Burton Joyce. The site provides flood relief. The site has been used for sludge disposal.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
004641	201402	Mr B Rainford

Summary of Objection

It is against government policy to build on the Green Belt or in the floodplain. Development would harm wildlife on the site. There will be a loss of privacy in existing dwellings. Access via Linden Grove would be unsafe. Brownfield land should be used. Delete the allocation.

AND ABOUT 100 INDIVIDUAL OBJECTIONS

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

Introduction

1. Many of the local residents have objections relating to the detailed design of the proposed new road near Linden Grove and, in particular, the traffic management measures that would be introduced after the road is built. I deal with this matter in the Transport chapter.
2. As indicated above, the Highway Authority objected that the proposed residential area could not be accessed directly from the A612 because of the traffic management measures intended for that road. They also said that if accessed from Linden Grove

(which would be hotly contested by residents in that road) the capacity of the site would have to be reduced. However, this objection has been conditionally withdrawn and I understand that the Highway Authority now envisages that an access directly onto the A612 would be possible. However, this could involve drivers having to follow the indirect route that the local residents object to. This is considered further in the Transport chapter.

Green Belt

3. I consider that the main issue relating to this site is that the land is in the narrow Green Belt gap between the suburbs of Nottingham and Burton Joyce. The issue is whether the site should remain undeveloped for Green Belt reasons.
4. The Council says that the possibility of allocating this land only arose once the new road had become a firm proposal. The gap between Nottingham and Burton Joyce is narrow but would be partly compromised by the new road, especially because it would be elevated where it crosses the railway to the south. To compensate for this the Local Plan extends the Green Belt gap towards Burton Joyce by including the ribbon of development on the north side of the A612 in the Green Belt.
5. In my view the gap between the built up area of the Nottingham conurbation and Burton Joyce is very important but vulnerable. One of the purposes of the Green Belt designation in this area is to prevent the coalescence of settlements such as would occur if this narrow gap is eroded. The extent to which the new road will compromise the gap remains to be seen when the detailed design is finalised but in my view this makes the protection of the gap more important rather than less. The extension of the Green Belt to include the ribbon of development on the north side of the A612 is unlikely to achieve any tangible result because the existing houses are likely to remain there indefinitely. The benefits will therefore only be apparent on the map and not on the ground.
6. I conclude that the housing allocation at Linden Grove should be deleted from the Local Plan because of the threat it poses to the Green Belt gap, the erosion of which would lead to the coalescence of the built up area of Nottingham and Burton Joyce.
7. (I recommend that a smaller objection site on the Burton Joyce side of the gap should be removed from the Green Belt and designated as Safeguarded Land. However, this does not mean that I favour development there either. Nevertheless, because of the existing pattern of building in the area I think the erosion of the gap from that direction would be less harmful.)

Flooding

8. It was agreed at the Hearing with objector 004134 that because the allocated land is flat and low it is badly drained. It therefore suffers from standing water at times of heavy rainfall but it is not subject to inundation when the Trent floods. This accords with the advice on flooding from the Environment Agency who have not included the objection site in the indicative floodplain. Neither do the Environment Agency object to the allocation. I conclude that the allocation cannot be ruled out because of flood risk.

Other Matters

9. At that Hearing there was also some discussion as to whether the allocated site has been used for sewage sludge disposal by injection into the soil. Later information confirmed that the site has been used for this purpose, but that the level of any contamination is low and no special work would be required to make the site suitable for residential development.
10. Objector 1158 also says that the site is unsuitable for housing because it is close to the sewage treatment works and could be subjected to odours from that source. I discuss this issue in more detail in the context of the Teal Close employment and housing allocations. This site is not as close to the sewage works as some of the Teal Close land but the prevailing wind may mean that this land is affected more. Interestingly, I note that the existing residents of Linden Grove do not make an issue of this matter. Be that as it may, I consider that this consideration does mean that this site is less suitable for residential development than other land that would not be similarly affected.
11. Although local residents may enjoy watching wildlife on the site I have no information to suggest that this is a special enough wildlife habitat to be protected. Similarly, although the residents enjoy their open views across countryside, the harm to their amenity would not be such as to stop development for that reason.

Conclusions

12. My overall conclusions are that this housing allocation is unfortunate and would further reduce the openness and effectiveness of a narrow but important gap between Nottingham and Burton Joyce. The proposed allocation would therefore harm the Green Belt.
13. It follows from the above that I also conclude the site should remain in the Green Belt.
14. Since I am not recommending the retention of the allocation of the site because of the impact on the Green Belt, I consider it is not necessary to consider the site's archaeology, access, density or education provision.

RECOMMENDATION

15. I recommend that the housing allocation at Linden Grove is deleted from the Local Plan.
 16. I also recommend that the land remains in the Green Belt.
-

2.23 H2 DISTRIBUTION OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT OBJECTION SITE: NORTH OF VICTORIA PARK

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000715	201286	Sport England

Summary of Objection

The objection is to the loss of an existing playing field. There are circumstances in which the loss of a playing field will be accepted but the Local Plan does not fulfil any of them.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000717	201427	Nottinghamshire County Council

Summary of Objection

A full Transport Assessment is required for this site in isolation and in conjunction with other nearby allocations. (The County Council considers this a matter of such importance as to threaten the general conformity of the Local Plan with the Structure Plan.) The site has archaeological implications. (Also a late representation indicated that extra educational facilities, including a new primary school, would be needed partly to service this site.)

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001158	201956	Nottinghamshire County Council (Strategic Property)

Summary of Objection

The site would involve the loss of a playing field in an area with a shortage. The site is in an area with a risk of flooding.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
003990	200012	Netherfield Forum

Summary of Objection

Development would divide the community. The land is contaminated and in the floodplain. Development would cause traffic congestion, noise and pollution. Move the proposed housing to Great Northern Way and use this land for industry.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
005016	201931	Cornwater Landowners

Summary of Objection

This is an area of high infrastructure costs. The site is within the indicative floodplain and would involve the loss of open space. Development would harm wildlife. Delete the allocation and substitute land at Ravenshead.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000888	200460	Mr W H Moore

Summary of Objection

The loss of the open space / playing field, which is used for informal recreation, is objected to. Development should be directed to under-used urban sites

AND ABOUT 100 OTHER INDIVIDUAL OBJECTIONS

ALSO CONSIDERED HERE ARE OBJECTIONS TO THE DESIGNATION OF THIS AREA AS WHITE LAND UNDER POLICY H4 IN THE FIRST DEPOSIT.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001158	002445	Nottinghamshire County Council (Strategic Property)
001324	002771	Langridge Homes Ltd

Summary of Objection

The policy is supported in principle but specific sites are disputed, including land North of Victoria Park.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000134	000170	Gedling Wildlife Group
000180	000262	RSPB
000609	002046	Ashley Travis Garage
000888	002103	Mr W Moore
001331	003008	Netherfield Wildlife Group
001331	003009	Netherfield Wildlife Group
001331	003010	Netherfield Wildlife Group
001331	003011	Netherfield Wildlife Group
001932	004512	Nottinghamshire Birdwatchers
003835	010553	R.A.G.E.

AND OVER 300 INDIVIDUAL OBJECTIONS

Summary of Objection

The designation as White Land is opposed, mainly because of the adverse impact any development would have on wildlife (principally migrating birds) at and near the site. Other reasons for given for opposing any development on this land include flood risk, poor access, traffic congestion, loss of open land, loss of Green Belt and contamination on the site.

A small proportion of the objectors supported the early development of the land in preference to allocations elsewhere.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

1. In my view the key consideration at this site is the loss of an existing playing field in an area that the Council acknowledges is not over-provided with such facilities. The objection from Sport England and the guidance in PPG17 make this clear. Moreover, this site has been raised above the surrounding area so that it is well drained and therefore particularly suited to its present use.
2. The Outline Planning Brief for the wider Teal Close area (CD A24) envisaged that replacement (and improved) playing fields would be provided in conjunction with the large employment allocation at Teal Close. The Council was relying on this replacement, although it is not shown on the Proposals Map.
3. My recommendations elsewhere are that the Teal Close employment allocation should not be included in this review of the Local Plan. This leaves this playing field with no visible means of replacement. I consider that this is decisive and that, pending any firm and deliverable means of replacement being included in the Local Plan, the site should be designated Protected Open Space (as in the First Deposit).
4. However, if my other recommendations are followed, this objection site would not abut any other area of Green Belt and I therefore consider the site should not be included in the Green Belt.
5. As noted above the land is higher than its surroundings. The EA has withdrawn its objection to the allocation because of flood risks. Thus, although part of the site is within the indicative floodplain, I consider that flood risk is not a decisive consideration at this site. The objection site is also far enough from the sewage works for possible odours from that source not to be a reason to prevent development.
6. In the circumstances, the issues of a Transport Assessment, the appropriate density of development and the need for a school site no longer arise. Neither do the archaeological implications of development.
7. I consider the replacement housing allocations for this site elsewhere.
8. I conclude that this allocation should be deleted because of the lack of a replacement playing field in the Local Plan.

RECOMMENDATION

9. I recommend that the housing allocation North of Victoria Park is deleted from the Local Plan and that the site is designated as Protected Open Space.
10. I recommend that the site is not included in the Green Belt.

2.24 H2 DISTRIBUTION OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT OBJECTION SITE: TEAL CLOSE

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000722	001074	Severn Trent Water Ltd

Summary of Objection

An objection (now withdrawn) was made to the First Deposit because this land was not allocated for housing.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000717	201441	Nottinghamshire County Council

Summary of Objection

There is concern about the flood risk. A full Transport Assessment is required for this site in isolation and in conjunction with other nearby allocations. (The County Council considers this a matter of such importance as to threaten the general conformity of the Local Plan with the Structure Plan.) The site has archaeological implications. (A late representation indicated that extra educational facilities, including a new primary school, would be needed partly to service this site.)

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001158	201957	Nottinghamshire County Council (Strategic Property)

Summary of Objection

Objection because of flood risk, proximity of site to the sewage works, the over concentration of development and the loss of open land. Too little housing to constitute mixed development. Replace by Top Wighay Farm.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001330	201808	Council for the Protection of Rural England

Summary of Objection

Increase the density at this site because of the proximity of Victoria Retail Park.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001339	201924	Environment Agency

Summary of Objection

Part of the site is in the indicative floodplain. If the adjacent employment allocation is not developed, flood compensation works will still be needed. A flood risk assessment will be needed.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001345	201509	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust

Summary of Objection

Objection to the loss of open land. There is particular concern at the proximity of the Netherfield lagoons and Home Pierpoint, which are important for wintering and breeding birds.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
003990	200011	Netherfield Forum

Summary of Objection

Development would divide the community. The land is contaminated and in the floodplain. Development would cause traffic congestion, noise and pollution. Move the proposed housing to Great Northern Way and use this land for industry.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
005016	201930	Cornwater Landowners
000888	2000462	Mr W H Moore
000313	201889	Mr R Self
000489	201847	Mrs G Storey
000610	201878	Mrs R Whitehead

Summary of Objection

Reasons for objection include: flood risk, loss of Green Belt and open land, impact on wildlife, the recreational value of the land, proximity to sewage works and business uses. There is also concern about the generation of traffic and its impact on Stoke and elsewhere. Some objectors suggest other sites (eg Top Wighay Farm and Ravenshead).

AND ABOUT 130 OTHER INDIVIDUAL OBJECTIONS

ALSO DEALT WITH HERE IS AN OBJECTION TO POLICY H6 (RESIDENTIAL DENSITY) AND THIS SITE

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001330	201811	CPRE

Summary of Objection

The density proposed for this site should be higher.

ALSO CONSIDERED HERE ARE OBJECTIONS TO THE DESIGNATION OF THIS AREA AS WHITE LAND UNDER POLICY H4 IN THE FIRST DEPOSIT.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001158	002445	Nottinghamshire County Council (Strategic Property)
001324	002771	Langridge Homes Ltd

Summary of Objection

The policy is supported in principle but specific sites are disputed, including land at Teal Close.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000134	000170	Gedling Wildlife Group
000180	000262	RSPB
000609	002046	Ashley Travis Garage
000888	002103	Mr W Moore
001331	003008	Netherfield Wildlife Group
001331	003009	Netherfield Wildlife Group
001331	003010	Netherfield Wildlife Group
001331	003011	Netherfield Wildlife Group
001932	004512	Nottinghamshire Birdwatchers
003835	010553	R.A.G.E.

AND OVER 300 INDIVIDUAL OBJECTIONS

Summary of Objection

The designation of land at Teal Close as White Land is opposed, mainly because of the adverse impact any development would have on wildlife (principally migrating birds) at and near the site. Other reasons given for opposing any development on this land include flood risk, poor access, traffic congestion, loss of open land, loss of Green Belt and contamination on the site.

A small proportion of the objectors supported the early development of the land in preference to allocations elsewhere.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

1. As recorded above Severn Trent Water objected to the First Deposit of the Local Plan because this land was not allocated for development. The Second Deposit included the land as a housing allocation. I therefore regard the objection as having been met. Accordingly I recommend no modification to the Local Plan in response to this objection. However, when I am dealing with the subsequent objections to the allocation, I shall treat this objection as support for the plan as it now stands and take it into account.

Introduction

2. This allocation adjoins the larger employment allocation at Teal Close but is separated from it by the line of the proposed road that is part of the A612 Major Integrated Transport Scheme.
3. The land is included in the Outline Planning Brief that the landowners (Severn Trent Water) have prepared. The Council submitted this as a Core Document (CD A24) in support of the allocation. This sets out a broad disposition of land uses within the site and includes an Ecological Enhancement Brief.

Flooding

4. This issue is dealt with more fully in the context of the Teal Close employment allocation, to which the reader is referred for a fuller account. Some members of the public approach this issue instinctively on the basis that development in the floodplain is unwise. In contrast objector 001158 presented a detailed, complex and highly technical case.
5. I do not want to get involved in the technical arguments more than is necessary. In my view the decisive issues are:
 - whether this site is within a floodplain;
 - what mitigation measures are proposed;
 - what does PPG25 say;
 - what is the best independent advice available;
 - what conclusions can be drawn.

Floodplain

6. Most of the site is within the indicative floodplain as it will be shown on the (revised) Proposals Map. Although the floodplain designation is indicative rather than definitive, I consider that the site should be regarded as being in an area with a high risk (above 1 in 100 years) of flooding. The Council describes the nature of the risk as arising only in rare circumstances but if these circumstances are likely to occur more often than every hundred years, then the risk of flooding has to be regarded as high. The Council also says that the severity of any flood is not likely to be great because any inundation is not likely to be very deep. But even a shallow flood may have dire consequences for people living in the area without causing loss of life.
7. I take the view that the floodplain location and the site's status as an area with a high risk of flooding cannot be set aside and should be the starting point in the assessment of the site and the issue of flooding.

Mitigation

8. In very general terms the landowners and the Council envisage large-scale earth moving to raise the level of the land upon which development would take place. This would be coupled with the creation of compensating lagoons so that the ability of the site to absorb floodwater would not be materially reduced. This has been worked up in some detail and has been the subject of detailed flood impact analysis undertaken on behalf of the landowner. It also forms the basis of the Outline Planning Brief.

PPG25

9. First, I consider it is useful to record the general tenor and approach of PPG25 as may be derived from the introductory preface. For example:
- the Environment Agency (EA) has the lead role in providing advice on flood issues, at a strategic level and in relation to planning applications;
 - policies in development plans should outline the consideration which will be given to flood issues, recognising the uncertainties that are inherent in the prediction of flooding and that flood risk is expected to increase as a result of climate change
 - (in) planning decisions authorities should apply the precautionary principle to the issue of flood risk, using a risk-based search sequence to avoid such risk where possible and managing it elsewhere;
 - (in) planning decisions authorities should recognise the importance of functional floodplains, where water flows or is held at times of flood, and avoid inappropriate development on undeveloped and undefended floodplains.
10. In greater detail later in the document (Table 1) high risk areas are deemed generally unsuitable for residential development unless a particular location is essential. All risks relate to the time at which a land allocation is made. (I take this to mean that future mitigation works are not to be accorded much weight.) Flood zones should be identified from EA flood data ignoring the presence of flood defences. (At the Inquiry the expert witnesses disputed the meaning of this part of the guidance.)
11. What is at issue is not only whether the land itself would be at risk but also whether its development would increase the risk of flooding elsewhere.
12. I find the import of the PPG25 guidance cautionary. The Council may be right that the guidance allows for exceptions and the issue of flooding has to be weighed in the balance with other considerations. However, I would want to be satisfied that I had very clear positive advice and guidance before committing this allocation.

Independent Advice

13. PPG25 indicates that the EA are the best source of advice. I invited them to attend the Inquiry both to help with technicalities (such as what “ignoring the presence of flood defences” means in practice) and more generally to advise on their view of this site. I would have found this particularly helpful as I understand they have been overseeing the modelling of flood risk being undertaken by the landowners on which the Council appears to have relied in reaching their decision to allocate the land. The EA could not attend the Inquiry but sent a letter dealing with some of the issues on which I was seeking guidance.

14. As far as the EA letter is concerned, I quote: “The EA has been in consultations with Severn Trent Water Ltd (the landowner) and their consultants for the above scheme for a number of years now, and it was understood by ourselves that an agreement in principle for the consolidation of the floodplain may well be workable. The work done by Mr Cooper and his colleagues is a significant change in what had been previously discussed, and for clarification, the report on his work was only submitted to EA in April 2003. The report is a major piece of work which requires very careful analysis of the methods and conclusions, and EA have therefore, passed the work to specialist consultants who are working on our behalf to carry out the Strategic Study of the fluvial River Trent, to carry out the necessary checks. Unfortunately, due to the very late submission of the document, in relation to the Local Plan Inquiry timings, we have not been able to complete this assessment to meet the Inquiry programme.”
15. I am bound to say that this falls a long way short of the very clear endorsement that I feel is needed from the EA before committing this allocation. It also makes me wary of drawing my own, non-expert, conclusions on the technical evidence that was presented to me at the Inquiry. Be that as it may, I am clear in my own mind that “an agreement in principle for the consolidation of the floodplain **may well be workable**” (my emphasis) is not a robust enough basis for concluding that this site satisfies the stringent requirements of PPG25.
16. After this letter the landowner's agent, via the Council, sent me a letter offering to clarify the EA position as it appears after the letter quoted above. They sought to demonstrate that there is agreement between themselves and the EA to an extent that would warrant supporting this allocation. The EA wrote again to disassociate itself from the letter from the landowner's agent in no uncertain terms.
17. In any event, according to the latest records I have been given, the EA has not withdrawn its objection to this particular allocation. A flood risk assessment has not been agreed as sought by the EA objection.

Conclusions on Flooding

18. I therefore conclude that this is a site where flooding is a real and acknowledged issue. PPG25 is clear in favouring a precautionary approach to the allocation of such sites for development and in considering them generally unsuitable for residential use. The EA is unable to give unequivocal support to the allocation. Having considered all the evidence on the matter before me I conclude that I am unable to treat this site as an exception to the general advice in PPG25. Accordingly I cannot recommend the allocation of this site for residential purposes because of unresolved flood risks.

Suitability of the Site

19. The allocation is very close to a major sewage works and near to a meat rendering plant, both of which have given rise to some complaints about odours over the years. Again I heard conflicting technical evidence on this matter. Again, whether a precautionary approach should be adopted was at issue. Also at issue was whether sewage works should, as a matter of policy, have a separating cordon around them to distance them from other uses for their mutual benefit. The Council also draws attention to the fact that some existing homes are as close to the sewage works as parts of this site are.

20. Relying on the record of the two potential sources of odour was contested, as were the future prospects for a trouble-free future. However, even if I accept that these existing facilities will be well managed and are not likely to create real problems very frequently, it is as much a matter of perception as the reality that may be decisive for many of the potential neighbours. With this in mind, I consider that, whatever view one takes on these matters, land close to a sewage works is not likely to prove the most attractive location for housing. If other sites are available, sites with disadvantages such as this should not be chosen.

21. I conclude that this consideration counts against the allocation of this land for housing.

Nature Conservation

22. There were many objections concerned about the impact of the proposed development on the wildlife, especially birds, in the valley. The nearby lagoons are important for wintering birds.

23. However, the Outline Planning Brief includes proposals for new lagoons and for the improved management of, and access to, the existing lagoons. On this basis some of the bodies representing ornithologists said they are now content with the proposals as a package. It was claimed that these interests now support the proposals. Other objectors have not expressed a view and their objections remain unresolved.

24. Be all this as it may, the housing allocation is some way from the most sensitive areas for wildlife conservation and the impact of the proposed intervening road also has to be taken into account. Accordingly I conclude that this, by itself, would not be a sufficient reason to delete the housing allocation from the Local Plan.

Alternative Sites

25. Although I accept that this site is an urban extension, is well related to the main urban area and is a sustainable location; I consider better sites (without the disadvantages identified above) can and should be found.

Access and Timing

26. The Highway Authority does not oppose this allocation in principle but would require a Transport Impact Assessment covering road access and public transport. In view of my recommendations on the principle of the development, I consider it is unnecessary to go onto this matter in detail.

Part Allocation

27. The issue of whether only part of the objection site could or should be allocated in this review of the Local Plan was not explored at the Inquiry beyond the suggestion that only part of the site was likely to be free of potential odour problems. However, what form a smaller allocation would take and whether it would be viable are unknown. The issue of flooding has not been explored for a smaller allocation developed independently of the larger land holding. The nature of the issues involved leads me to conclude that the site stands or falls as a whole and there is no scope, in practice, for allocating only part of the site in this review of the Local Plan.

Green Belt

28. Whether or not the site is to be allocated for housing, there are objections to the land being removed from the Green Belt. Indeed, the designation of White Land in this area in the First Deposit attracted more individual objections than the subsequent allocation of this site for development.
29. I discuss elsewhere the general principle of whether there should be designations of Safeguarded Land in the plan and have concluded that there should be. The decision on this land also needs to take account of the fact that I am recommending that the land to the east (the employment allocation) should be removed from the Green Belt. I note that the site was shown as “White Land” in the First Deposit, although this gave rise to a large number of objections. The land will also be on the “inside” of a substantial road when the A612 Major Integrated Transport Scheme is implemented. Taking all these considerations into account, this site accords well with the criteria I have identified in policy H4 for assessing the suitability of Safeguarded Land.
30. The Structure Plan Authority has concerns about the definition of a clear and defensible boundary for the Green Belt in this area and I consider it would be unsatisfactory to base this on a road line that has not, as yet, been fixed in detail.
31. For all these reasons I conclude that the site should be excluded from the Green Belt and designated as Safeguarded Land in the Local Plan.

Other Issues

32. The issues of the appropriate density of development and the need for a school site no longer arise. Neither do the archaeological implications of development.

Overall Conclusions

33. For all these reasons I conclude that the allocation of land at Teal Close for residential development should be deleted from this review of the Local Plan. The decisive consideration in reaching this conclusion is the unresolved issue of flood risk. However, this conclusion is supported by my concern about the suitability of this location for the purpose because it is so near the sewage works.
34. I also conclude that the land should be excluded from the Green Belt and designated as Safeguarded Land in the Local Plan.

RECOMMENDATIONS

35. I recommend that the housing allocation at Teal Close is deleted from the Local Plan.
36. I recommend that the land should be excluded from the Green Belt and designated as Safeguarded Land.
-

2.25 H2 DISTRIBUTION OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT OBJECTION SITE: FLATTS LANE, CALVERTON

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000033	000045	Miss K Briggs

Summary of Objection

The mixed use development at Flatts Lane would increase traffic on unsuitable roads. Local facilities cannot cope with more development. Open land would be lost. There should be no more development in Calverton.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

1. This objection was wrongly grouped with those seeking more housing at Flatts Lane. Whilst it is clearly an objection to any development anywhere in Calverton, I also see it as an objection to the proposed housing at Flatts Lane and will consider it as such.
2. In addition several other objectors (who are seeking the allocation of other sites for housing in Calverton) also refer in their representations to the alleged unsuitability of Flatts Lane for housing.
3. The Local Plan contains a proposal (as part of policy H2) for a mixed use development at Flatts Lane with a residential capacity (in the Second Deposit) of 90 dwellings. This has attracted objections from both directions, namely that there should be no housing at all in this location or conversely that all the land should be used for housing. I am here dealing with the objections that seek the deletion of the housing element of the mixed use scheme.
4. My understanding of the Council’s position is that there has been an allocation of land for employment purposes at Flatts Lane for many years. However, this has proved difficult to implement as much because of a failure by the landowners to co-operate as because of a basic lack of demand. The Council is hopeful that by introducing an element of housing to the site enough resources and momentum will be generated to secure the comprehensive development of the whole area. I note that with a dwelling capacity of 90 dwellings this is a site where a Development Brief should be prepared and this might aid the development process.
5. Be that as it may, those opposing a residential component in the development say the site is unsuitable (environmentally) for housing, that the site should be retained for employment or that there should be no more development of any sort in Calverton.
6. As far as the suggestion that the site is environmentally unsuitable for housing is concerned, in my view there is enough land remaining to be developed to make some separation of the different uses possible. With some separation, careful design and adequate screening I see no reason why housing here could not be provided with an acceptable level of amenity. Mixed-use development is strongly recommended in government guidance and I can see no reason why such an approach would be inappropriate or unachievable in Calverton. I consider that for me to go into greater detail on this matter would take me beyond my Local Plan remit.
7. As to the need to retain the land for employment development, I have no clear evidence one way or the other as to whether there is a demand for this in Calverton. The landowners say that there is not but I have not seen any evidence that the site has

been marketed, or even offered, as an employment location. Be that as it may, the drift of recent government guidance (for example PPG3) is that little purpose is served by keeping land vacant over many years in the hope of attracting employment. In all the circumstances the Council’s view of the matter (as outlined above) seems a reasonable and hopeful compromise in the cause of achieving some movement.

8. As to the view that there should be no development at all either here or in Calverton as a whole, this is a large village in the Green Belt where the Structure Plan says that limited development is appropriate. Although some of this land may still be greenfield, it is not in the Green Belt, it is partially developed and it is committed for some form of development in any event. I can see no planning purpose being served by attempting to halt all development here. I have no evidence that the services and facilities in Calverton are inadequate but if they were unable to cope with the proposed development, the developer would be expected to contribute to their enhancement.
9. For all these reasons I conclude that the mixed use development allocation at Flatts Lane Calverton should be retained in the Local Plan with a residential capacity of 90 dwellings.

RECOMMENDATION

- 10. I recommend no modification to the Local Plan in response to this objection.**
-

2.26 H2 DISTRIBUTION OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT ADDITIONAL SITE: ADJACENT TO WEST CROFT, CALVERTON

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001012	002178	Burton Buckley Ltd (Mrs C P Worrall)
001931	004511	Mr D N Lees

Summary of Objection

Land adjacent to Long West Croft, Calverton should be allocated for housing. There is not a wide enough choice of sites, especially for small builders, in Calverton. Flatts Lane is unsuitable for mixed uses.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

1. The objection site is in the Green Belt. Although the objections relate to the allocation of the land for housing, this would also require a change to the Green Belt boundary.

Villages in the Green Belt

2. The Local Plan treats the villages in the Green Belt in one of three ways:
 - it excludes (or “insets”) the built up area of the village from the Green Belt notation so that limited development may take place within the village;
 - it includes (“washes over”) the village in the Green Belt but defines an “infill boundary” within which infilling will be allowed (see policy ENV30);
 - it includes (“washes over”) the village within the Green Belt without any “infill boundary “ so that Green Belt policies apply throughout the village.
3. This approach is in accordance with the guidance from government in the current PPG2 (paragraph 2.11). I therefore consider that the approach is acceptable.
4. Having collected data on the services available in each village and its character GBC has categorised the villages as follows:
 - ***Inset Villages:*** Bestwood, Burton Joyce, Calverton, Newstead and Ravenshead;
 - ***Washed over Villages with Infill Boundaries:*** Lambley, Linby, Papplewick and Woodborough;
 - ***Washed Over Villages Without Infill Boundaries:*** all the smaller settlements, including Stoke Bardolph.

Calverton

5. Having studied the Council’s data and considered objections on the matter, my view is that this categorisation is reasonable and justified. Thus I accept that Calverton is a suitable village, in principle, for a limited amount of development. Indeed, elsewhere in this report I recommend that an additional site is allocated for housing in the village.
6. However, this is not to accept that the village should be expanded to any great extent or that every site put forward for development is suitable. Indeed both the Structure Plan and PPG3 indicate that, even in large villages, development should be limited in scale so that most new housing is located in and adjacent to urban areas. Certainly there is nothing in these documents to suggest that all the demand for development in large villages (whether expressed as people being willing to buy houses or builders wanting to build them) can or should be met. Overall I consider that enough land for new housing can be provided in Calverton without this objection site.

The Objection Site

7. This site is on the edge of the village and its development would amount to an extension of the settlement into the open countryside. Although the objectors suggest measures and open uses next to their proposed development, the form of the village would nevertheless be extended. From the footpath along Hollinwood Lane and up onto the ridge to the south, this site is visible and development would be an obtrusive incursion into the countryside.
8. It may well be that the land, between the village and the golf course, is now divorced from other farmland and is difficult to manage. But such situations arise far too often for this to be a decisive consideration when determining which land should be developed. .
9. As the local name (West End) suggests, the site is not centrally placed and is not particularly well related to services in the village. I consider that there are no reasons for regarding this land as especially suitable for an extension to the village.

Other Matters Raised at the Inquiry

10. I note the Council restricted the amount of land allocated in Calverton because there were several partly completed planning permissions in the village. It is not clear to me that this approach would necessarily have the desired result of stimulating the take-up of outstanding commitments. Be that as it may, at the time of the Local Plan Inquiry some development was taking place and I attach little weight to this consideration in relation to these objections.
11. Conversely, the objectors complain that too much developable land and options to buy are in the hands of one builder. However, it does not seem to me that such matters can or should determine the pattern of building land or land release would have to continue until every local builder indicated that they were satisfied with the outcome.
12. I note that the objectors consider the land at Flatts Lane is unsuitable for mixed development and should be kept entirely for employment. I consider such objections separately elsewhere in this report. Suffice it to say here that mixed development is strongly recommended in government guidance and I can see no reason why such development would be inappropriate in Calverton.
13. I note the Council's officers suggested that the objection site should be explored for its development potential at an early stage in the preparation of the Local Plan. I also note that the site has a long planning history and that it was considered as a potential development site in the past. However, I have re-appraised the site's suitability in the context of current policies and guidance and the current need for housing land.

Conclusion

14. In view of all the above I conclude that there is no need to allocate the objection site for housing and that it is less suitable than other land closer to the centre of the village. I also have no reason to recommend removing the land from the Green Belt.

RECOMMENDATION

15. I recommend no modification to the Local Plan in response to these objections.

2.27 H2 DISTRIBUTION OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT ADDITIONAL SITE: EAST OF NEWSTEAD

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001933	004514	Midlands Mining Ltd

Summary of Objection

90 ha of former colliery land east of Newstead should be allocated for residential development, associated community uses and open space. This would use and restore despoiled land tipped with colliery spoil. The development would be sited adjacent to the village and would act as a catalyst for regeneration.

ALSO DEALT WITH HERE IS AN OBJECTION TO POLICY E1 (ALLOCATION OF EMPLOYMENT LAND)

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001933	004515	Midlands Mining Ltd

Summary of Objection

Land at Annesley colliery should be allocated for employment. The site is split between two districts and part of it is allocated in the Ashfield Plan. This will allow overall reclamation of the Colliery site.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

1. This could amount to a very large proposal and yet I have very little information or detail. Because the land has been tipped in the past it would be necessary to establish whether and how it could be reclaimed before the principle of development could be accepted. However, I consider that there are also fundamental planning objections to the proposed development.
2. The land is in the Green Belt and was not identified by the Council's sieve map analysis as having development potential. This area is in the countryside and remote from any towns. It is close to the village of Newstead, which is a village inset in the Green Belt because it is suitable for limited development. But what is proposed here would be larger than the existing settlement and in my view would exceed "limited development" by a wide margin. Thus proximity to a relatively small village cannot be seen as a justification for such a large development in the countryside.
3. The land is close to the rail link to Nottingham but Newstead is beyond the Nottingham / Hucknall public transport corridor that the Structure Plan indicates as a location for development. All in all this is not a suitable or favoured a location for residential or employment development on any scale, let alone the large area involved here. Whilst there would be advantages in securing the restoration of despoiled land, in this rural location these do not outweigh this site's unsuitable location. I also note that the site is close to the borough boundary but do not consider that development proposals in the neighbouring district provide a justification for this proposal.
4. I have considered whether the site should be removed from the Green Belt and designated as Safeguarded Land. However, it does not perform well in relation to most of the criteria I have identified in considering policy H4 and I consider that this land should remain in the Green Belt.
5. I conclude that the objection site should not be allocated for residential, employment or mixed development and that the Local Plan should not be modified.

RECOMMENDATION

6. I recommend no modification to the Local Plan in response to this objection.

2.28 H2 DISTRIBUTION OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT ADDITIONAL SITE: SOUTH OF NEWSTEAD

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001021	002199	Hallam Land Management Ltd

Summary of Objection

Land south of Newstead should be allocated for a mixed-use scheme including housing. This accords with the Structure Plan because the site is in the Nottingham/Hucknall public transport corridor. It would assist in regenerating the area following the demise of the coal industry. It is close to Newstead station.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001949	004600	The Marshal Family c/o J H Walter Rural Consultants

Summary of Objection

Land south of Newstead should be allocated for housing as part of a comprehensively planned development. The site is well suited to comprehensive development for a range of uses, guided by a masterplan approach. It is well located to the existing settlement of Newstead and to existing transport nodes. The Local Plan fails to make a proper selection of residential sites based on sustainable principles.

ALSO DEALT WITH HERE IS AN OBJECTION TO POLICY ENV26 (GREEN BELT)

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001021	002195	Hallam Land Management Ltd

Summary of Objection

An area south of Newstead should be removed from the Green Belt instead of the area north of Hucknall. It would be better to extend Newstead southwards than to extend Hucknall northwards.

ALSO DEALT WITH HERE ARE OBJECTIONS TO POLICY E1 (ALLOCATION OF EMPLOYMENT LAND)

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001021	002202	Hallam Land Management Ltd
001949	004603	c/o J H Walter Rural Consultants
001949	004609	c/o J H Walter Rural Consultants

Summary of Objection

Land South of Newstead should be allocated for a mix of uses, including employment. It is a sustainable location in the Hucknall Transport Corridor.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

1. From their site descriptions both these objectors appear to be referring to the same area – the tract of land between Newstead and the Top Wighay Farm objection site.
2. The area is currently in the Green Belt. Although land at Top Wighay Farm was identified in the Council's sieve analysis as being relatively free from constraints on development, this land was not. In terms of the impact on the Green Belt, it is important that an effective open gap is retained between Hucknall and Newstead. This means, in effect, that if Top Wighay Farm is removed from the Green Belt and/or developed, then this land should not be (and vice versa). In my view (as I will explain below) Top Wighay Farm is a better location for development than the land south of Newstead, which means that the latter should remain in the Green Belt in order to ensure the continued existence of the open gap between Hucknall and Newstead.
3. Comparing this land with Top Wighay Farm, the land to the south is an urban extension whereas this objection site is separated from Hucknall and relates more to the village of Newstead than to the urban area. Newstead is a village inset in the Green Belt, which means that it is suitable for limited development. But what is proposed here would be larger than the existing village and would far exceed what can reasonably be described

as “limited development”. Accordingly, in my view, proximity to Newstead cannot be seen as a justification for such a large development in the countryside.

4. Both objection sites are in the same broad landscape tract and their development would have a similar impact on the landscape. In my view there is little to choose between this land and Top Wighay Farm in purely visual terms.
5. The objectors regard this objection site as being in the Nottingham / Hucknall public transport corridor because it is close to Newstead station. However, all the evidence I have points to Newstead being beyond the main corridor. This means that the area is too remote for the Structure Plan to regard this as a suitable location for development. (In contrast Top Wighay Farm is regarded as being close enough to Hucknall to be in the corridor.) I therefore regard the objection site as being a relatively unsustainable location.
6. Thus, for two important reasons I have come to the view that this land should not be allocated for housing or employment or the mixed-use development proposed by the objectors. To allow large-scale development here would harm the Green Belt by eroding the gap between Hucknall and Newstead. The site is in a relatively remote location outside a public transport corridor and is therefore not sustainable.
7. As to the Green Belt, the above considerations also relate to the criteria I have identified in relation to policy H4. Thus, for the same reasons I consider that the land is unsuitable for designation as Safeguarded Land.
8. For the above reasons, I conclude that no modifications to the Local Plan are justified.

RECOMMENDATION

9. **I recommend no modification to the Local Plan in response to these objections.**
-

2.29 H2 DISTRIBUTION OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT ADDITIONAL SITE: BONNER LANE, CALVERTON

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001344	003125	Slack; Kirkham; Goldby and Grocock (Joint)
001344	201541	Slack; Kirkham; Goldby and Grocock (Joint)

Summary of Objection

Land east of Calverton and north of Bonner Lane should be allocated for housing development. It is more suitable for development than many sites included in the First Deposit and Second Deposit.

ALSO DEALT WITH HERE IS AN OBJECTION TO POLICY ENV26 (GREEN BELT)

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001344	003122	Slack; Kirkham; Goldby; Grocock (Joint)

Summary of Objection

Land east of Calverton between Bonner Lane and Crookdole Lane should be removed from the Green Belt and allocated for housing.

ALSO DEALT WITH HERE IS AN OBJECTION TO POLICY ENV33 (MATURE LANDSCAPE AREAS)

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001344	003123	Slack; Kirkham; Goldby; Grocock (Joint)

Summary of Objection

The Mature landscape policy should be deleted. Failing that, land east of Calverton between Bonner Lane and Crookdole Lane should be removed from the Mature Landscape Area and allocated housing.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

1. The objection site is a large area of land; over 11 ha with an estimated capacity of more than 500 dwellings.

Villages in the Green Belt

2. The Local Plan treats the villages in the Green Belt in one of three ways:
 - it excludes (or "insets") the built up area of the village from the Green Belt notation so that limited development may take place within the village;
 - it includes ("washes over") the village in the Green Belt but defines an "infill boundary" within which infilling will be allowed (see policy ENV30);
 - it includes ("washes over") the village within the Green Belt without any "infill boundary" so that Green Belt policies apply throughout the village.
3. This approach is in accordance with the guidance from government in the current PPG2 (paragraph 2.11). I therefore consider that the approach is acceptable.
4. GBC collected data on the services and character of each rural settlement and has categorised the villages as follows:
 - ***Inset Villages:*** Bestwood, Burton Joyce, Calverton, Newstead and Ravenshead;
 - ***Washed over Villages with Infill Boundaries:*** Lambley, Linby, Papplewick and Woodborough;
 - ***Washed Over Villages Without Infill Boundaries:*** all the smaller settlements, including Stoke Bardolph.

5. Having studied the Council's data and considered objections on the matter, my own view is that this categorisation is reasonable and justified, certainly as far as Calverton is concerned. It is a large village with a wide range of services and facilities.
6. But it is still a village in the Green Belt. The Structure Plan (policy 1/3) says that villages are only suitable for limited provision (which is more than small scale but this has to be assessed cumulatively). PPG3 also says that only a limited amount of housing can be expected in expanded villages. Priority in allocating is to be given to urban sites, urban extensions and then to public transport nodes.
7. The objectors say that the priorities derived from the Structure Plan and PPG3 could lead to the indefinite expansion of the urban area. I do not accept this because of the importance given in the Structure Plan to not breaching the important ridgelines around suburban Nottingham. Be that as it may, it is clear that in advancing a case for large-scale development at Calverton, the objectors are pursuing a different strategic approach to that found in the Structure Plan. The objectors' strategy could fairly be described as "growth points in strategic villages" (some in Gedling borough and others in neighbouring authorities).
8. Whatever the merits of such a strategy, it is different from the one in the Local Plan derived from the Structure Plan and PPG3. The objectors acknowledge this. Although the objectors may regard the Local Plan as following the Structure Plan in a formulaic way, I consider that GBC has correctly interpreted the strategic context and guidance that the Local Plan should follow. Moreover, I consider that the Local Plan is not the right forum to reopen a debate on the general strategy for Greater Nottingham. The objectors may not like what the Structure Plan and PPG3 say about the broad pattern of development or about villages but these are important considerations that cannot be set aside.
9. In view of the above I consider that an allocation of the size that these objectors seek would not be acceptable even if no other housing land was being allocated in Calverton. The objectors devote some attention to comparing their site with urban extension sites that have been allocated in the Second Deposit. To my mind such comparisons miss the point that Calverton is an inappropriate location for large-scale development in any event (or at least until the Structure Plan is reviewed and the strategy is changed to incorporate growth points in strategic villages).

The Objection Site and Calverton

10. This is not to say, however, that development of part of the objection site could not be in accord with the current Structure Plan or that the entire objection site has to retain its Green Belt and MLA designations.
11. The objectors attach particular importance to the accessibility of Calverton in general and especially by public transport. I do not deny any of this and it is one reason why Calverton is appropriately categorised as an inset village. Nor do I envisage that there are any general or detailed transport difficulties inherent in developing all or part of the objection site, although I note that the Highway Authority has reserved its position on this because further work would be needed to be sure. Even so, I do not rule out the proposed allocation for highway reasons.

12. The objectors also say there is potential to link Calverton to Nottingham by rail and I accept that this is the case. However, it does not seem to me that this objection site is particularly well located within Calverton in relation to existing or potential public transport services. Nevertheless on the whole I accept that the objection site is (or could easily be) adequately served by public transport. However, I do not regard this as a distinctive or decisive consideration that points to this site being uniquely suitable for housing either in Calverton or in the borough as a whole.
13. Within Calverton, three comparisons are of particular significance: the sites at Flatts Lane, Dark Lane and Hollinwood Lane. The proposed housing at Flatts Lane would not involve taking land out of the Green Belt and arises from the slow take up of employment land. For these reasons that allocation is to be preferred to this objection site. The site at Dark Lane does involve Green Belt land but is close to the village centre and involves less of an intrusion into the open countryside. Again that site is preferable to this objection site. The site at Hollinwood Lane is broadly comparable to the objection site in terms of its locational advantages in my view.
14. Accordingly I consider there are no reasons to afford the objection site priority within Calverton. Because other sites that are more suitable for housing are available in the village (which taken together would more than account for the limited development that can take place in the village) I consider this land should not be allocated for residential development.

MLA Designation (Policy ENV35)

15. The MLA policy is derived from the Structure Plan (policy 3/3). Whilst I may share some of the methodological qualms of the objectors (for example a suspicion that claims of objectivity are rather bogus), it is not in doubt that the work has been undertaken on a consistent basis and comprehensively reviewed by an independent professional. This is a local landscape designation and the level of control in policy ENV35 (assessing “significant effect”) is appropriate to this level of designation. Although some features of the landscape could be protected by other policies, only this policy would provide a general framework for protecting and enhancing the historic character of the identified landscape tracts. For these reasons I consider that policy ENV35 is justified and should be retained in the Local Plan.
16. However, the Council has given me very little evidence or reasoning in support of retaining the MLA designation at the objection site. Having been to the site and having studied the survey data and maps supplied by the objectors, it seems to me that the MLA designation here turns on the continued presence of the historic field pattern. Moreover, the objection site is part of a much larger block of protected landscape extending to the north and south. On this basis I consider that the MLA designation here is warranted and should be retained.
17. However, although this assessment may bolster my recommendation not to allocate the land for housing, that recommendation stands on its own merits in my view.

Green Belt

18. As far as the Green Belt is concerned, there may be a need to identify a limited amount of Safeguarded Land (see discussion under policy H4 and my recommendation that there should be a new policy for Safeguarded Land) in Calverton. Although I

consider that development of this objection site would be no more harmful to the Green Belt than the area at Lampwood Close identified as White Land in the First Deposit, in my view this is not a strong recommendation. More tellingly, in my opinion, although this land and the land at Hollinwood Lane are broadly similar in their locational characteristics, the land to the west of the village would be less obtrusive and less harmful to the character and appearance of the wider countryside. Accordingly I would prefer to see that site removed from the Green Belt rather than this objection site.

19. For these reasons I consider that this objection site should remain in the Green Belt.

Conclusions

20. I conclude that this objection site would amount to a major housing site if it were allocated for development. Calverton is a suitable location for only limited development, which means that the allocation of this site is not appropriate. Furthermore, other more suitable sites are available that provide the village, in aggregate, with enough new housing to satisfy the requirement for limited development. I conclude that no part of the objection site should be allocated for residential development.

21. I also conclude that the Green Belt and Mature Landscape Area designations on this land should be retained.

RECOMMENDATION

22. I recommend no modification to the Local Plan in response to these objections.

2.30 H2 DISTRIBUTION OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT ADDITIONAL SITE: BROOKFIELD NURSERY, MAPPERLEY PLAINS

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001334	003028	Jaycee (Nottingham) Ltd.

Summary of Objection

The site of the Brookfield Nursery should be allocated for residential development.

ALSO DEALT WITH HERE IS AN OBJECTION TO POLICY ENV26 (CONTROL OVER DEVELOPMENT IN THE GREEN BELT) AND TWO OBJECTIONS TO POLICY ENV31 (PROTECTION OF THE RIDGELINES / URBAN FRINGE).

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001334	003029	Jaycee (Nottingham) Ltd.

Summary of Objection

Brookfield Nursery should be removed from the Green Belt. The Green Belt boundary should be amended to follow this site's southeastern and northeastern boundaries. The land should be allocated for residential development. The ridgeline is not material in considering the merits of the land as Green Belt. The existing garden centre is not an appropriate use in the Green Belt.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001334	003032	Jaycee (Nottingham) Ltd.

Summary of Objection

The ridgeline policy should not be seen as a blanket reason to refuse all development in elevated positions on the northeast edge of the district. Due consideration needs to be given to the character and quality of each part of each ridge. Only prominent development that would have a harmful visual impact should be of concern. Green Belt policy is separate and more stringent. The text in the plan should reflect this.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001334	201518	Jaycee (Nottingham) Ltd.

Summary of Objection

The ridgeline objection is reiterated.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

Introduction

1. It is convenient and efficient to deal with all the H2, ENV26 and ENV31 objections here.
2. This objector also has objections to policies H1 (two objections) and H6 (three objections). Because these other objections are not specifically and directly related to this site, I will deal with them in the relevant parts of my report. Suffice it to say here that I agree with the objector that, overall, more housing sites need to be found in this Local Plan review. However I am not accepting their case on residential densities, although this will have only an indirect impact on this site unless it is to be allocated.

Main Issues

3. There are three main issues to be resolved here:
 - whether the site is on a major ridgeline and whether (because of this or not) it should remain in the Green Belt;
 - whether the fact that some of the site has buildings and hard surfaces on it means that it should be regarded as previously developed land and therefore suitable for residential development;
 - whether the site is well enough served by public transport to be a sustainable location for development.
4. The TIA indicates that any highways and access issues can be resolved at the detailed design stage and are not, therefore, decisive in determining whether the site should be allocated for development. This is agreed by the Highway Authority.

Green Belt / Ridgeline

5. This site is unquestionably on a major ridgeline and the objectors accept this.
6. The objectors argue that its ridgeline location should not influence whether the land is kept in the Green Belt. In terms of the national guidance in PPG2 I understand their stance. PPG2 suggests that the definition and review of Green Belt boundaries should be based upon a consideration of the purposes of Green Belts as set out in the PPG. Nevertheless PPG2 (paragraph 2.7) does say that Green Belt boundaries should not be changed in Local Plans unless this is sanctioned in an approved Structure Plan (as is the case here). PPG2 (paragraph 2.3) also says that Structure Plans provide the strategic policy context for planning at local level. I therefore consider it very material that policy 1/5 of the Structure Plan says “The major ridgelines and hills around the Greater Nottingham urban area should remain in the Green Belt and should be identified in Local Plans.” In my view this is a clear indication at the strategic level that the ridgelines should be taken into account in the review of the Nottingham Green Belt.
7. The objectors also argue that policy ENV31 is too stringent because they feel that it will be applied to all sites on ridgelines irrespective of how much visual harm development would cause. However, the policy says that development will be assessed for the adverse effect it would have on the open character and visual quality of the primary and secondary ridges. It does not say that all development on the ridges will be refused. This is exactly the distinction the objectors are seeking to emphasise. Moreover, in the Second Deposit the wording of the policy has been changed to refer to “unacceptably adverse” rather than just “harm” as it did in the First Deposit. I am recommending that the word “unacceptably” is removed from the policy but see no need or reason to alter or qualify the policy or the text any further.
8. The objectors support their in principle argument on the relationship between ridgelines and Green Belt definition by claiming that this site is in fact (and in spite of its ridgeline location) not at all prominent. To an extent I accept this assessment because as one travels along Mapperley Plains one is on the same level as the objection site and most of it is shielded from view by the buildings on its frontage. Therefore from Mapperley Plains I accept that the site is not prominent and that its development would have only a small visual impact on the openness of the area. However, in longer distance views (for example from Spring Lane and from the northwest) the buildings that are on the site are visible. Residential development (at any density likely to be acceptable in the context of this Local Plan) would amount to a very considerable extension to and intensification of buildings on the site. I consider that this would have a noticeable visual impact and would harm the general perception of openness in the surrounding area. In my view, any further extension northwards of the urban area along this important ridge should be avoided.
9. I therefore conclude that the ridgeline location of this site is material to the review of the Green Belt boundary in this area and that, because of the site's visibility from long distances, it should not be taken out of the Green Belt.
10. For the same reasons I consider the site should not be identified as Safeguarded Land in the Local Plan.

Previously Developed Land

11. Whether parts of the site are previously developed land (in terms of PPG3) is difficult to determine, although I accept that it is definitely not an open field. On the other hand, even if all the outstanding planning permissions on the site were implemented, the whole site would not be affected. Although some of the structures on the site are relatively tall, residential development would amount to a marked intensification and urbanisation of the character of the site. Even though the existing use of the site may not be appropriate in the Green Belt, the use is not out of place in the urban fringe. There is also the possibility that a nursery displaced from this site would (seek to) relocate to another site, which in this area is also likely to be in the Green Belt.
12. In all the circumstances I conclude that these considerations are not sufficient to overcome or override the conclusions I have reached above.

Public Transport

13. As far as bus services to this area are concerned, there would be a walk from the site (rather longer than ideal) and the walk to the best service would involve a steep climb. But the situation is not significantly worse than at some allocated sites. For example I consider that the objectors' comparison to the Ashwater Drive allocation is well made. Accordingly, in my view this consideration does not point decisively to not allocating this site if it were suitable in other respects. But it is not.

Other Matters

14. I note that the site could be made available for early development.
15. Enough suitable land can be found elsewhere for residential development so that the allocation of this site is not necessary.

Overall Conclusions

16. Overall, therefore, I conclude that this site should remain in the Green Belt and should not be allocated for residential development.
17. I also conclude that policy ENV31 should not be modified in response to objections 003032 and 201518.

RECOMMENDATION

18. I recommend that the objection site at Brookfield Nursery should remain in the Green Belt and should not be allocated for residential development.
 19. I also recommend that policy ENV31 should not be modified in response to objections 003032 and 201518.
-

2.31 H2 DISTRIBUTION OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT ADDITIONAL SITE: CALVERTON COLLIERY

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
003835	010550	R.A.G.E.

Summary of Objection

We urge further investigation of the Calverton area, especially with regard to capacity at the colliery end of the village. And further investigation is required to ascertain the potential of the old colliery site for employment use (policy E8). This is brownfield land and should be brought into economic use even though it is in the Green Belt. Calverton Colliery provides the opportunity to regenerate effectively an old colliery site.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

1. I have given a rather full account of the objectors' representations above, partly to demonstrate how little I have to go on here. It is not even entirely clear to me that the primary concern here is housing. However, in the context of their wider objections, I consider that the objectors are suggesting that more housing land could be allocated to the west of Calverton.

Villages in the Green Belt

2. The Local Plan treats the villages in the Green Belt in one of three ways:
 - it excludes (or "insets") the built up area of the village from the Green Belt notation so that limited development may take place within the village;
 - it includes ("washes over") the village in the Green Belt but defines an "infill boundary" within which infilling will be allowed (see policy ENV30);
 - it includes ("washes over") the village within the Green Belt without any "infill boundary " so that Green Belt policies apply throughout the village.
3. This approach is in accordance with the guidance from government in the current PPG2 (paragraph 2.11). I therefore consider that the approach is acceptable.
4. GBC collected data on the services and character of each rural settlement and has categorised the villages as follows:
 - ***Inset Villages:*** Bestwood, Burton Joyce, Calverton, Newstead and Ravenshead;
 - ***Washed over Villages with Infill Boundaries:*** Lambley, Linby, Papplewick and Woodborough;
 - ***Washed Over Villages Without Infill Boundaries:*** all the smaller settlements, including Stoke Bardolph.
5. Having studied the Council's data and considered objections on the matter, my own view is that this categorisation is reasonable and justified, certainly as far as Calverton is concerned. It is a large village with a wide range of services and facilities.
6. But it is still a village in the Green Belt. The Structure Plan (policy 1/3) says that such villages are only suitable for limited provision (which is more than small scale but this has to be assessed cumulatively). PPG3 also says that only a limited amount of housing can be expected in expanded villages. Priority in allocating is to be given to urban sites, urban extensions and then to public transport nodes.

7. It is also noteworthy that, quite apart from this objection, I will be recommending enough residential sites in Calverton to fulfil any requirement or allowance for limited development in the village.
8. It may be that this group objector does not accept the strategic framework set by the Structure Plan and PPG3. However, I consider GBC has correctly interpreted the strategic context and guidance that the Local Plan should follow. Even if the objectors do not like what the Structure Plan and PPG3 say about the broad pattern of development or about villages, these are still important considerations that cannot easily be set aside.
9. In view of all of the above I conclude that a further substantial residential allocation would not be acceptable in Calverton.

RECOMMENDATION

10. I recommend no modification to the Local Plan in response to this objection.

2.32 H2 DISTRIBUTION OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT ADDITIONAL SITE: DARK LANE, CALVERTON

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001324	002784	Langridge Homes Ltd

Summary of Objection

Land at Dark Lane, Calverton should be allocated for residential development.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

1. I take into account representations in support of this land remaining in the Green Belt.
2. At the Public Inquiry GBC explained how this site had been recommended for inclusion as a housing site but had been rejected by Councillors. The Council then offered no evidence or reasons why the site should not be allocated for residential development.

Villages in the Green Belt

3. The Local Plan treats the villages in the Green Belt in one of three ways:
 - it excludes (or “insets”) the built up area of the village from the Green Belt notation so that limited development may take place within the village;
 - it includes (“washes over”) the village in the Green Belt but defines an “infill boundary” within which infilling will be allowed (see policy ENV30);
 - it includes (“washes over”) the village within the Green Belt without any “infill boundary “ so that Green Belt policies apply throughout the village.
4. This approach is in accordance with the guidance from government in the current PPG2 (paragraph 2.11). I therefore consider that the approach is acceptable.

5. GBC collected data on the services and character of each rural settlement and has categorised the villages as follows:
- ***Inset Villages:*** Bestwood, Burton Joyce, Calverton, Newstead and Ravenshead;
 - ***Washed over Villages with Infill Boundaries:*** Lambley, Linby, Papplewick and Woodborough;
 - ***Washed Over Villages Without Infill Boundaries:*** all the smaller settlements, including Stoke Bardolph.
6. Having studied the Council's data and considered objections on the matter, my own view is that this categorisation is reasonable and justified. Certainly as far as Calverton is concerned, it is a large settlement with a full range of services. There is no reason not to accept limited development at Calverton.

The Objection Site

7. In my view the impact of development on this site on the Green Belt, the landscape, the immediate surroundings and the village as a whole are all acceptable. No reasons have been advanced why the site should not be developed. Furthermore, the site is close to the centre of the settlement, the majority of services and bus stops on the frequent service into Nottingham. I therefore regard this as a sustainable location.
8. According to evidence presented at the Inquiry, satisfactory accesses onto Main Street and Renals Way can be provided. The Highway Authority has not objected to this allocation. In as far as third party land is needed, I am assured that agreement with the landowners has been secured.
9. I therefore consider this objection site should be allocated for residential development.

Density

10. The objector envisages 30 dph and a site capacity of about 78 dwellings, including some specifically for old people. GBC seeks 50 dph and a capacity of 112 dwellings. The site is convenient for a range of services and facilities and there is no reason why the higher density in policy H6 should not apply to this site. Neither have I seen any evidence to indicate that this site or Calverton in general are unsuitable locations for higher density development. Therefore, although I do not entirely follow the Council's mathematics in this instance, I am prepared to recommend the outcome they seek, namely a site capacity of about 110 dwellings (rounding their 112 to the nearest 10).

Conclusion

11. I conclude that this objection site should be allocated for residential development with a capacity of about 110 dwellings. A paragraph should be added to the text accompanying policy H2 in the Local Plan setting out the requirements for the development of this site.

RECOMMENDATION

12. **I recommend that the objection site at Dark Lane, Calverton is allocated for residential development with a capacity of about 110 dwellings. A paragraph should be added to the text accompanying policy H2 in the Local Plan setting out the requirements for the development of this site.**

2.33 H2 DISTRIBUTION OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT ADDITIONAL SITE: FLATTS LANE, CALVERTON (EXTENDED)

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000998	002150	Mr G Withers
003886	010638	Mrs J P Seaton / J Taylor

Summary of Objection

There is a surplus of industrial land in this location, which has been for sale for long periods of time. In view of this, all the vacant ;and should be allocated for housing.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

1. The Local Plan contains a proposal (as part of policy H2) for a mixed use development at Flatts Lane with a residential capacity (in the Second Deposit) of 90 dwellings. This has attracted objections from both directions, namely that there should be no housing in this location or conversely that all the land should be used for housing. I am here dealing with the objections that seek the allocation of all the remaining land for housing.
2. My understanding of GBC's position is that land has been allocated for employment at Flatts Lane for many years. However, this has not been implemented, as much through a failure by the landowners to co-operate as because of a basic lack of demand. The Council hopes that by introducing an element of housing, enough resources and momentum will be generated to secure the comprehensive development of the whole site. With a dwelling capacity of 90 dwellings this is a site where a Development Brief would be prepared and this might also aid the development process.
3. Because some employment development has already taken place, it will not be entirely straightforward to achieve a satisfactory environment for housing. But there is enough vacant land remaining to make some separation of the different uses possible. With some separation, careful design and adequate screening I see no reason why housing cannot be provided with an acceptable level of amenity. However, if all the remaining land were to be allocated for housing no such separation would be possible.
4. Mixed development is strongly recommended in government guidance and I can see no reason why such an approach would be inappropriate or unachievable in Calverton. I consider that for me to go into greater detail would go beyond my Local Plan remit.
5. There may also be a need to retain some land for employment uses, I have no clear evidence as to whether there is a demand for this in Calverton. The landowners say that there is not but I have no evidence the site has been marketed, or even offered, as an employment location. The drift of recent government guidance (for example PPG3) is that little purpose is served by keeping land vacant over many years in the hope of attracting employment. But in the circumstances here GBC's view of the matter (see above) seems a reasonable compromise in the cause of achieving some movement.
6. For all these reasons I conclude the mixed use development allocation at Flatts Lane should be retained in the Local Plan with a residential capacity of 90 dwellings.

RECOMMENDATION

7. I recommend no modification to the Local Plan in response to these objections.

2.34 H2 DISTRIBUTION OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT ADDITIONAL SITE: NEW FARM REDHILL

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001348	010874	Mr P Anderson-Price

Summary of Objection

New Farm is on the edge of the urban area and adjacent to a public transport corridor. It should be allocated for residential development

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001940	004543	Nottingham High School for Girls

Summary of Objection

The land was identified as suitable for housing in the Consultative Draft Local Plan and the officers recommended its allocation. More land is needed for development. The site is in a sustainable location and it is an urban extension so its allocation would comply with PPG3. Development could be assimilated into the urban area and the surrounding landscape.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001324	002785	Langridge Homes Ltd

Summary of Objection

Land should be allocated for residential development at New Farm. The land was identified as suitable for housing in the Consultative Draft Local Plan and the Council's officers recommended its allocation. More land is needed for development. The site is in a sustainable location and it is an urban extension so its allocation would comply with PPG3. An Illustrative Master Plan has been prepared for the whole area.

ALSO DEALT WITH HERE ARE OBJECTIONS TO POLICY ENV26 (GREEN BELT)

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001348	003324	Mr P Anderson-Price

Summary of Objection

New Farm is on the edge of the urban area and adjacent to a public transport corridor. It should be allocated for residential development

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
003827	010496	Nottingham City Council

Summary of Objection

The Council's officers recommended an allocation of 200 dwellings on the southern part of New Farm. This should be reconsidered as it would help reduce the under-provision of dwellings. The site adjoins the urban area and accords with policy 2/1 of Structure Plan. If it is not allocated, it should be White Land.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
003835	010533	R.A.G.E.

Summary of Objection

New Farm should remain in Green Belt. The attractive landscape would be destroyed and lost forever.

ALSO DEALT WITH HERE IS AN OBJECTION TO POLICY R1 (PROTECTION OF OPEN SPACE)

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001940	004541	Nottingham High School for Girls

Summary of Objection

Private open space cannot have the same value as public open space. Two sites at Redhill should be allocated for residential development.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

Introduction

1. I have gathered together here objections to policies ENV26 and R1 that relate to the same site (or parts of it) and deal with them all here.
2. It seems to me that the objection from RAGE (003835 / 010533) is in support of the Local Plan as it now stands. I consider it here together with many other similar representations in support of the plan.

The Site, Background and Objections

3. The area covered by these objections is large and not all of the objections relate to the whole site. Objector 001324 (Langridge Homes) puts the capacity of the total area at between 850 and 1000 dwellings. Some of the objectors place particular emphasis on the southern part of the area, which officers of the Council recommended should be allocated for residential development with a capacity of about 200 dwellings. I consider it is necessary to assess the proposed development in the first instance looking at the whole area and then, in the light of that, part(s) of the site can be examined.
4. The site extends from Bestwood Lodge Drive in the south towards the main east-west ridgeline in the north. It is agreed that any built development should be restricted to heights that would not breach the major ridge physically or visually. However, the Illustrative Master Plan for the whole area submitted by Langridge Homes (and also referred to by objector 001940 – Nottingham High School for Girls, NHSG) relies on an access to the Leapool roundabout to the north beyond the ridge.
5. The (whole) area (below the ridge) was identified in the Council's Green Belt review sieve map as being relatively free from constraints. At the Consultative Draft stage (before the First Deposit) the area was considered suitable for removal from the Green Belt and development was proposed. At the First Deposit the Council's officers recommended an allocation of 200 houses on the southern part of the site but this was not accepted by the members of the Council and all of the land was retained in the Green Belt. This situation remained unchanged in the Second Deposit.
6. Notwithstanding this rather chequered history, my task is to assess afresh the planning merits of proposed development at this site. The objectors place some reliance on the officers having recommended development here but this, by itself, is not a conclusive consideration. I start from the position that this is greenfield land that should not be released for development unless there is an overriding need to do so in order to meet the Structure Plan's requirements for housing land
7. The land rises quite steeply from the south towards the ridge. The land is in the form of a broad and open bowl. Some of the southern part of the site is designated as a Mature Landscape Area that connects to the wider Bestwood Lodge parkland. I consider the whole area to be an attractive open landscape and it has very few buildings in it. From some view points development would be prominent. The site is a significant and attractive tract of open land that has a visual cohesion, such that if part of it were developed then the case for keeping the rest of it open would be materially weakened.
8. There is some dispute about the agricultural quality of the land. Unsurprisingly the Council assesses its quality as being higher than the objectors do. Be that as it may, GBC appears to accept that the land is not of such agricultural quality and importance as to preclude development if this is necessary. I agree with this view.

The Need for Development and Priorities

9. There is a need to find more land for development than the Second Deposit plan identifies. This is partly because I am recommending against some of the allocated sites and partly because I am not convinced that delivery of all the Gedling Colliery / Chase Farm (GCCF) housing can be relied upon within the plan period.

10. During the Local Plan Inquiry I asked Langridge Homes to rank their objection sites for me. They said, “We have deliberately excluded New Farm from our priority list. We consider that due to the size and capacity (1000 dwellings) of this site it is only likely to be recommended for allocation if it is concluded that land at GCCF and/or the Teal Close housing sites should be deleted from the Local Plan. In this case New Farm would provide the next best alternative location for major development as it is the only other large site identified by GBC through its sieve analysis that is located on the edge of the urban area and which can be delivered during the Local Plan period.”
11. I agree that this site is one of the few large sites under consideration. In my view it would be wrong to allocate all the Local Plan's housing development in large sites to the exclusion of smaller sites if early improvements in the availability and delivery of housing land are to be achieved. Of the larger sites, GCCF remains my most favoured site because it is the urban extension with least impact on the countryside and Green Belt and because some of the site is previously developed land. Teal Close (and nearby sites) are my least favoured major site because of the unresolved flooding problems there.
12. This leaves New Farm and Top Wighay Farm. Both are urban extensions and both are in quality public transport corridors. I recognise that the Council and others might give priority to New Farm because it is an extension to the **main** urban area. However, even if I accept that such a distinction is justified, my preference is still for Top Wighay Farm; mainly for two reasons. First, residential development at Top Wighay Farm will balance and complement the major employment allocation I am recommending there. Second, there is an unresolved transport/access problem at New Farm (see below) that leads me to the view that development here could not start as early as it could at Top Wighay Farm. What this Local Plan does not need is another large allocation where there is any doubt about the speed with which it can be delivered.

The Transport/Access Difficulty at New Farm

13. I referred above to a Transport/Access difficulty here. Langridge's Illustrative Master Plan for the area shows three new neighbourhoods totalling 850 to 1000 dwellings and a new suburban centre with shops and other facilities. These would be served by a spine road from the Leapool roundabout to Bestwood Lodge Drive, the middle section of which would not cater for general through traffic. This would achieve a bus priority route from Leapool to the south but other traffic generated in the northern part of the development would have travel north even if its ultimate destination was to the south. The objectors say this would encourage bus use, although the Highway Authority is concerned about abortive mileage.
14. Transport Assessment work was begun on this proposal but there were unresolved problems between the objectors and the Highway Authority. To the best of my knowledge these remained unresolved at the time of the Local Plan Inquiry. I consider that, as things stand, I do not have enough information to resolve the rights and wrongs of the matter. Be that as it may, it is clear that the main highway network in the area is congested and the achievement of bus priority in the area is also crucial. Without these matters being resolved not only must the principle of the development be in doubt but there is a potential for delay while an acceptable solution is found. I consider this potential delay is an important consideration.

Playing Fields

15. Some of the land was formerly used by NHSG as playing fields, although it is my understanding that this is no longer the case. There are two approximately triangular areas involved one of which is shown in the Illustrative Master Plan as open space whilst the other is shown as housing land.
16. Nevertheless both areas are protected by policy R1 in the Local Plan. I note that NHSG object to this and say that private playing fields are of less public worth than publicly available facilities, although they do not appear to dispute the principle that land previously used for such a purpose should be protected. I also note that the effect of policy R1 is to protect playing fields unless and until an adequate replacement is provided and that at the time of the Local Plan Inquiry no audit of such facilities had been conducted in the borough.
17. In all these circumstances it does not seem to me that this would prove an insuperable problem if development were agreed in principle, However, as things stand at the moment this is another unresolved matter that militates against allocating the land for development. However, it is another potential source of delay.

Other Difficulties?

18. The suggestion that this site might be allocated for development gave rise to considerable and organised (RAGE) public objection. Notwithstanding the various matters raised and comparisons with other possible allocation sites, I consider that I have dealt with all the matters that might preclude the development of this site. I can find no other decisive reason to reject the proposed allocation. However, in the absence of an overriding need to allocate more land, I consider that the site should not be allocated in this review of the Local Plan.

The Southern Part of the Site

19. For the most part so far I have considered the whole of this area as a unit. I consider this is justified because of the site's essential unity of character and landform. I now address the issue of whether, notwithstanding my view that the whole site should not be allocated, part of it should be. The obvious candidate is the south of the site, partly because this is where the site relates best to the existing urban area and partly because this is the lowest and least prominent land. It is also the area that the Council's officers recommended for allocation.
20. However, I take the view that part of the site should not be allocated in isolation from the rest. This is partly because it is my understanding of the Highway Authority's position that even this raises unresolved access issues. As with the whole site, these are important in themselves and they could lead to a delay in delivery. However, I am also concerned that allowing development of part of the site now could prejudice the position for the rest of the land in subsequent reviews of the plan. I return to my assessment that the area has an essential unity of character and landform. It is also an undeniably attractive area. If there were a compelling or overriding need to allocate the land for development things would be different but in the absence of such a need I consider that the case for releasing part of the site is actually weaker than the case for releasing it all.

Green Belt / Safeguarded Land

21. There remains the question of whether the site should be kept in the Green Belt. Bearing in mind my general conclusions on the need for Safeguarded Land (see policy H4) and the criteria I am using to select it, this area should clearly be removed from the Green Belt. It could form an urban extension, it is in a transport corridor, it was identified in the Council's sieve map and it would not breach the major ridgeline to the north of the site.
22. I am a little concerned as to whether a clear and defensible boundary between the Green Belt and Safeguarded Land can be identified here but the Council says that it can – using a combination of field boundaries and (occasionally) following the contour of the land.
23. On this basis I consider that the whole of the land should be taken out of the Green Belt and protected by the Safeguarded Land policy I am recommending.
24. I refer to the fact that in the case of the Safeguarded Land at Top Wighay Farm I have, in effect, identified it as "first reserve" for development in the event of Gedling Colliery / Chase Farm not progressing as quickly as anticipated. I have given careful thought to whether the Safeguarded Land at New Farm should be regarded in the same way but I have decided against it. This is largely because I am recommending an allocation at Top Wighay Farm in any event. It would, if the need arose, be relatively straightforward to extend that development. At New Farm I am not recommending an allocation and there are outstanding issues to be resolved before one could be made. In other words New Farm is not suitable for a quick response.

Overall Conclusions

25. I conclude therefore that none of this land should be allocated for development in this review of the Local Plan. However, for me this is less a matter of principle and more a matter of need and prematurity. By this I mean that at this time there is no need for this land to be developed and in any event there remain unresolved difficulties that preclude its allocation. Whether there will be a sufficient need to warrant the development of this greenfield land in the future and whether the outstanding difficulties can be resolved are matters for future reviews of the Local Plan. In the meantime I conclude that the site should be identified as Safeguarded Land in this review of the Local Plan.

RECOMMENDATIONS

26. I recommend that none of the land at New Farm Redhill should be allocated for residential development.
27. I also recommend that all the land at New Farm Redhill identified as relatively free from constraints in the Council's sieve map analysis of the Green Belt should be designated as Safeguarded Land and protected accordingly.

2.35 H2 DISTRIBUTION OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT ADDITIONAL SITE: HOWBECK ROAD

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001937	201287	Mr N Foster (c/o FDP Savills)
001937	0044531	Mr N Foster (c/o FDP Savills)

Summary of Objection

One of these objections seeks the restoration of the First Deposit housing allocation at Howbeck Road. This land was included in the First Deposit version of the plan but was deleted in the second deposit. The other objection seeks a larger allocation at the time of the first deposit and this objection has not been withdrawn.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

1. I am taking into account the objections to the First Deposit that relate to this site.
2. As far as the First Deposit allocation is concerned, the site is an urban extension that is close to good bus services. It is thus, in general terms, in a good location for housing development. The Council says the site should remain in the “search pool” for housing land, so would not appear to be against its development in principle, although it takes the view it is no longer needed to meet the Structure Plan housing requirement.
3. The Council’s main concerns in relation to the formerly allocated site are that its boundary would not follow any physical features that exist on the ground at the moment and that for this reason the Green Belt boundary that would be created would not be clear and defensible. The Council also has more detailed OS survey information than it had when the Local Plan was first drawn up and this suggests that the crest of the main ridgeline running along Mapperley Plains is further west than was originally thought.
4. As far as the defensibility of the Green Belt boundary is concerned, whilst I acknowledge that this is a consideration arising from PPG2, I am not convinced that it is decisive in this case. The boundary between the allocated land and the Green Belt would follow the 107 metre contour. Although this is not marked by any physical features on the ground now, it would become the edge of the urban area if the land were developed. Following a contour has been used successfully to create a very clear and defensible boundary to the recent housing development to the north of this site. It is also being used in this Local Plan review, for example at Stockings Farm. In any event the First Deposit site has short cul-de-sacs pointing into it from Howbeck Road at the moment. These look like they were intended to access the land at some time in the future and hardly give the boundary the appearance of permanence. To this extent, a “rounding off” development that created a new boundary without accesses pointing into the Green Belt would be more defensible than the present situation.
5. The same approach (using the 107-metre contour to define the edge of the development area) would also ensure that new housing would not be obtrusive in the landscape because it would be below the main ridge. This would remain true whether or not one relies on the most recent and detailed OS survey data.
6. Thus for all these reasons I consider that the Council has failed to substantiate its reasons for opposing the reinstatement of the Howbeck Road allocation.

7. As far as the views of local residents are concerned, many are opposed in principle to the release of (this) land from the Green Belt. However, I am sure that some Green Belt land has to be used for development if the Structure Plan housing requirement is to be met and this land is better placed than most. In particular it is an urban extension close to the main urban area and is well served by buses on Howbeck Road. There are also concerns expressed about the loss of wildlife on the site, although there is no suggestion that this land is particularly important in this respect.
8. There is also general concern about the increased traffic that would be generated by the proposed development. As I have already noted, the site has accesses in place at the moment. The scale of development proposed is relatively modest. There is no highway objection to the allocation from the Highway Authority or GBC.
9. Other local residents refer to a (supposed) adverse impact on property values and the views of the countryside from their homes but these are not matters that should determine the distribution of housing allocations.
10. For all these reasons I conclude that the allocation of housing land at Howbeck Road that was in the first deposit version of the Local Plan should be reinstated.
11. The site has a capacity for about 50 dwellings and is available for early development.
12. The larger objection site would take housing well above the 107 metre contour onto the main ridge running along Mapperley Plains. It would thus be in a very prominent position and obtrusive in the landscape especially from the northwest and southeast. For these reasons alone I consider that the land should not be developed. In addition I have no transport assessment for the larger site and it seems to me that much of it would not be conveniently served by public transport.
13. I conclude that the larger objection site should not be allocated for development and should remain in the Green Belt.

RECOMMENDATION

14. **I recommend that the Local Plan is modified to reinstate the Howbeck Road housing allocation with a capacity of about 50 dwellings.**
 15. **I recommend no modification to the Local Plan in respect of the larger objection site at Howbeck Road / Mapperley Plains.**
-

2.36 H2 DISTRIBUTION OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT ADDITIONAL SITE: KILLISICK LANE, ARNOLD

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001937	004530	Mr N Foster c/o FPD Savills

Summary of Objection

More housing land is needed and the edge of the urban area is acknowledged to be a suitable location. This site could be developed and with suitable landscaping would provide a transition between the urban area and the countryside as well as enhancing the ridgeline. Services are available and the site would provide flexibility and choice.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

1. This site is on the northern edge of the urban area on rising land on the side of a valley. The ridges on either side of the valley are identified on the Proposals Map as a major ridge (Mapperley Plains) and a lesser one (also running north/south). Development here, however well and extensively landscaped, would be a prominent intrusion into the countryside in contravention of one of the guiding principles in the Structure Plan. It would call into question the position of the northern boundary of the urban area in this vicinity. The site is also part of a Mature Landscape Area.
2. The Council also says that, despite its urban edge location, the site is not well served by public transport and I have no evidence to the contrary.
3. For all these reasons I conclude that the site should not be allocated for residential development.
4. For the same reasons I conclude that the site should remain in the Green Belt.

RECOMMENDATION

5. I recommend no modification to the Local Plan in response to this objection.
-

2.37 H2 DISTRIBUTION OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT ADDITIONAL SITE: LAMBLEY LANE

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001337	003070	Messrs J N C&T Cutts

Summary of Objection

This urban fringe site is suitable and available for development. It could be considered on own merits or in conjunction with Gedling Colliery site, ensuring a wider and more comprehensive approach to development and transportation proposals in area.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

1. This is the same area of land referred to in objection 001337 / 003073 which sought its inclusion in the Gedling Colliery / Chase Farm development area. In the Second Deposit the GCCF Access Road crosses the objection site.
2. However, whether considered on its own or in conjunction with the larger development nearby, the answer is the same. This is rising ground where development would be a prominent intrusion into the countryside. In my view Lambley Lane is the best and clearest boundary for the Green Belt in this vicinity and this objection site is on the wrong side of the road. I consider the land should remain in the Green Belt and should not be developed. Whatever the merits of urban fringe sites in general, this site should be protected against development.
3. I conclude that this site should remain in the Green Belt.

RECOMMENDATION

4. I recommend no modification to the Local Plan in response to this objection.
-

2.38 H2 DISTRIBUTION OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT ADDITIONAL SITE: LAMPWOOD CLOSE, CALVERTON

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000466	003027	William Jones
001947	004559	Mrs D & D Pickerill & Purvis
001737	004027	Mrs H Ainscough & Mrs P Thomason

Summary of Objection

More housing land is needed. Land at Lampwood Close was identified for housing in the Consultative Draft Plan and is more suitable than the alternatives in Calverton. Calverton is a suitable location for development and this site is close to services and facilities. The site is not prominent and its north facing aspect reduces its agricultural value. The site can be accessed and would be a sustainable location.

ALTHOUGH THE COUNCIL REGISTERED THE FOLLOWING AS AN OBJECTION TO POLICY H1 (DWELLING PROVISION) I NOTE THAT IT SPECIFICALLY REFERS TO THIS SITE.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001737	004026	Mrs H Ainscough & Mrs P Thomason

Summary of Objection

More housing land is needed and Lampwood Close would be suitable.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

Villages in the Green Belt

- The Local Plan treats the villages in the Green Belt in one of three ways:
 - it excludes (or “insets”) the built up area of the village from the Green Belt notation so that limited development may take place within the village;
 - it includes (“washes over”) the village in the Green Belt but defines an “infill boundary” within which infilling will be allowed (see policy ENV30);
 - it includes (“washes over”) the village within the Green Belt without any “infill boundary “ so that Green Belt policies apply throughout the village.
- This approach is in accordance with the guidance from government in the current PPG2 (paragraph 2.11). I therefore consider that the approach is acceptable.
- GBC collected data on the services and character of each rural settlement and has categorised the villages as follows:
 - Inset Villages:*** Bestwood, Burton Joyce, Calverton, Newstead and Ravenshead;
 - Washed over Villages with Infill Boundaries:*** Lambley, Linby, Papplewick and Woodborough;
 - Washed Over Villages Without Infill Boundaries:*** all the smaller settlements, including Stoke Bardolph.
- Having studied the Council’s data and considered objections on the matter, my own view is that this categorisation is reasonable and justified, certainly as far as Calverton is concerned. It is a large village with a wide range of services and facilities.
- But it is still a village in the Green Belt. The Structure Plan (policy 1/3) says that villages are only suitable for limited provision (which is more than small scale but this has to be assessed cumulatively). PPG3 also says that only a limited amount of housing can be expected in expanded villages. Priority in allocating is to be given to urban sites, urban extensions and then to public transport nodes.

The Objection Site and Calverton

6. Thus, whilst Calverton is a suitable location for a limited amount of development, the scale of all the development taken together has to be limited if the Structure Plan is to be complied with.
7. The objectors attach some importance to the accessibility of Calverton in general and of this site in particular. I do not deny any of this and it is one reason why Calverton is appropriately categorised as an inset village. Nor do I envisage that there are any general or detailed transport difficulties inherent in developing the objection site, and providing easy access to the village centre.
8. However, within Calverton three comparisons are of particular significance: the sites at Flatts Lane, Dark Lane and Hollinwood Lane. The proposed housing at Flatts Lane would not involve taking land out of the Green Belt and arises from the slow take up of employment land. For these reasons that allocation is to be preferred to this objection site. The site at Dark Lane does involve Green Belt land but is very close to the village centre and involves less of an intrusion into the open countryside. Again that site is preferable to this objection site. However, I accept that the site at Hollinwood Lane is a little less well related to the village centre than this site.
9. On this basis I have recommended that two other sites in Calverton should be allocated for residential development. These, taken together, provide for slightly more than the limited development envisaged in the Structure Plan. These other two sites are preferable to this objection site for the reason I have explained above.
10. Moreover, in my view further development in the Lampwood Close area would have untoward effects on the village form and the surrounding countryside. This site is close to a Conservation Area, which contains part of the historic centre of the village. A large-scale suburban development on the objection site would detract from the form of the village and its historic centre. It would also intrude into the countryside and although the objection site is not especially prominent, it is very attractive. For these reasons I consider that the site should not be developed if alternatives are available in the village.
11. I note that the Council included the site as a possible housing site in its Consultative Draft Plan but that is true of a large number sites that it decided not to pursue.
12. Accordingly I consider there are no reasons to afford the objection site priority within Calverton. Because other sites that are more suitable for housing are available in the village (which taken together would more than account for the limited development that can take place in the village) I consider that this land should not be allocated for residential development.

Green Belt

13. As far as the Green Belt is concerned, I note that there have not been any objections to the Second Deposit seeking the reinstatement of the White Land designation at this site.
14. However, there may be a need to identify a limited amount of Safeguarded Land (see discussion under policy H4 and my recommendation that there should be a new policy

for Safeguarded Land) in Calverton. If this is so, in my view the land at Hollinwood Lane would be less obtrusive and less harmful to the character and appearance of the village and the surrounding countryside. Accordingly I would prefer to see that site removed from the Green Belt before this objection site is.

15. For these reasons I consider that the objection site should remain in the Green Belt.

Conclusions

16. I conclude that Calverton is a suitable location for only limited development, which means that the allocation of this site is not necessary. Other more suitable sites are available that provide the village, in aggregate, with enough new housing to satisfy the requirement for limited development. I conclude that the objection site should not be allocated for residential development.

17. I also conclude that the Green Belt designation on this land should be retained.

RECOMMENDATION

18. I recommend no modification to the Local Plan in response to these objections.

2.39 H2 DISTRIBUTION OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT ADDITIONAL SITE: NORTH OF MAIN STREET, WOODBOROUGH

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
003851	010572	Barratt (East Midlands)
003853	010580	Mr & Mrs R W Burton

Summary of Objection

Insufficient land is allocated for residential development in the Local Plan. Land to the north of Main Street Woodborough should be allocated. Other allocated sites are inferior.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

1. These objectors have made a series of related objections. There are several objections that more land needs to be released for development. (The assumed densities in the plan are too high, the timing of the Gedling Colliery site is unrealistic and the plan under-provides in any event.) These general objections are dealt with in relation to policy H1. There are also objections concerning the wording of policy ENV32 (Agricultural Land) and these are dealt with in the context of that policy.
2. What remains to be dealt with here are objections that:
 - Woodborough is a suitable village for limited development;
 - as such it should be excluded from the Green Belt as an inset village;
 - land north of Main Street (the objection site) should be included within the inset and allocated for residential development;
 - if all of the objection site is not needed for development in this plan period, the rest of the objection site should be excluded from the Green Belt and treated as “white land”;

Villages in the Green Belt

3. The Local Plan treats the villages in the Green Belt in one of three ways:
 - it excludes (or “insets”) the built up area of the village from the Green Belt notation so that limited development may take place within the village;
 - it includes (“washes over”) the village in the Green Belt but defines an “infill boundary” within which infilling will be allowed (see policy ENV30);
 - it includes (“washes over”) the village within the Green Belt without any “infill boundary “ so that Green Belt policies apply throughout the village.
4. This approach is in accordance with the guidance from government in the current PPG2 (paragraph 2.11). I therefore consider that the approach is acceptable.
5. Having collected data on the services available in each village and its character GBC has categorised the villages as follows:
 - ***Inset Villages:*** Bestwood, Burton Joyce, Calverton, Newstead and Ravenshead;
 - ***Washed over Villages with Infill Boundaries:*** Lambley, Linby, Papplewick and Woodborough;
 - ***Washed Over Villages Without Infill Boundaries:*** all the smaller settlements, including Stoke Bardolph.

6. Having studied the Council's data and considered objections on the matter, my own view is that this categorisation is reasonable and justified. I reach this conclusion even though – in my view – Bestwood, Newstead and Woodborough are all middle order settlements with a rather limited range of facilities. This would suggest that they should all be treated as washed over villages with infill boundaries. However, I accept that the character and circumstances of Bestwood and Newstead are such that they would benefit from some limited development and diversification. In addition there are particular reasons why the housing allocations in Bestwood and Newstead have been included in the plan. For these reasons I consider that simply comparing the three villages does not indicate that the categorisation of Woodborough should be altered.
7. As far as Woodborough is concerned, this means that I consider it is properly classified in the Local Plan. Its services are limited in comparison to the larger villages of Burton Joyce, Calverton and Ravenshead. Woodborough is therefore less suitable even for limited development than any of those three villages. Whilst it compares more closely to Bestwood and Newstead – and the objectors emphasised this – as indicated above this does not mean it is large enough or has enough facilities to warrant more intensive development than infilling. In my view the other two villages are special cases. The discussion at the Inquiry concerning the limited range of shops in Woodborough and their viability only served to emphasise this.
8. I therefore regard Woodborough as properly categorised as a washed over village with a defined infill boundary, even though it was previously an inset village in the adopted Local Plan. The infill boundary now proposed is largely the same as the previous inset boundary. Be that as it may, it is correct – given the classification of the village – that the boundary should be tightly drawn around the existing built up area with no scope for more substantial development than limited infilling.
9. The fact that PPG3 and the Structure Plan allow for limited development in villages does mean that every village should have development in it.

The Objection Site

10. As far as the site itself is concerned, it is rising ground that is visible from several places within and beyond the village. Even though the objection site has existing development on three sides, its development would be harmful to the character of the settlement, its rural setting and the wider countryside. However, in my opinion the site is not so prominent that this is the main reason for not allocating it for development.
11. Whilst I note that the landowner experiences some difficulties in farming the land, I have no expert independent evidence to indicate that the site should not be regarded as good quality agricultural land. There is no overriding need for the land to be developed and other lower grade land is available for development in the Local Plan area. Therefore, even if policy ENV32 were to be redrafted as the objectors suggest, this land would not be a strong candidate for development.

Other Matters

12. I have considered all the other matters raised by the objectors:

- it may be that Woodborough is as well served by public transport as some other villages. However, this does not mean that the objection site would be as sustainable a location as an urban extension;
- it may also be the case that the objection site could be developed to use or create clear and defensible Green Belt boundaries;
- except in the most generalised (and thus unconvincing) terms, I have no evidence that development of the scale proposed would make a decisive contribution to the viability of existing facilities in Woodborough;
- any shortfall in the overall housing provision can be made good without recourse to releasing land for development in Woodborough;
- I recognise that not all of the objection site would have to be developed at the same time or during this plan period;
- that the site could make some contribution to any local need for affordable housing is not a reason, in my view, to allocate such a large site. If there is a proven need for affordable housing that has to be in this village, it could be provided as an exception to the generally prevailing policy of restraint;
- it may be true that any development of the objection site could respect the design and layout of the Conservation area but I share the Council's assessment that the objection site provides important open views into the countryside around the village that these would be harmed by development.

13. Thus, none of these other considerations overcomes or overrides the basic deficiencies of Woodborough as a location for development.

White Land / Safeguarded Land

14. I have concluded that the infill boundary for Woodborough should be tightly drawn around the existing built up area with no scope for more substantial development than limited infilling. It follows that Safeguarded Land should not be identified at the objection site or generally at Woodborough.

Conclusion

15. I conclude that Woodborough is properly categorised as a washed over village only suitable for infilling and that no part of the objection site should be allocated for residential development or identified as White Land or Safeguarded Land in the Local Plan.

RECOMMENDATION

16. I recommend no modification to the Local Plan in response to these objections.

2.40 H2 DISTRIBUTION OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT: ADDITIONAL SITE: SOUTH OF REGINA CRESCENT, RAVENSHEAD.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000526	201275	Mr N Fletcher
005016	201930	Mr J Carter for Cornwater Landowners
005016	201931	Mr J Carter for Cornwater Landowners

Summary of the Objections

This allocation in the First Deposit (deleted in the Second Deposit) should be reinstated. The small site is a logical extension of Ravenshead. No other sites in the village are identified and the village is large enough to warrant some development. This site was previously allocated in the First Deposit. There are good transport links and adequate services. More land is needed in the borough for development to meet Structure Plan requirements. The site is better than others that have been allocated for development in the Second Deposit.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000714	201908	Mr P Lane
001337	200586	Messrs J N C&T Cutts

Summary of the Objections

Reinstate the allocation southeast of Regina Crescent to redress the shortfall in the supply of housing land.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001948	201944	Aldergate Properties Ltd

Summary of Objection

The past rate of windfalls in this area cannot be relied on. Ravenshead is well served by community facilities including schools and shops. The higher densities proposed in the Local Plan might not be realistic or achievable. The Local Plan fails to provide a satisfactory choice of locations for new housing and includes proposals that may not be capable of development by 2011.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

1. There were a large number of objections to the allocation of this site for residential development when it was included in the First Deposit. Now that the Second Deposit has removed the allocation from the plan, I am regarding these objections as support for the plan as it now stands. I take them into account here.

Villages in the Green Belt

2. The Local Plan treats the villages in the Green Belt in one of three ways:
 - it excludes (or "insets") the built up area of the village from the Green Belt notation so that limited development may take place within the village;
 - it includes ("washes over") the village in the Green Belt but defines an "infill boundary" within which infilling will be allowed (see policy ENV30);
 - it includes ("washes over") the village within the Green Belt without any "infill boundary" so that Green Belt policies apply throughout the village.
3. This approach is in accordance with the guidance from government in the current PPG2 (paragraph 2.11). I therefore consider that the approach is acceptable.
4. GBC collected data on the services and character of each rural settlement and has categorised the villages as follows:
 - ***Inset Villages:*** Bestwood, Burton Joyce, Calverton, Newstead and Ravenshead;
 - ***Washed over Villages with Infill Boundaries:*** Lambley, Linby, Papplewick and Woodborough;

- **Washed Over Villages Without Infill Boundaries:** all the smaller settlements, including Stoke Bardolph.

5. Having studied the Council's data and the objections on this matter, my view is that GBC's categorisation is reasonable and justified. I reach this conclusion even though – in my view – Bestwood, Newstead and Woodborough are all middle order settlements with a rather limited range of facilities. This suggests they should all be treated as washed over villages with infill boundaries. However, I accept that the character and circumstances of Bestwood and Newstead are such that they would benefit from some limited development and diversification. In addition there are particular reasons why the housing allocations in Bestwood and Newstead have been included in the plan.
6. However, whatever the situation in Bestwood, Newstead and Woodborough I have no doubt that Ravenshead – as one of the largest villages with a wide range of services – has been correctly categorised.

Ravenshead

7. Even so, despite its status as an inset village, Ravenshead has no housing allocation in the Second Deposit. Whilst the village may be suitable for limited development in terms of its size and facilities, this does not mean there is an overriding obligation to allocate land there for housing if no suitable sites can be identified. Also, if there is no particular and compelling need for a particular type of housing in Ravenshead, potential housing sites in the village will need to be assessed on their merits.
8. However, unsubstantiated assertions that the village cannot accommodate any more housing are not a sufficient reason to avoid allocating land for development. Some objectors point to the (perceived) inadequacy of particular services in Ravenshead and say that the proposed development cannot be accommodated for this reason. I have three comments on these reasons for objection:
 - first and foremost, I have to rely on the relevant service providers in assessing such matters. For example, if the Local Education Authority does not say that the schools are full or the Health Authority does not say the medical services are over-stretched, it is difficult for me to conclude that they are;
 - second, the Authorities know that developers can be required to make contributions towards the provision of services if their development would overload the existing provision. The Local Plan makes reference to this in several places, although I am recommending this should be made clearer by drawing the material in the plan together and spelling out in more detail where and how it is likely to arise;
 - in any event, my task is to identify enough housing land to fulfil a requirement in the Structure Plan. If all the potential areas for development are over-stretched in one way or another (as some objectors would have me believe) this does not help in the choice of sites. Extra services would be needed wherever the development goes.
9. For these reasons I do not consider that the adequacy of the existing services in the vicinity of this site are decisive in determining whether the land should be allocated for development.

10. GBC's position is that Ravenshead is a relatively unsustainable location and residential development should not be encouraged there. This is based primarily on two considerations:
- that the village is a long way from Nottingham and not within a particularly well-served public transport corridor;
 - that the 1991 census indicates that journeys to work by car are a high proportion of all such trips in Ravenshead.
11. For my part I am reluctant to reach the conclusion that a settlement as large as Ravenshead with so many local services is unsustainable in any absolute sense of the word. In my view this would not be consistent with the decision to inset the village in the Green Belt. At the Inquiry one objector emphasised that, even if Ravenshead is remote from Nottingham, it is relatively close to Mansfield. Whilst this may be true, the village is not particularly close to either urban area and many potential housing sites on the edge of the urban area are likely to be more sustainable, especially if they are in good public transport corridors.
12. The census data on journeys to work is old. However, it is the latest available and I have no other data to indicate that reliance on the car has decreased in the meantime. Be that as it may, there are relatively frequent bus services to the largest urban centres, although the journey times are not particularly attractive.
13. In all the circumstances I come to the view that Ravenshead is a sustainable location but not a prime location in this respect.

The Objection Site

14. As far as the objection site is concerned, there are bus routes that pass it but the main bus routes are along the main road. These are less easily walked to from the site. Other facilities (such as a primary school and the village centre) are within walking distance but also are not immediately to hand. Again the conclusion is that the site is a sustainable location but not a prime location.
15. I note that the objection site was allocated for housing in the First Deposit and that at the Local Plan Inquiry GBC said this site should be regarded as one of its "reserve pool of sites". For these reasons I have come to the view that GBC does not share the opinion of the Parish Council and many local residents that there is no scope at all for development in Ravenshead. The classification of the village as an inset in the Green Belt also suggests that this is the case.
16. Moreover, in my assessment this objection site is far and away the most suitable for development in Ravenshead. This site's contribution to the wider Green Belt is rather limited. The site adjoins the built up area and is a "logical" extension to the village. Also, despite the opinions of some local residents, there is no evidence this site is important for nature conservation reasons. It is a gently sloping and rather featureless field with a clear southern boundary separating it from the wider countryside beyond.

Housing Needs in Ravenshead

17. The objectors seeking development have suggested that there is a particular need for certain types of housing in Ravenshead, such as small dwellings, affordable homes, starter homes or accommodation for the elderly. Walking around the village and looking

at the existing housing stock this all seems plausible. However, I have no reliable survey data to support the proposition.

18. Also, there is no firm intention or mechanism to tie this allocation to a particular local housing need, although development at the higher density the Local Plan seeks would imply a diversification of the existing local housing stock with smaller and less expensive dwellings than most of the existing village. Allocating the site for housing would ensure that a proportion of the dwellings would be “affordable” but, in my view, this is a rather inefficient way of catering for any local need for affordable homes.
19. For these reasons I do not regard these arguments as very well supported by evidence or very compelling. I consider that they would not, on their own, justify the release of this site for development.

Overall Conclusions

20. I am mindful that there is a compelling need to find more housing land in the borough as a whole and Ravenshead has been identified as a suitable location for a limited amount of development. Ravenshead is not in a public transport corridor but is on a main inter-urban bus route. It has a good range of local services. Historically car use may be high locally but this may reflect the range of housing in the area and some higher density housing would increase diversity in the village’s housing stock.
21. This is a suitable site and there are no overriding reasons why it should not be developed.
22. I therefore conclude that this objection site should be allocated for residential development.
23. I note that the Council assesses the site’s capacity as 140 dwellings and I know of no planning reasons why this should not be achieved.

RECOMMENDATION

24. I recommend that the objection site South of Regina Crescent, Ravenshead should be allocated for residential development with a capacity of 140 dwellings.
-

2.41 H2 DISTRIBUTION OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT ADDITIONAL SITE: SOUTH OF CORNWATER FIELDS, RAVENSHEAD

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000714	001049	Mr P Lane

Summary of Objection

The Green Belt boundary around Ravenshead should not be so tightly drawn. Housing for the elderly should be dealt with as a special land use and this objection site south of Cornwater Fields would be ideal for development catering for the elderly, disabled and disadvantaged. There is a housing shortfall in the Local Plan. There is a need for housing in Ravenshead but no previously developed land available.

ALSO DEALT WITH HERE IS AN OBJECTION TO POLICY H4 THAT THE SITE SHOULD BE DESIGNATED AS WHITE LAND OR SAFEGUARDED LAND

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001337	003074	Messrs J N C&T Cutts

Summary of Objection

Insufficient land has been designated White Land to meet longer-term development needs. This site should be designated as White Land.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

1. This objection relates to the land immediately south of the objection site known as “South of Regina Crescent” (see immediately above). This site is to the south of the access to the leisure centre. Two issues arise:
 - should this land be allocated for residential development?
 - if not, should the land be taken out of the Green Belt and be treated as Safeguarded Land?
2. To some extent the issues raised here are the same as those relating to the land immediately to the north and I repeat some of my reasoning.

Villages in the Green Belt

3. The Local Plan treats the villages in the Green Belt in one of three ways:
 - it excludes (or “insets”) the built up area of the village from the Green Belt notation so that limited development may take place within the village;
 - it includes (“washes over”) the village in the Green Belt but defines an “infill boundary” within which infilling will be allowed (see policy ENV30);
 - it includes (“washes over”) the village within the Green Belt without any “infill boundary “ so that Green Belt policies apply throughout the village.
4. This approach is in accordance with the guidance from government in the current PPG2 (paragraph 2.11). I therefore consider that the approach is acceptable.
5. GBC collected data on the services and character of each rural settlement and has categorised the villages as follows:
 - ***Inset Villages:*** Bestwood, Burton Joyce, Calverton, Newstead and Ravenshead;
 - ***Washed over Villages with Infill Boundaries:*** Lambley, Linby, Papplewick and Woodborough;
 - ***Washed Over Villages Without Infill Boundaries:*** all the smaller settlements, including Stoke Bardolph.

6. Having studied the Council's data and considered objections on the matter, my own view is that this categorisation is reasonable and justified, certainly for Ravenshead. It is one of the largest villages with a wide range of services.

Ravenshead

7. Even so, despite it being an inset village, Ravenshead has no housing allocations in the (Second Deposit) plan. Whilst the village may be suitable for limited development in terms of its size and facilities, this does not mean there is an overriding obligation to allocate land there for housing if no suitable sites can be identified. Also, if there is no particular and compelling need for a particular type of housing in Ravenshead, potential housing sites in the village will need to be assessed on their merits.
8. No doubt some local residents who support the Local Plan and the fact that it does not provide for a residential allocation in Ravenshead would say that local services could not cope with the extra people who would be brought to the village by development. However, as I explain in detail above, I do not find these arguments convincing in the absence of any objections from the authorities responsible for providing local services.
9. GBC's (current) position is that Ravenshead is a relatively unsustainable location where residential development should not be encouraged. This view is based primarily on two considerations:
- that the village is a long way from Nottingham and not within a particularly well-served public transport corridor;
 - that the 1991 census indicates that journeys to work by car are a high proportion of all such trips in Ravenshead.
10. For my part I am reluctant to reach the conclusion that a settlement as large as Ravenshead with so many local services is unsustainable in any absolute sense of the word. This would not be consistent with the decision to inset the village in the Green Belt. However, Ravenshead is not especially close to Nottingham or Mansfield and potential housing sites on the urban peripheries are likely to be more sustainable, especially if they are in good public transport corridors. The census data on journeys to work is old but it is the latest available and I have no other data to indicate that reliance on the car has decreased. Ravenshead is not in a public transport corridor but is on a main inter-urban bus route. In all the circumstances I come to the view that Ravenshead is a sustainable location but not a prime location in this respect.

The Objection Site

11. As far as the objection site is concerned, there are bus routes that pass it but the main bus routes are along the main road. These are within walking distance but not easily so. Other facilities (such as a primary school and the village centre) are within walking distance but are not immediately to hand. Again the conclusion is that the site is a sustainable location but not a prime location. Certainly the site is not as conveniently located for most services as the land immediately to the north.
12. And I have recommended allocating the land to the north for development so that Ravenshead would already be making a contribution to the overall need for residential development. Inset villages are only suitable for limited development and are not suitable locations for large-scale housing development.

13. The objector argues that Kighill Lane would form a suitable boundary for the settlement but in my view it is too far south. To draw the boundary so far south would include too much countryside as well as the sporadic housing to which the objector refers. I consider that the access road to the leisure centre forms the strongest and clearest defensible boundary to the south of the village, although I acknowledge that this site also has a clear southern field boundary.

Other Matters

14. The objectors suggest there is a need for housing for the elderly in Ravenshead. Whilst I find this suggestion plausible, I have no reliable survey data to substantiate it and no firm intention or mechanism has been suggested to ensure that housing on this site would be geared to meeting that particular need. Anyway, this site is not uniquely suitable for this purpose because it is rather remote from the centre of the village. It is certainly further from the centre than the land immediately to the north. All in all I consider that there is a better housing site in Ravenshead and there are other better sites elsewhere in the borough. In my view there is therefore no overriding need or reason to allocate this site for residential development at this time.
15. However, I do not rule out the possibility that a pressing local need may exist in the future. Thus I consider there would be merit in keeping a modest amount of land at Ravenshead out of the Green Belt and treating it as Safeguarded Land. (I deal with the general issue of Safeguarded Land under policy H4.) It is appropriate that one of the largest rural settlements should have the ability to meet such local needs as may arise. This is not to say that development will take place but only that a compelling need may arise before it is necessary to review the Green Belt boundary again.
16. Having already recommended that the land to the north of this objection site should be allocated for development, so this is the next best site for the purpose. It performs reasonably well in terms of the criteria I have identified for the selection of Safeguarded Land and, in particular it has a clear southern field boundary. Although the access road to the leisure centre forms a clearer boundary, the field boundary of this site is quite clear and is adequate for Green Belt definition. I therefore consider that the site should be removed from the Green Belt and protected as Safeguarded Land at least for the duration of this Local Plan.
17. I have taken into account all the comments made by the objectors on other aspects of the Local Plan and on government guidance but none of these alters or outweighs the conclusions reached above.

Conclusions

18. I conclude that this objection site should not be allocated for residential development in this review of the Local Plan. However, I also conclude that the site should be designated as Safeguarded Land.

RECOMMENDATION

19. **I recommend that this objection site should not be allocated for residential development in the Local Plan.**
20. **I recommend that this objection site should be designated as Safeguarded Land.**

2.42 H2 DISTRIBUTION OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT ADDITIONAL SITE: SOUTH OF CORNWATER FIELDS, RAVENSHEAD

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001948	004579	Aldergate Properties Ltd

Summary of Objection

Ravenshead is larger than other villages and is perhaps too large to be called a village. It has little character to protect and is thus suitable for more development. This site is similar to other edge of urban area sites, is on a bus route and close to services. This land should be allocated for development because Kighill Lane is the natural southern boundary for the settlement. There is a need for affordable housing, housing for the elderly and mixed housing and office development in Ravenshead.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

1. This objection relates to land between the objection 1049 site (see above) and the corner of Kighill Lane. (The site does not include the wooded area set back from Longdale Lane, so this site is not as deep as the adjacent site considered above.)
2. There is also an objection to policy E1 to the effect that the land should be allocated for an employment use. As explained at the Inquiry what the objector seeks (now) is a mixed development of housing (including old persons’ dwellings) and offices. The employment and housing objections are therefore considered together here.
3. Two issues arise:
 - should this land be allocated for development?
 - should the land be taken out of the Green Belt?
4. To some extent the issues raised here are the same as those relating to the land to the north and I repeat some of my reasoning.

Villages in the Green Belt

5. The Local Plan treats the villages in the Green Belt in one of three ways:
 - it excludes (or “insets”) the built up area of the village from the Green Belt notation so that limited development may take place within the village;
 - it includes (“washes over”) the village in the Green Belt but defines an “infill boundary” within which infilling will be allowed (see policy ENV30);
 - it includes (“washes over”) the village within the Green Belt without any “infill boundary “ so that Green Belt policies apply throughout the village.
6. This approach is in accordance with the guidance from government in the current PPG2 (paragraph 2.11). I therefore consider that the approach is acceptable.
7. GBC collected data on the services and character of each rural settlement and has categorised the villages as follows:
 - ***Inset Villages:*** Bestwood, Burton Joyce, Calverton, Newstead and Ravenshead;
 - ***Washed over Villages with Infill Boundaries:*** Lambley, Linby, Papplewick and Woodborough;
 - ***Washed Over Villages Without Infill Boundaries:*** all the smaller settlements, including Stoke Bardolph.

8. Having studied the Council's data and considered objections on the matter, my own view is that this categorisation is reasonable and justified, certainly for Ravenshead. It is one of the largest villages with a wide range of services.

Ravenshead

9. Despite its size and status as an inset village, Ravenshead has no housing allocations in the Second Deposit. Whilst the village may be suitable for limited development in terms of its size and facilities, this does not mean there is an overriding obligation to allocate land there for housing if no suitable sites can be identified. Also, if there is no compelling need for a particular type of housing in Ravenshead, potential housing sites in the village will need to be assessed on their merits. In any event designation as an inset village only implies that it is suitable for limited development.
10. GBC's position is that Ravenshead is a relatively unsustainable location and housing development should not be encouraged. This view is based primarily because:
- the village is a long way from Nottingham and not within a particularly well-served public transport corridor;
 - the 1991 census indicates that journeys to work by car are a high proportion of all such trips in Ravenshead.
11. For my part I am reluctant to reach the conclusion that a settlement as large as Ravenshead – with so many local services – is unsustainable in any absolute sense of the word. In my view this would not be consistent with the decision to inset the village in the Green Belt. However, Ravenshead is relatively remote from Nottingham and not very close to Mansfield and potential housing sites on the urban peripheries are likely to be more sustainable, especially if they are in good public transport corridors.
12. The census data on journeys to work is old but it is the latest available and I have no other data to indicate that reliance on the car has decreased. The village is not in a public transport corridor, although it is on main inter-urban bus routes.
13. In all the circumstances I come to the view that Ravenshead is a sustainable location but not a prime location in this respect.

The Objection Site

14. As far as the merits of this objection site are concerned, it is more remote from the centre of the village than the land to the north and intrudes further into the countryside. I consider that any need for development in Ravenshead, during this plan period or beyond it, can be met more appropriately on the land to the north.
15. There are bus routes that pass the site but the main services are along the main road. These are within walking distance but not easily so. Other facilities (such as a primary school and the village centre) are within walking distance but are not immediately to hand. Again the conclusion is that the site is a sustainable location but not a prime location and not as conveniently located for most services as the land to the north.
16. I have recommended against allocating the land immediately north of this objection site for development so that on this side of Longdale Lane this site is not contiguous with the settlement boundary. As such I consider that development of this objection site would amount to an obtrusive outlier of development outside the village. The objector

argues that Kighill Lane would form a suitable boundary for the settlement but in my view it is too far south. To draw the boundary so far south would include too much countryside as well as the sporadic housing to which the objector refers. I consider that the access road to the leisure centre forms the clearest defensible boundary for the south of the village and the field boundary between this site and the next field is an adequate boundary for the Green Belt.

Other Matters

17. The objector has suggested that there is a need for affordable housing, housing for the elderly and mixed-use development in Ravenshead. Whilst I find this plausible, I have no reliable survey data to substantiate it and there is no firm intention or mechanism suggested that would ensure any development on this site would meet these needs.
18. As far as offices are concerned, the Council says that the preferred location for these is in town centres and this is in accord with PPG6. Combining two types of development, each of which would be better located elsewhere, into one mixed use proposal does not make this a suitable location. Two wrongs do not make a right!
19. I am also at a loss to understand why this site should be considered uniquely suitable for these purposes because it is rather remote from the centre of the village. It is certainly further from the centre than the land to the north. The fact that it is a relatively small site is not a sufficient reason to allocate it for development.
20. In terms of the form of the settlement, this site would be the third choice for allocation after the two objection sites to the north. Thus even if there is a local need for affordable housing, homes for the elderly or for mixed development, these needs would best be met on other sites before this land is allocated for development.

Safeguarded Land

21. However, I say above I do not rule out the possibility that a pressing local need may exist in the future. For this reason I accept there would be merit in keeping a modest amount of land at Ravenshead out of the Green Belt and treating it as Safeguarded Land. (I deal with Safeguarded Land in general under policy H4.) However, land to the north of this objection site is better located to meet any such need. This objection site performs the important Green Belt function of safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. I therefore consider that the site should be kept in the Green Belt.
22. I note this objector also has objections concerning the MLA and SINC designations. However, since I am able to reach a view on the proposed allocation of this land independently of deciding those objections I have done so. These other matters are dealt with in the appropriate parts of this report.

Overall Conclusions

23. I conclude this objection site should not be allocated for development in this review of the Local Plan. I also conclude that the site should remain in the Green Belt.

RECOMMENDATION

24. I recommend no modification to the Local Plan in response to this objection (or the related objection to policy E1).

2.43 H2 DISTRIBUTION OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT ADDITIONAL SITE: WOODSIDE ROAD, BURTON JOYCE

Objector Number 001324	Objection Number 002776	Objector Name Langridge Homes Ltd
----------------------------------	-----------------------------------	---

Summary of Objection

Land off Woodside Road, Burton Joyce should be allocated for residential development.

Objector Number 003835	Objection Number 010552	Objector Name R.A.G.E.
----------------------------------	-----------------------------------	----------------------------------

Summary of Objection

R.A.G.E. supports the allocation of the site at Woodside Road. This development would provide access to New Plantation, which dominates the ridgeline on Nottingham Road. The Woodland Trust would also be prepared to take over management of the wood provided vehicular access is provided.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

Villages in the Green Belt

- The Local Plan treats the villages in the Green Belt in one of three ways:
 - it excludes (or "insets") the built up area of the village from the Green Belt notation so that limited development may take place within the village;
 - it includes ("washes over") the village in the Green Belt but defines an "infill boundary" within which infilling will be allowed (see policy ENV30);
 - it includes ("washes over") the village within the Green Belt without any "infill boundary" so that Green Belt policies apply throughout the village.
- This approach is in accordance with the guidance from government in the current PPG2 (paragraph 2.11). I therefore consider that the approach is acceptable.
- GBC collected data on the services and character of each rural settlement and has categorised the villages as follows:
 - 'Inset Villages':** Bestwood, Burton Joyce, Calverton, Newstead and Ravenshead;
 - Washed over Villages with Infill Boundaries:** Lambley, Linby, Papplewick and Woodborough;
 - Washed Over Villages Without Infill Boundaries:** all the smaller settlements, including Stoke Bardolph.
- Having studied the Council's data and considered objections on the matter, my own view is that this categorisation is reasonable and justified. I reach this conclusion even though – in my view – Bestwood, Newstead and Woodborough are all middle order settlements with a rather limited range of facilities. This would suggest that they should all be treated as washed over villages with infill boundaries. However, I accept that the character and circumstances of Bestwood and Newstead are such that they would benefit from some limited development and diversification. In addition there are particular reasons why the housing allocations in Bestwood and Newstead have been included in the plan.

Burton Joyce

- In any event, the situation in Bestwood, Newstead and Woodborough has little bearing on which category Burton Joyce should be in and I consider that it is properly classified as an inset village. This means that, in principle, it is suitable for limited development

beyond infilling. However, whilst the village may be suitable for limited development in terms of its size and facilities, there is no overriding need to allocate land for housing in the village if suitable sites cannot be found. If all my recommendations are followed that would be the outcome in Burton Joyce.

6. There is scope in Burton Joyce for considerable infilling and intensification whether or not sites large enough for allocation are identified in the Local Plan. However, part of the case advanced by Langridge Homes at the Inquiry was that the objection site at Woodside Road is preferable to two other potential allocations in the village (land off Park Avenue and land at Millfield Close). In my view this argument loses some of its force once I have come to the view that it is not necessary to allocate any of the three sites. Be that as it may, I record here that in my view both the other potential sites are more sustainable than this one. Therefore, on balance, the other sites would be preferable to this one if I considered it was imperative to allocate a site in Burton Joyce.

The Objection Site

7. Woodside Road is not close to the centre of the village. It is close to frequent bus services but not within easy walking distance of local shops, services, the railway station and other facilities. In my view it cannot be regarded as a sustainable village site.
8. The site also has access difficulties and the Highway Authority opposes its allocation. In their view Woodside Road already serves more dwellings than the Highway Design Guide indicates should be the case. Any additional development, even if numbers were constrained for this reason, would exacerbate an already sub-standard situation. The objectors maintain that these difficulties can be addressed by widening the top part of Woodside Road and creating accesses for emergency vehicles. However, I am not convinced that these measures have been (or can be) secured and (as far as widening the existing road is concerned) may not be desirable. I consider there are real unresolved access difficulties in connection with this site.
9. The site is in the Green Belt. Whilst this is true of much of the land to be allocated for housing in the Local Plan, this site is not an urban extension and is not well-related to the existing form of Burton Joyce. Development would constitute an incursion into open countryside at the extremity of the village where the compact settlement form is degenerating into a ribbon of development along the north side of the A612.
10. Furthermore, the land rises steeply. Although the principle objector maintains that the site is difficult to see I consider that buildings on the site would be visible (and obtrusive) from the wider river valley to the south. Be that as it may, the objection site would form an irregular intrusion of the developed area into the countryside even if it were difficult to see from nearby. The land in question is part of a MLA and, although the site's neglect may have eroded its original quality somewhat, I am not convinced that this designation should be set aside or disregarded. There are also protected trees on the site. Again the value of these trees may be disputed but I see no reason to disregard or discount them entirely.
11. It is true that the landowner is willing to make the woodland to the west more accessible to the public if the objection site is allocated for housing. It is also true that the proposed emergency accesses would, if implemented, benefit the existing

dwellings in the vicinity. However, these advantages of the proposed allocation do not outweigh or overcome the disadvantages I have outlined above.

Conclusions

12. For all these reasons I conclude that this site should not be allocated for residential development in the Local Plan. For the avoidance of doubt I wish it to be clear that in my view other and better sites can be found. The allocation of this land is unnecessary. This is true both at a borough-wide scale and within Burton Joyce (although I am not in fact recommending that any allocations are made in Burton Joyce).
13. I also conclude that there are no reasons compelling enough to warrant removing this site from the Green Belt.

RECOMMENDATION

14. I recommend no modification to the Local Plan in response to these objections.
-

2.44 H2 DISTRIBUTION OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT ADDITIONAL SITE: MAPPERLEY GOLF COURSE

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000021	000722	Mr M Spick

Summary of Objection

It is unfair that this private golf course should be retained when there is such pressure for development land elsewhere. There is already another course nearby (at Dorket Head). Mapperley Golf Course should be reduced to 9 holes and the surplus land used for residential development or another recreational use.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000015	000015	Mr P Pritchard
000015	201995	Mr P Pritchard
003835	010551	R.A.G.E.

Summary of Objection

This site meets every requirement for allocation for residential development. It should be allocated in preference to other less suitable sites.

ALSO DEALT WITH HERE IS AN OBJECTION TO POLICY ENV26 (CONTROL OF DEVELOPMENT IN THE GREEN BELT)

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001158	002498	Nottingham County Council (Strategic Property)

Summary of Objection

This site should not be removed from the Green Belt. The golf course use is appropriate in the Green Belt. Other policies can adequately control ancillary development so that the objectives of Green Belt policy are not compromised. There is no justification for removing the site from the Green Belt and it would only be justified in exceptional circumstances.

ALSO DEALT WITH HERE ARE THREE OBJECTIONS TO POLICY R5 (GOLF COURSES)

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000559	201308	Dr P Martin
003906	201307	Mrs T Martin

Summary of Objection

Because Mapperley Golf Course will be surrounded by housing development, it will be even more valuable as a local amenity. A golf course also supports wildlife. It should not be lost as a sporting facility and should be retained in the Green Belt.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001158	201969	Nottinghamshire County Council (Strategic Property)

Summary of Objection

The new text added to paragraph 7.16 is inaccurate because Mapperley Golf Course remains in the Green Belt until the Local Plan review is adopted. There are no exceptional circumstances to justify the removal of this land from the Green Belt. It is not required for development so its removal is contrary to the Structure Plan. This additional paragraph should be deleted.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

1. I deal with all the objections relating specifically to Mapperley Golf Course here. The objectors range from those who wish to see the land kept in the Green Belt, to those who think (all or part of) the site should be allocated for residential development.
2. My understanding of the Local Plan as it now stands after the Second Deposit is as follows:
 - Mapperley Golf Course is protected by policy R5;
 - this means, in effect, that it should remain as a golf course unless an adequate replacement is provided elsewhere;
 - however, there is no presumption against such a replacement;

- the site is removed from the Green Belt and is not allocated for any use or development; (other than the golf course);
 - this means that if an adequate replacement is found there is currently no policy in the Local Plan that can be applied to this site.
3. I consider that this situation is unsatisfactory. I deal with the general issue of Safeguarded Land elsewhere.
 4. The Council owns the Mapperley Golf Course site. This review of the Local Plan removes the site from the Green Belt, the site having been identified as (relatively) free from constraints in the Council's sieve map exercise. The Council has no planning objections in principle to Mapperley Golf Course being developed but simply states that it has not been included as a housing allocation in this review of the Local Plan. However, the Council accepts that it could be reconsidered for inclusion in a future review of the plan. The planning history indicates that the Council decided not to pursue development of this site very early in the plan preparation process and has not revisited the matter since.
 5. As far as golf is concerned, I am told that the site slopes too steeply to be ideal for its current use. However as someone who does not play golf, I imagine this could be a matter of opinion that would vary with the age, fitness, playing standard and preferences of each individual golfer. Be that as it may, Sport England was of the view (when this matter was considered some years ago) that there is no objection in principle to the relocation of the course and that a move could result in the provision of a better golfing facility. But I understand that without a replacement Sport England would object to the loss of this facility.
 6. The Council has some concerns that the site they were exploring for relocation some years ago would lead to a very large swathe of land in the Green Belt being used for this purpose (because the potential site they were exploring was adjacent to one or more existing course). But this is an open recreational use that would be appropriate in the Green Belt, so I do not regard these concerns as being decisive.
 7. Any replacement course would also be further from the urban area and therefore in a less sustainable location than the present one. Whilst this may be true, in my view this consideration applies with even greater force when one is comparing possible sites for residential development, if only because the density of trips is likely to be so much greater in the case of housing.
 8. The sloping nature of the site also means that it is an attractive, if rather manicured, landscape. But the Council does not suggest that its landscape qualities are such as to preclude its development and I take a similar view. Be all this as it may, I have no evidence to indicate that the site has to be retained, as a matter of planning policy, in its present use once a replacement is available.
 9. I therefore conclude that the identification of Mapperley Golf Course under policy R5 is correct and that the present use of the site should be protected unless and until an alternative course can be provided elsewhere. However, I consider that a more general planning policy is needed in relation to this site to deal with the situation that would arise if and when the golf course is relocated.

10. As far as the site's contribution to the Green Belt is concerned, I have strong reservations. I am recommending that in the vicinity of the Gedling Colliery / Chase Farm development the best available Green Belt boundary would follow Spring Lane and Lambley Lane. This would leave Mapperley Golf Course some way from the wider Green Belt and separated from it by the colliery spoil heaps and a strip of unallocated land with the GCCF Access Road running through it. Although objector 1158 may be right that such situations do arise elsewhere, it is not common and the isolation of this site from the wider Green Belt would be considerable. In any event I am not convinced that the land performs a valuable Green Belt function. The exceptional circumstances that justify removing this site from the Green Belt are:

- the requirement in the Structure Plan to review Green Belt boundaries;
- the need to find Safeguarded Land;
- the considerable separation of this site from the wider Green Belt (if my recommendations concerning the land to the northeast are followed).

11. I therefore conclude that the site should not be retained in the Green Belt.

12. Whilst the above considerations all point to the possibility that this site could make a longer term contribution to providing housing land in the borough, the site cannot be regarded as readily available in the short term or even by 2011. Experience shows that the process of providing an alternative golf course is an uncertain and protracted one. The Council has not resolved to resume this process and, as far as I know, no steps have been taken in this direction. For practical reasons therefore, I conclude that the land should not be allocated for residential development in this review of the Local Plan.

13. This leaves designation as Safeguarded Land as the only practical alternative and I conclude that this is what should happen. I consider the wider question of what form a Safeguarded Land policy should take elsewhere in my report (under policy H4).

RECOMMENDATION

14. I recommend that Mapperley Golf Course should retain its R5 designation so that it is protected from development unless or until a replacement golf course facility is provided.

15. I further recommend that, in addition, the land is identified as Safeguarded Land in the Local Plan.

2.45 H2 DISTRIBUTION OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT ADDITIONAL SITE: LAND NORTH OF PAPPLEWICK LANE

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001939	201276	CWS Property & Development (now CG Property)
001939	004542	CWS Property & Development (now CG Property)

Summary of Objection

The objector seeks the restoration of the housing land allocation north of Papplewick Lane. This land was included in the First Deposit version of the plan but was deleted in the Second Deposit. In addition the objector sought a larger allocation at the time of the first deposit and this objection has not been withdrawn.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

The Strategic Context

1. The objector says the merits of this land as a housing allocation should be assessed in the light of its relationship to Hucknall (in the adjoining Ashfield District) rather than in relation to its peripheral location in Gedling Borough.
2. The Structure Plan says that major new development will be concentrated within and adjoining the main urban areas and along public transport corridors, including Nottingham to Hucknall. It is important to the objector’s case that there is no priority differentiation in the Structure Plan between locations in and adjoining the main urban areas and those in public transport corridors. Furthermore, when the Structure Plan EIP Panel recommended an increase in the amount of housing land to be found in Gedling from 7000 to 8000, they specifically took into account the availability of suitable sites close to Hucknall.
3. Subsequently PPG3 introduced a sequential approach into the search for housing land. Sites within urban areas were to be used first but there is insufficient land available from this source to meet Gedling’s needs. Urban extensions come next in the PPG3 search sequence and finally new development around nodes in public transport corridors. The objector emphasises that this sequence does not differentiate between urban areas in general and main urban areas.
4. The objector criticises GBC’s approach because it conflates and confuses priorities derived from the two prime sources of guidance for the Local Plan. Hucknall is an urban area and, following PPG3, as an urban extension this objection site has a high priority – higher priority than it is due because it is also in a public transport corridor. The concept of giving high priority to *main* urban areas is derived from the Structure Plan but this gives equal priority to land in public transport corridors. The objector maintains, therefore, that if viewed separately the Structure Plan and PPG3 do not support GBC’s assessment of this site and they cannot be taken together to support it either. In any event the site is far more sustainable in practice than many of the allocations included in the Local Plan.
5. The objectors say that cross-boundary comparisons illustrate the weaknesses in GBC’s approach because in the Ashfield Local Plan Hucknall is treated as a suitable location for major development whereas just across the border a contrary view appears to exist. This objection site is part of a wider land holding part of which is in Ashfield where development is being progressed within the context of a Local Plan and a planning brief. The planning brief deals with land on both sides of the district boundary.

6. Whilst I completely accept that the existence and position of district council boundaries should not produce arbitrary and discordant patterns of development, it does not follow that two council’s applying different priorities will necessarily produce this result. Whether the resultant pattern of development in this case would be arbitrary and discordant is a matter of fact and degree that I shall return to in detail below.
7. Similarly, the reconciliation of the priorities in the Structure Plan and PPG3 is not a purely intellectual exercise. What matters is whether the merits of allocating this site can be justified and whether the different priorities that can be derived from the two prime guidance documents would make any real difference in practice. I intend to approach the issues involved in a practical way and not a theoretical one.

Associated Development and the Masterplan

8. The objectors have produced a masterplan showing how all the land in their ownership could be developed as an urban extension of Hucknall, incorporating amenity and recreational improvements in the adjoining Leen valley. However, whilst it may make perfect sense for a landowner to plan the whole of their land in a single exercise, it does not follow that the future of all the land is inextricably linked and that it has to be developed comprehensively or simultaneously.
9. In this particular case it is my view that the objector’s land on either side of Papplewick Lane is separated by that road and the ribbon development along it. There is no direct access from the land on one side of Papplewick Lane to the land on the other side and the future of the two parcels of land can be decided independently without this appearing to be an arbitrary response to the administrative boundary. Furthermore, the development south of Papplewick Lane is a more compact “rounding off” of Hucknall, whereas the land to the north is an extension of the settlement into the countryside.
10. I was also told that none of the ancillary elements of the masterplan to the south of the road (such as the proposed new school or the valley improvements) are dependent on the land to the north being developed. The landowners say these are committed and will go ahead irrespective of the future of the land in Gedling.
11. Accordingly, although the masterplan is not without merits, it does not in my view provide a compelling reason to allocate the land north of Papplewick Lane. The decision on the land in Gedling can and should be assessed on its own merits.

Sustainability

12. Chief amongst the claimed merits of the site are sustainability and accessibility to Hucknall and public transport. I accept that Hucknall is a town (and therefore an urban area), although it is not contiguous with the main urban area of Nottingham. But the site is not within easy walking distance of urban facilities in Hucknall. I also accept that with its station Hucknall is part of a major public transport corridor, although at 1.2 km distance this site is not an easy walk from the station. I attach little weight to the suggestion that because this land is to the north of Hucknall it lies outside the public transport corridor. The Council accepts that this location is “reasonably accessible” and so do I. But only reasonably so and not especially so. However, these advantages are less apparent for the land to the north of the First Deposit allocation than for the original allocation itself.

Green Belt Considerations

13. The land is in the Green Belt and should only be removed from it if there is a strong reason for doing so. However, the land is not a high ridge and is not especially prominent. Development would erode the open gap between Hucknall and the villages of Linby and Papplewick but would not destroy it, although the northern extension to the First Deposit allocation would be more damaging. Either way, the wider Green Belt tract between Hucknall and Ravenshead and Mansfield would be preserved. For these reasons I would not regard the Green Belt reasons for keeping this land open as completely overriding, except with regard to the land to the north of the housing allocation in the First Deposit.

Other Benefits Associated with the Proposed Development

14. The objector emphasises other aspects of the masterplan, especially the proposed environmental and recreation improvements in the adjacent Leen valley. I accept that these have merits and that those north of Papplewick Lane should be included in the overall development scheme if the housing there goes ahead. However, it does not seem to me that they are of such merit that they should determine the location of housing development.
15. I have already said that the future of the proposed new school is independent of the allocation of land for housing north of Papplewick Lane.
16. The objector says the land is immediately available for early development in the event of its allocation. The Council does not dispute this and I have no reason to.

Other Allocations in the Local Plan

17. The objector argues this land is to be preferred to many of the allocations that are included in the Local Plan. In particular, it is said that the housing allocations in villages are excessive in terms of the strategic distribution of development and because of the better public transport accessibility at this site. Examples of this are the allocations in Bestwood and Newstead villages. In addition the allocations of land in the Teal Close area are said to result in a loss of open recreational facilities, whilst this proposal would contribute to the realisation of recreation potential in the adjoining Leen valley.
18. Whilst I have some sympathy with these views, especially in respect of the village allocations referred to, the following considerations arise:
- as indicated at the Local Plan Inquiry, I can only recommend the deletion of an allocation (and the substitution of this land) where I have a duly made objection to the other allocation. This does not appear to be the case, for example, as far as the land at Newstead is concerned (where, in any event, other considerations also apply);
 - but I will take these arguments into account where I am able to;
 - however, the fact that this objection site is thought to be “better than” an existing allocation in the Local Plan would not, on its own, be a decisive reason for allocating this site once the required total has been reached.

Overall Assessment and Conclusions

19. The Council included this site as an allocation in the First Deposit. The site was deleted in the Second Deposit because higher densities elsewhere made its allocation unnecessary. The Council says that the site should still be included in the “search pool” for additional sites if any are needed. Accordingly the Council does not appear to object in principle to development of its original allocation site if more sites have to be found.
20. Thus, it is agreed that this objection site is to be regarded and assessed as a potential housing allocation. Neither the Council nor I would rule this site out solely because it is closer to Hucknall than to the major urban areas in Gedling, although GBC would give other sites higher priority for this reason.
21. However, if land is to be allocated in the Hucknall area (as was envisaged by the Structure Plan EIP Panel) this site will need to be compared with Top Wighay Farm. In my view the Top Wighay Farm site is to be preferred for the following reasons:
- it is better related to the public transport corridor, especially because of the possibility of extending rail services into the Top Wighay Farm site;
 - it is, by virtue of the employment allocation I am recommending at Top Wighay Farm, more likely to produce a sustainable mixed development;
 - the Top Wighay Farm site is in a wider and less sensitive open gap, so that development there would be less harmful to the Green Belt.
22. I conclude, therefore, that this objection site should not be allocated for development in this review of the Local Plan. However, the site accords reasonably well with the criteria I am using to identify Safeguarded Land (see policy H4). I conclude that the area originally allocated for development in the First Deposit should be removed from the Green Belt and treated as Safeguarded Land in the Local Plan.
23. Whatever happens to the land allocated in the First Deposit, I take a different view of the remaining land to the north (that was subject to an objection to the First Deposit). I consider that to remove this land from the Green Belt would endanger the gap between the built up area of Hucknall and the village of Papplewick. I therefore conclude that this land should be retained in the Green Belt.

RECOMMENDATION

24. I recommend no modification to the housing allocations in the Local Plan in respect of objections 001939 / 004542 and 201276.
25. I recommend that the land north of Papplewick Lane allocated for residential development in the First Deposit should be designated as Safeguarded Land.
26. I recommend that the land north of the land north of Papplewick Lane allocated for residential development in the First Deposit should remain in the Green Belt.

2.46 H2 DISTRIBUTION OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT ADDITIONAL SITE: MILLFIELD CLOSE, BURTON JOYCE

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001943	004550	Persimmon Homes (North Midlands) Ltd

Summary of Objection

Land adjacent to Millfield Close Burton Joyce should be allocated for housing. There is a need for more housing land in the borough. Burton Joyce and this site were identified by GBC as sustainable locations and suitable for limited development in the earlier work on the Local Plan. The Green Belt gap between Nottingham and Burton Joyce would not be prejudiced because the north side of A612 is already built up.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

1. This site and objection are considered in the Environment chapter where objections to the inclusion of the site in the Green Belt are considered. I conclude there that the site should be designated as Safeguarded Land.
2. For the reasons set out in the Environment chapter of this report, I recommend that this site should not be allocated for residential development.

RECOMMENDATION

3. I recommend no modification to the Local Plan in response to this objection.
-

2.47 H2 DISTRIBUTION OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT ADDITIONAL SITE: LAND NORTH OF WOODBOROUGH

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000392	000556	Mr R Holehouse

Summary of Objection

Woodborough should be inset in the Green Belt to allow for development in the village. Land north of Main street should be allocated for housing. Because the Green Belt washes over Woodborough there is no scope for extending the village, diversifying house types for local needs or sustaining facilities in the village.

ALSO DEALT WITH HERE IS AN OBJECTION TO POLICY ENV26 (GREEN BELT)

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000392	000555	Mr R Holehouse

Summary of Objection

The Green Belt washes over Woodborough so there is no scope for extending the village, diversifying house types for local needs or sustaining the facilities in the village.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

Villages in the Green Belt

1. The Local Plan treats the villages in the Green Belt in one of three ways:
 - it excludes (or “insets”) the built up area of the village from the Green Belt notation so that limited development may take place within the village;
 - it includes (“washes over”) the village in the Green Belt but defines an “infill boundary” within which infilling will be allowed (see policy ENV30);
 - it includes (“washes over”) the village within the Green Belt without any “infill boundary “ so that Green Belt policies apply throughout the village.
2. This approach is in accordance with the guidance from government in the current PPG2 (paragraph 2.11). I therefore consider that the approach is acceptable.
3. Having collected data on the services available in each village and its character GBC has categorised the villages as follows:
 - ***Inset Villages:*** Bestwood, Burton Joyce, Calverton, Newstead and Ravenshead;
 - ***Washed over Villages with Infill Boundaries:*** Lambley, Linby, Papplewick and Woodborough;
 - ***Washed Over Villages Without Infill Boundaries:*** all the smaller settlements, including Stoke Bardolph.
4. Having studied the Council's data and considered objections on the matter, my own view is that this categorisation is reasonable and justified. I reach this conclusion even though – in my view – Bestwood, Newstead and Woodborough are all middle order settlements with a rather limited range of facilities. This would suggest that they should all be treated as washed over villages with infill boundaries. However, I accept that the character and circumstances of Bestwood and Newstead are such that they would benefit from some limited development and diversification. In addition there are particular reasons why the housing allocations in Bestwood and Newstead have been included in the plan.

5. As far as Woodborough is concerned, this means I consider it is properly classified in the Local Plan. Its services are limited in comparison with the larger villages of Burton Joyce, Calverton and Ravenshead. Woodborough is therefore less suitable even for limited development than any of the three larger villages. Whilst it compares more closely to Bestwood and Newstead as I have indicated above this does not mean it is large enough or has enough facilities to warrant more intensive development than infilling. In my view the other two villages are special cases.
6. In my view Woodborough is properly classified as a washed over village with a defined infill boundary, even though it was previously an inset village in the adopted Local Plan. The infill boundary now proposed is substantially the same as the previous inset boundary. Be that as it may, it is correct – given the classification of the village – that the boundary should be tightly drawn around the existing built up area with no scope for more substantial development than limited infilling.

The Objection Site

7. As far as the objection site itself is concerned, it is a large area of rising ground. Although the site is difficult to see from within the village itself, it is prominently visible from several places beyond the village. Its development would amount to a significant intrusion of built development into the countryside. It would harm the character of the settlement, its rural setting and the wider countryside.

Other Matters

8. It is claimed that allowing more development in the village would make it possible to achieve a greater diversity of house types to cater for local need. It is also said that more development would help sustain local facilities. No evidence is advanced in support of these propositions. In particular I have no evidence to indicate that the range of housing in Woodborough is currently inadequate. Nor do I have any evidence that local facilities are vulnerable or how much development would be needed to safeguard them in the future.

Conclusion

9. For these reasons I consider that these linked objections should fail and the Local Plan should not be modified in response to them.

RECOMMENDATION

10. I recommend no modification to the Local Plan in response to these objections.
-

2.48 H2 DISTRIBUTION OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT ADDITIONAL SITE: NORTH OF SPRING LANE, MAPPERLEY

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001324	002769	Langridge Homes Ltd

Summary of Objection

Land north of Spring Lane should be allocated for residential development.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

1. This objection site needs to be considered with the adjacent land to the west that is the subject of a similar objection (see immediately below).
2. The site is proposed as an urban extension and I do not disagree with this description. However, having explored this objection and others in the area I have come to the firm view that Spring Lane provides the clearest and best southern boundary for the Green Belt in this part of the borough. I reach this conclusion notwithstanding the existing ribbon of development along the northern side of Spring Lane, which detracts from the open character and appearance of this part of the Green Belt to some extent.

The Objection Site

3. The objection site is about 5.5 ha in extent. The objectors accept that the number of dwellings that could be built here is likely to be constrained by the Highway Authority’s view of the capacity of a single access road. They are prepared to adjust the extent of any development to achieve an acceptable number of dwellings at an appropriate density. GBC were less than happy with such a “flexible boundary” but in my view it is open to me to remove any uncertainty that is involved by specifying the extent and capacity of any allocation. Be that as it may, a substantial area of built development is proposed even though it may not amount to a major housing site if the area is reduced.
4. However, in the context of the surroundings (and especially when viewed from the west or the east) I consider that what is proposed would amount to a major intrusion of development into the countryside. The landform here is in the nature of a wide and open bowl. The proposed housing would intrude into this open area and harm both its character and its cohesion.
5. The land is in the Green Belt and, whilst this is also true of much of the land to be allocated in the Local Plan, I consider that allocating this land for development would have a very harmful impact on a large and important tract of the Green Belt. Whilst it would be possible to provide a clear and defensible boundary between the residential development and the Green Belt, in my view a strategic and important line would be breached.
6. The land in question is also part of a large MLA tract. Although the contribution of the southern part of the objection site to the MLA was disputed because of the utilitarian and industrial appearance of some of the structures associated with the farm, I am not convinced that any of this designation should be set aside or disregarded. In any event the importance of the Dumble itself and the footpath along it was not disputed. As I found when I walked this route the objection site is visible from the Dumble and residential development would be a major visual intrusion, even if substantial planting

took place. I therefore consider the proposed allocation would harm the MLA and the landscape quality of the area.

7. Whilst I accept that this site can be regarded as an urban extension, in my view it is not especially well related to shops, good bus services and other urban facilities. To this extent its sustainability is questionable. However, I acknowledge that it is no worse in these respects than some allocated sites, including the one to the south on the other side of Spring Lane.

Benefits

8. I also note the farmer's wish to move the centre of his activities to another site but was not supplied with enough information about this to reach a conclusion as to whether this is a material planning consideration that ought to influence the contents of the Local Plan.
9. I accept that, if the proposed development took place, opportunities would arise to provide enhanced structural planting on the boundary of the housing and to improve public access to the Dumble. However, I take the view that these benefits of the proposed allocation do not outweigh or override the disadvantages identified above.

Conclusions

10. I therefore conclude that no part of this objection site should be allocated for residential development.
11. I also conclude that no part of the site should be removed from the Green Belt.
12. I also conclude that no purpose would be served by altering the MLA boundary at the objection site.
13. I conclude that enough housing land can be found in Gedling Borough without recourse to this site.

RECOMMENDATION

14. I recommend no modification to the Local Plan in response to this objection.
-

2.49 H2 DISTRIBUTION OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT ADDITIONAL SITE: NORTH OF SPRING LANE / EAST OF MAPPERLEY PLAINS

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001945	004551	Nat Puri c/o FPD Savills

Summary of Objection

More housing land is needed to meet the Structure Plan requirement. The Local Plan acknowledges that sites on the edge of the urban area are suitable and this is one such. The site is close to services and facilities. Because there are already buildings on the north side of Spring Lane, the Green Belt is already diluted here. Sensitive planting in association with the development of this site would assist in creating a transition from the built up area to the countryside and enhance the appearance of the ridgeline.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

1. This objection was to the First Deposit. Since then more land has been allocated in the Second Deposit, although more land has still to be found. I have dealt with all the arguments relating to the amount of residential development under policy H1.
2. This objection site is on the corner of Mapperley Plains and Spring Lane. This, and its position very close to the prominent ridge that runs along Mapperley Plains, makes the objection site very conspicuous. Development on this site would be visible from the north and northeast and from Mapperley Plains and no amount of landscaping would alter this. I consider that allocation of this site would conflict with the Structure Plan policy regarding the main ridgelines north of Nottingham.
3. As far as the Green Belt is concerned, it is true that there is a loosely knit ribbon of development on the north side of Spring Lane. Nevertheless Spring Lane forms the clearest and most defensible boundary between the suburbs to the south and the large tract of Green Belt to the north. I consider that residential development on this site would be an obtrusive intrusion of development into this tract of open countryside. This would harm both the appearance of the countryside and the integrity of the Green Belt.
4. Notwithstanding the fact that more housing land has to be found, this site is not needed to make up the numbers and would be far more damaging to the Green Belt and landscape than many sites that could be allocated. The proximity of the urban area and the local availability of services and facilities does not overcome the basic planning shortcomings of this site.
5. I conclude that this objection site should not be allocated for residential development.
6. For the same reasons I also conclude that the site should remain in the Green Belt.

RECOMMENDATION

7. I recommend no modification to the Local Plan in response to this objection.

2.50 H2 DISTRIBUTION OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT ADDITIONAL SITE: STOCKINGS FARM (WEST) (OR LAND OFF LODGE FARM LANE)

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001930	004510	Gadsby Brothers (represented by Langridge Homes)

Summary of Objection

This land was originally identified as suitable for development in the Consultative Draft along with the Stockings Farm (East) allocation. The site is located on the edge of the urban area in a public transport corridor. Thus it satisfies the requirements of the Structure Plan and national guidance. The main ridge to the north and the secondary ridgeline to the east of the site would be retained. There are no environment constraints and there would be no loss of residential amenity. Local services already exist in the urban area. Footpath links would be created to Mansfield Road and the development at Stockings Farm East. An illustrative plan was submitted.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

1. The objection referred to a site of 2 ha. As presented at the Local Plan Inquiry, the boundary of the site and the density of development could be varied depending on how much housing is required to satisfy the Structure Plan (or other requirements). The objectors’ evidence referred to a site capacity of 36 dwellings whereas the Council assessed the capacity of the whole site as about 120 dwellings at 50 dph.

General Appraisal

2. This objection site was identified as part of a larger area at Stockings Farm as relatively free from constraints in the Council’s sieve map analysis of the Green Belt. The site is in a bowl and is visually contained. I consider that the impact on the wider landscape would be very limited, provided any development were kept below the ridgelines to the north and east. Because of this and its location next to the urban area and in a public transport corridor, this site is – in locational terms – appropriate for development.
3. However, there are no existing features on the ground that would be suitable to mark the boundary of the Green Belt pending any development. Reliance would have to be placed entirely on a line defined to follow a contour.

Access

4. The main area of dispute between the Council and the objectors at the Local Plan Inquiry related to the adequacy of the access to the site and the Highway Authority’s standard relating to the number of dwellings that can be served from a single cul-de-sac. This says that up to 50 dwellings can be served by a minor access road if it is less than 300 metres long.
5. The objectors say that if Georgina Drive (which has 14 houses in it) is regarded as the cul-de-sac in this case, then there is scope for a further 36 dwellings here. However, Georgina Drive is one of several roads served by the single access road (Lodge Farm Lane) after its junction with Derry Hill Road. This is the point from which the Highway Authority says that a cul-de-sac exists and I consider this reasonable because all the traffic from houses north of this point has to emerge from here. This being the case the number of dwellings already served by the cul-de-sac exceeds 50 by a considerable margin.

6. I accept that the Highway Authority's Highway Design Guide is only a guide and is not part of the Local Plan. However, it is based on common sense and experience. All in all I am prepared to use it as a useful "rule of thumb" not to be followed slavishly. But in this case the existing situation is so far below the guideline that reasonable flexibility in interpretation cannot encompass the objectors' aspirations.
7. It is also true that the Highway Authority did not produce any evidence specific to this site and could not identify any particular traffic or amenity problems or complaints arising from the existing situation. Nevertheless the existing situation is so far below what the Design Guide recommends that it would not, in my view, be sensible to aggravate matters by adding a significant number of dwellings.
8. I have also taken into account the possibility of providing an emergency-only access direct onto Mansfield Road. This would address one of the common sense areas of concern underlying the Design Guide and would have benefits for existing residents as well as new ones. However, the possible point of access is far from ideal even if limited to emergency use only and it would do nothing to alleviate general traffic and environmental conditions.
9. Taking all this into account I consider that there is a real and insurmountable highway objection to this proposed allocation.

Green Belt / Safeguarded Land

10. If the site is not to be allocated for residential development in this review of the Local Plan, the issue arises as to whether the land should be taken out of the Green Belt. Although in general terms the site performs well in relation to the criteria I have set out under policy H4, there are in my view three particular problems:
 - uncertainty about how much land to take out of the Green Belt, is it to be the whole site or some lesser amount determined by highway considerations;
 - uncertainty as to whether the access difficulties can be overcome at all (without which the site could never be considered for development, thus rendering it unsuitable for designation as Safeguarded Land);
 - the lack of any discernible features on the ground to form a clear and defensible boundary for the Green Belt.
11. In view of these difficulties I consider that the land is unsuitable for designation as Safeguarded Land.

Overall Conclusions

12. I conclude that this objection site should not be allocated for residential development because of highway and access problems to which I cannot envisage any solution. For this and other reasons I also conclude that the objection site should not be designated as Safeguarded Land but should remain in the Green Belt.

RECOMMENDATION

13. I recommend no modification to the Local Plan in response to this objection.

2.51 H2 DISTRIBUTION OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT ADDITIONAL SITE: THE SPINNEY, BESTWOOD

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
01324	002783	Langridge Homes Ltd

Summary of Objection

Land at The Spinney, Bestwood should be allocated for residential development.

ALSO CONSIDERED HERE ARE OBJECTIONS TO THIS LAND BEING DESIGNATED AS WHITE LAND UNDER POLICY H4 IN THE FIRST DEPOSIT

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001158	002445	Nottinghamshire County Council (Strategic Property)
001324	002771	Langridge Homes Ltd

Summary of Objection

The policy is supported in principle but specific sites are disputed, including The Spinney Bestwood.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000532	000759	Mrs L Purdeu

Summary of Objection

The Spinney should not be built on, there are plenty of brownfield sites and vacant properties. Development would increase traffic on Moor Road, the school too small for more children.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

Villages in the Green Belt

1. The Local Plan treats the villages in the Green Belt in one of three ways:
 - it excludes (or "insets") the built up area of the village from the Green Belt notation so that limited development may take place within the village;
 - it includes ("washes over") the village in the Green Belt but defines an "infill boundary" within which infilling will be allowed (see policy ENV30);
 - it includes ("washes over") the village within the Green Belt without any "infill boundary" so that Green Belt policies apply throughout the village.
2. This approach is in accordance with the guidance from government in the current PPG2 (paragraph 2.11). I therefore consider that the approach is acceptable.
3. GBC collected data on the services and character of each rural settlement and has categorised the villages as follows:
 - ***Inset Villages:*** Bestwood, Burton Joyce, Calverton, Newstead and Ravenshead;
 - ***Washed over Villages with Infill Boundaries:*** Lambley, Linby, Papplewick and Woodborough;
 - ***Washed Over Villages Without Infill Boundaries:*** all the smaller settlements, including Stoke Bardolph.
4. Having studied the Council's data and considered objections on the matter, my own view is that this categorisation is reasonable and justified. I reach this conclusion even though, in my view, Bestwood, Newstead and Woodborough are all middle order settlements with a limited range of facilities. This suggests they should all be treated as washed over villages with infill boundaries. However, I accept that the character and circumstances of Bestwood and Newstead are such that they would benefit from limited development and diversification. In addition there are particular reasons why the housing allocations in Bestwood and Newstead have been included in the plan.

Bestwood

5. This means I accept that Bestwood is an appropriate location for limited development. However, it must also be clear that I do not consider it suitable for major enlargement or extension because its range of facilities is not wide enough. In addition, although it can be described as being located within a transport corridor, it is not in fact conveniently located in relation to the nearest railway stations.
6. Furthermore, I am recommending that the site already allocated for housing in Bestwood is retained in the Local Plan, despite this objector's representations on the matter. I consider that the allocated site has three clear and important advantages over this objection site:
- it is previously developed land;
 - it is not an extension of the village into open countryside;
 - it is closer to the centre of the village and to the services and facilities that are located there.

The Objection Site

7. As far as this site is concerned, it is in the Green Belt and would amount to an extension of the village into the countryside. However, this is also true of many of the sites being allocated for development in this Local Plan. This site is relatively contained and would not have a very harmful impact on the wider countryside or any sensitive open gaps. The site is close to bus services but on the outskirts of Bestwood. The site is relatively small and would not, in my view, impose unacceptable burdens on either local services or the local road network.
8. All in all I regard this site as a candidate for development, but not an especially strong one. There is already a site allocated for development in Bestwood and there is no particular or pressing need to allocate more land there in the short or medium term. In these circumstances this site need not and should not be allocated for development in this review of the Local Plan. Alternative and better sites can be found to meet both the local need for housing in Bestwood and the wider needs of the borough as a whole.
9. I note the Council took the view that this site could be taken out of the Green Belt at an earlier stage in the preparation of the Local Plan. In all the circumstances I consider that the limited harm caused by removing the site from the Green Belt would be acceptable in this instance. (I discuss the wider issue of the principle of Safeguarded Land elsewhere – see policy H4.)

Conclusions

10. I conclude that the objection site should not be allocated for housing but nevertheless should be removed from the Green Belt and protected as Safeguarded Land.

RECOMMENDATION

11. I recommend that this objection site is not allocated for residential development in the Local Plan.
12. However, I recommend that the objection site is removed from the Green Belt and protected as Safeguarded Land.

2.52 H2 DISTRIBUTION OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT ADDITIONAL SITE: TOP WIGHAY FARM

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001158	002431	Nottinghamshire County Council (Strategic Property)

Summary of Objection

More land is needed for housing and the land at Top Wighay should be allocated.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
003835	010549	R.A.G.E.

Summary of Objection

Land at Top Wighay Farm is a sustainable location following confirmation of NET funding. Housing development should be located there in preference to other land (in the Arnold area).

ALSO DEALT WITH HERE ARE OBJECTIONS TO POLICY H4 IN THE FIRST DEPOSIT (WHITE LAND)

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001021	002200	Hallam Land Management Ltd

Summary of Objection

Delete the White Land designation at Top Wighay Farm. Development should be promoted where transport services are already operating. Land south of Newstead is to be preferred to Top Wighay Farm as a development area or, failing that, as White Land.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001025	004621	Mrs M Hunt

Summary of Objection

Objection – no reason given.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001325	002852	Papplewick Parish Council

Summary of Objection

Disagree in principle with identifying White Land in the Local Plan because there is no requirement to do so in the Structure Plan. But if there is to be White Land it should be kept to a minimum. Top Wighay Farm should not be developed or designated as White Land. The site is wrongly described because it is in Linby.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001949	004601	The Marshall Family c/o J H Walter Rural Consultants

Summary of Objection

The land between Joe's Wood and Wighay Road should not be designated White Land because it is less suitable for development than land south of Newstead. The reasons Top Wighay Farm is less suitable include transportation, accessibility, visual impact and opportunities for regeneration.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001158	002446	Nottinghamshire County Council (Strategic Property)

Summary of Objection

The land designated as White Land should be allocated for development. The White Land should be extended northwards.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001324	002771	Langridge Homes Ltd

Summary of Objection

The White Land policy is supported in principle but specific sites are disputed, including Top Wighay Farm.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001955	004670	Gedling Labour Group

Summary of Objection

All White Land should be deleted from the Local Plan. White Land at Top Wighay Farm is particularly objected to.

THE COUNCIL DID NOT REGISTER ALL OF THE ABOVE OBJECTIONS AS RELATING TO THIS SITE. HOWEVER THEY DO REFER TO IT EXPLICITLY.

IN ADDITION THERE WERE ABOUT 12 OBJECTIONS TO THE WHITE LAND DESIGNATION AT THIS SITE IN THE FIRST DEPOSIT THAT HAVE BEEN WITHDRAWN. I REGARD THESE AS SUPPORT FOR THE PLAN AS IT NOW STANDS AND TAKE THEM INTO ACCOUNT HERE ALSO.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

1. RAGE are not alone among objectors when they say that an allocation at Top Wighay Farm would be preferable to the sites to which they object. Other sites where this argument arises include Gedling Colliery / Chase Farm, Teal Close and Linden Grove. However, the Council has not always recorded these as objections to the lack of development at Top Wighay Farm. I take these objections and arguments into account here. There is also objector 003873 who objected to an allocation at Top Wighay Farm (see above) and must now be seen as a supporter of the Local Plan.
2. The question of whether land at Top Wighay Farm should be taken out of the Green Belt is also dealt with here.
3. Related objections concerning an employment allocation and a Park and Ride facility at Top Wighay Farm are dealt with elsewhere, as is the general issue of Safeguarded Land. (See the relevant parts of this report for my recommendations on these matters – E1, T4 and H4 respectively.)

Introduction

4. Three of my conclusions elsewhere in this report are of particular relevance to my consideration of this site and these objections:
 - I have concluded more housing land should be allocated if an orderly supply of developable land is to be achieved; some because Gedling Colliery / Chase Farm is unlikely to be completed by 2011. Replacement land also needs to be found for other allocations I am not recommending, principally in the Trent valley (H1, H2 and H3);
 - I am recommending that there needs to be a substantial allocation of land for employment development at Top Wighay Farm (E1);
 - I am recommending that substantial areas of Safeguarded Land are identified in the Local Plan to protect the Green Belt after 2011 (H4). This land is to be treated as if it were in the Green Belt unless and until it is released for development by another Local Plan review. However, there is also a need for a reserve of land to cater for the possibility that the development at Gedling Colliery / Chase Farm is delayed more than I anticipate or have allowed for (H3 and H4).

This Site Assessed

5. This is greenfield land in the Green Belt. The release of such land for development would not be contemplated unless it was necessary. I am satisfied that it is necessary and is sanctioned by the Structure Plan. In any event the same considerations would apply at any alternative housing site.
6. However, although it is in the countryside, the site is said to be relatively “contained” visually. The evidence I have about the impact that the development would have on the landscape is that it would not be unduly obtrusive or harmful if adequate landscaping measures are incorporated in the development. This would be especially true of the proposed housing, once the proposed employment land has been developed. Moreover, the site is in a wide Green Belt tract so that the coalescence of settlements would not result from development here. In these respects I consider this area a preferable location for development in comparison to other possible locations.

7. Taking into account the urban area in Ashfield district, the site is an urban extension – albeit a rather irregular one. Hucknall is not in Gedling borough and may not be part of the main urban area of the Nottingham conurbation but it is a sizeable urban area so that the general priority for urban extensions in PPG3 would be satisfied by development here. Moreover, I note that in determining the housing allocation for Gedling, the Structure Plan EIP Panel envisaged that there is scope for development in this general area. No better site north of Hucknall has been suggested to me.
8. A transport assessment of the site has been undertaken and is largely agreed by the Highway Authority and the Planning Authority. It is agreed (by the Councils if not by other objectors) that the site is in a public transport corridor and there is the expectation and scope for an improved rail connection into the Top Wighay Farm area in the long term. In the short term it is agreed by the Councils that the site can be serviced adequately by existing and augmented bus services.
9. In addition, as I said at the outset, I am recommending that there should be a substantial allocation of employment land at Top Wighay Farm. This means that an adjacent housing allocation could create a balanced mix of uses in the area with the potential for reducing the need for long distance commuting. This enhances the sustainability of the location.
10. Generally the site is not a special wildlife habitat and its noteworthy features in this respect can be protected as part of any development. There is no suggestion of a flood risk at this site. My understanding is that the site is immediately available for development, although I anticipate that it would take some time to plan a large development in detail, let alone implement it.
11. For all these reasons I conclude that land should be allocated for housing at Top Wighay Farm.
12. I consider that the amount of land to be allocated should depend on the overall need to find more housing land after decisions on other housing sites more favourably located in relation to the existing urban areas within the borough have been taken. In other words, I am regarding this area as a “safety valve” for the borough’s housing land supply; to be adjusted (in its extent and timing) in response to the wider need for housing land. It may be argued by some that Top Wighay Farm should be accorded higher priority than this implies but my reasons are:
 - I consider that the Gedling Colliery / Chase Farm development is the borough’s highest priority land release (as explained in more detail elsewhere) and that the capacity of that area should be limited only by the ability to deliver the housing within the plan period;
 - I consider that, apart from this, the needs of the borough for an urgent injection of readily available and developable land are best met by identifying a range of (smaller) sites and locations;
 - I have already said that, with the best will in the world, it will take some time before development could be started at this site. My view is that what is most urgently needed is some readily available building land rather than more allocated land at a large site.

13. In practice this leads me to the view that the initial allocation at Top Wighay Farm should be for 955 dwellings. However, on the basis of the Master Plan put forward by the landowners there is a total capacity at the site of 1400 dwellings, of which 1000 could be built by 2011. I was assured at the Local Plan Inquiry that a partial or phased release of housing land at Top Wighay Farm is feasible.

Safeguarded Land

14. I have recorded above the objections to policy H4 in the First Deposit concerning the designation of White Land at Top Wighay Farm. I deal with these objections here.
15. For my views on the principle of whether there should be Safeguarded Land in the Local Plan, please see policy H4. My conclusions are that Safeguarded Land should be identified in the Local Plan and that it should be protected by a policy designed for that purpose. This is in accord with the guidance in PPG2 and is not, in my view, in any way inconsistent with the current versions of PPG3 and PPG13.
16. As far as the amount is concerned, there needs to be enough Safeguarded Land to avoid the need for another review of the Green Belt in 2011 or when the Local Plan is next reviewed (which should be before 2011). In general terms something in the order of the amount identified by GBC in the First Deposit appears to me to be about right.
17. I also identify several criteria for assessing the suitability of potential Safeguarded Land. In my view land at Top Wighay Farm performs well in relation to the criteria I have identified. In particular it is:
- in a sustainable location;
 - on the edge of an urban area;
 - in an identified transport corridor;
 - not where the coalescence of settlements would occur if development took place;
 - not where a major ridgeline around Nottingham would be breached;
 - an area identified by GBC's sieve map analysis of the Green Belt;
 - allows a clear boundary for the Green Belt following physical features to be established.
18. I therefore consider that there is scope for identifying Safeguarded Land at Top Wighay Farm. Indeed, I consider that all the land included in the Master Plan area that is not needed for development should be designated as Safeguarded Land and protected by the new policy I am recommending. By "development", in this context, I mean the land allocated for employment purposes, the land needed to accommodate 955 dwellings together with the land required for any ancillary uses such as schools and a local centre. This is the area identified as White Land in the First Deposit Proposals Map less any land that is being allocated for development.
19. Under my suggested policy Safeguarded Land would be treated as if it were in the Green Belt unless and until another Local Plan review established it is needed for development. There is, however, a potential conflict between this approach to Safeguarded Land and my view (above) that Top Wighay Farm should be regarded as the "safety valve" for the borough's housing land supply. The strict terms of the Safeguarded Land policy would make it difficult to adjust the extent and timing of

development at Top Wighay Farm in response to any change in the overall need for housing land in the borough before 2011.

20. This would arise if (and in my view **only** if) development at Gedling Colliery / Chase Farm were to be materially slower than I have assumed (700 dwellings by 2011). This is already slower than the Council think is achievable. Moreover, in my view slow progress at GCCF would either need to be very marked or occur in combination with delays at other sites before the release of more land elsewhere was required. Nevertheless I view the possibility of a general land shortage with such concern that I believe it is a matter that ought to be addressed.
21. If these circumstances do arise (and I have specified that regular monitoring should take place to establish whether they are arising), I envisage that more housing land should be released in advance of the next review of the Local Plan to compensate for the shortfall. I consider that the Safeguarded Land at Top Wighay Farm should be the first and best land to be considered. However, I am reluctant to weaken the Safeguarded Land policy by writing such a caveat into it. But I believe that by addressing the issue now I am enabling appropriate action to be taken as a departure from the Local Plan without the need to undertake a time consuming review of all the Safeguarded Land. I do not believe I can or should go further in anticipating events that I hope will not arise.

Controlling the Development

22. The main objector seeking development of this land has prepared an Illustrative Concept Master Plan for the site. At the inquiry I asked for, and was supplied with, a draft policy that could be incorporated in the Local Plan in the event of my recommending the allocation of this site. On this basis the Council did not take issue with it. The draft policy reflected the Master Plan.
23. Whilst I have no specific reservations about the draft policy, I consider that its final form should be determined by the Council (no doubt in consultation with the landowners) at the time the Council makes modifications to the Local Plan. This will allow consideration to be given both to my recommendations and to the situation that exists at the time. I am conscious that some time will have elapsed between my hearing evidence at the Local Plan Inquiry and the modifications. The situation at Gedling Colliery / Chase Farm may also be clearer at that time, for example. In any event, I am hopeful that a fully integrated and balanced mixed-use development at Top Wighay Farm will result.

Overall Conclusion

24. I therefore conclude that land should be allocated for residential development at Top Wighay Farm. This should be sufficient to accommodate 955 dwellings in the first instance. This should be at a density that complies with policy H6 (as recommended).
25. For the avoidance of doubt I also conclude that the allocated land should be excluded from the Green Belt.
26. I conclude that the Local Plan should also include a policy to guide and control the development, disposition and density of the various land uses at Top Wighay Farm to achieve an integrated mixed-use development. This can be based on the policy

discussed at the Local Plan Inquiry. The policy will need to specify where and when supporting services (such as schools, open space and local shops) will be provided. It will also need to address the issue of the phasing of development and the triggers that would influence any subsequent release(s) of land for development.

27. The land needed for the future extension of the local rail network into the site and for Park and Ride facilities will also need to be protected.
28. An area of Safeguarded Land should also be designated at Top Wighay Farm.

RECOMMENDATIONS

29. **I recommend that land should be allocated for residential development at Top Wighay Farm. This should be sufficient to accommodate 955 dwellings in the first instance. The development should be at a net density that complies with policy H6 (as recommended).**
 30. **I recommend that the allocated land should be excluded from the Green Belt.**
 31. **I also recommend that all the other land excluded from the Green Belt in the First Deposit Proposals Map should be excluded from the Green Belt and be protected from development by the Safeguarded Land policy I am recommending.**
 32. **I recommend that the Local Plan should include a policy to guide and control the development and disposition of the various land uses at Top Wighay Farm to achieve an integrated mixed-use development. This will need to specify where and when supporting services (such as schools, open space and local shops) will be provided.**
 33. **I recommend that the land needed for the future extension of the local rail network into the site and for Park and Ride facilities should be protected.**
 34. **I recommend that, in the event of a demonstrable shortage of housing land being caused by slow delivery at Gedling Colliery / Chase Farm, the Safeguarded Land at Top Wighay Farm should be regarded as the first area of search for compensatory housing land. This possibility could be referred to in the text of the Local Plan but not in its policies.**
-

2.53 H2 DISTRIBUTION OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT ADDITIONAL SITE: WEST OF MAPPERLEY PLAINS

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001938	004537	Mr D Frudd c/o FDP Savills

Summary of Objection

More housing land is needed. Some Green Belt land on the urban periphery will be needed. A site west of Mapperley Plains is suggested as being suitable both because it would be close to existing services and because new planting would enhance the wider landscape.

ALSO DEALT WITH HERE IS AN OBJECTION TO POLICY ENV26 (GREEN BELT)

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001938	004538	Mr D Frudd c/o FDP Savills

Summary of Objection

Land adjacent to Brookfield Nursery should be removed from the Green Belt to provide more housing land..

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

1. Although the representation on this objection site says that any development could be set below the ridgeline, the site is on top of the ridge where it is broad and level. It would be impossible to develop any part of the objection site without any buildings appearing above the skyline in distant views of the ridge. No amount of landscaping could prevent development on this land appearing as an obtrusive extension of the built up area into the countryside.
2. Immediately to the south is the Brookfield nursery site, which I am recommending should be kept in the Green Belt. This objection site is therefore not contiguous with the built up area and this will remain the case. To the west is sloping land falling away from the ridge. Some way down the slope is an area of land that I am recommending should be allocated for housing. But I am recommending that the extent of this allocation should respect the contours so that it does not protrude above the ridgeline. In view of my recommendations on the adjoining land to the south and west of the objection site, it would make no sense to allocate this land for development.
3. The site may be in the urban fringe and reasonably close to services (although this was a matter of some dispute even in relation to the nursery site, which is adjacent to the urban area) but these are not a sufficient justification for development in such a prominent position.
4. I conclude that the objection site should not be allocated for residential development.
5. For the same reasons I conclude that the land should remain in the Green Belt.

RECOMMENDATION

6. I recommend no modification to the Local Plan in response to these objections.

2.54 H2 DISTRIBUTION OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT ADDITIONAL SITE: MONSELL DRIVE

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
005007	201841	Nottinghamshire County Council (Education Department)

Summary of Objection

The land at Monsell Drive may be released for housing and the allocation should be reinstated.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

1. There were over 800 objections to the allocation of this land for housing in the First Deposit. In the Second Deposit the allocation was no longer included in the Local Plan. I am taking the objections to the original allocation into account here.
2. My understanding is that this land is in educational use and cannot be released for residential development unless the (government) Department for Education and Skills sanctions its sale. I have been supplied with correspondence dating from 2002, which shows that ministerial clearance for the sale had not been obtained at that time. Because of this GBC is not pursuing the allocation, even though it says it may do if the site becomes surplus to education requirements in the future. In 2002 the NCC Education Department was still pursuing release of the land with a view to residential development.
3. However, on the basis of the information available to me, the availability of the site for housing is still uncertain and for this reason, if no other, I consider it should not be allocated for development in the Local Plan. Accordingly I recommend no modification to the Local Plan in response to this objection.

RECOMMENDATION

4. I recommend no modification to the Local Plan in response to this objection.
-

2.55 H2 DISTRIBUTION OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT ADDITIONAL SITE: LAND AT HOLLINWOOD LANE CALVERTON

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
004308	200483	Mrs A Hobbs

Summary of Objection

The Second Deposit allocates no new land in Calverton for housing outside the existing village boundary.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
004860	201273	Mr I R Rockley
004899	201494	Mrs A Rockley

Summary of Objection

Council officers suggested this site in the first place. There is a need for residential sites in Calverton. The site is bounded by roads and development and not logically part of the Green Belt. Development would not lead to traffic congestion and would assist the local economy and shops. Utilities are available at the site. Other services are conveniently available in the village. The site is preferable to the land allocated in Calverton in the Second Deposit.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
004883	201420	Mr R D P Careless

Summary of Objection

This objection seeks the reinstatement of part of the allocation. A small development would meet local needs without impacting on the Green Belt. The site is part of the fabric of the village with defensible boundaries and a road frontage. Reallocate (at least) part of the original allocation

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

1. There were objections to the allocation of this site when in the First Deposit. I regard these as support for the plan as it now stands and I take them into account here.

Villages in the Green Belt

2. The Local Plan treats the villages in the Green Belt in one of three ways:
 - it excludes (or "insets") the built up area of the village from the Green Belt notation so that limited development may take place within the village;
 - it includes ("washes over") the village in the Green Belt but defines an "infill boundary" within which infilling will be allowed (see policy ENV30);
 - it includes ("washes over") the village within the Green Belt without any "infill boundary" so that Green Belt policies apply throughout the village.
3. This approach is in accordance with the guidance from government in the current PPG2 (paragraph 2.11). I therefore consider that the approach is acceptable.
4. GBC collected data on the services and character of each rural settlement and has categorised the villages as follows:
 - **Inset Villages:** Bestwood, Burton Joyce, Calverton, Newstead and Ravenshead;
 - **Washed over Villages with Infill Boundaries:** Lambley, Linby, Papplewick and Woodborough;
 - **Washed Over Villages Without Infill Boundaries:** all the smaller settlements, including Stoke Bardolph.

Calverton

5. Having studied the Council's data and considered objections on the matter, my own view is that this categorisation is reasonable and justified, certainly as far as Calverton is concerned. Thus Calverton is a suitable location for limited development.

6. The Second Deposit includes a proposal for some residential development at Flatts Lane. I am also recommending the allocation of a site at Dark Lane with a capacity of about 110 dwellings. More development in the village would exceed what is intended by the term "limited development". Also, I have no evidence that more development is needed in Calverton beyond these other two sites.

The Land Allocated in the First Deposit

7. This site would extend the village boundary in an irregular way. Development would bite into the Green Belt and remove the gap between the village and the former colliery. The site is at the extremity of the village and not well related to village services. The site may have roads on three sides but it is not surrounded by development. For these reasons I consider that this land should not be allocated for development unless there is a proven and overriding need to do so. No such need has been shown to exist.
8. I accept that there are utility services and possible accesses available at the site and that developing the site would not cause undue congestion or highway difficulties but these are not sufficient reasons for an allocation.
9. I conclude that whole site should not be allocated for residential development.

A Smaller Area

10. The site allocated for development in the First Deposit included objector 004883's house and its large garden, although this was only a small part of the whole allocation. This objector wants his land to be designated for housing development.
11. If the whole of the First Deposit allocation were to be reinstated there is no question but that this objector's land should be included because it sensibly forms part of the wider area. However, as I am not recommending that the larger area is reinstated, the issue Mr Careless raises is whether a separate and smaller residential development should take place on the corner of Hollinwood Lane and Collyer Road.
12. This objection site as identified in objection 201420 was an approximately rectangular plot corresponding to the present curtilage of Hollinwood Lodge. The objector says that his main objective is to be able to build one or two new dwellings in his garden and that he is willing to reduce the extent of the objection site accordingly. In his view such a small development would be infilling.
13. The Council responded that, whether reduced or not, the objection site is too small to constitute a separate allocation (the threshold being 0.4 ha) and that for this reason alone the objection should be rejected. The objector was unwilling to see his objection fail on such a "technicality" and said that it was equally possible to see his land as part of a 0.4 ha block on the corner of Hollinwood Lane and Collyer Road. He anticipated no difficulty in obtaining the agreement of the adjoining landowner.
14. I therefore intend to explore whether or not it would be appropriate for the plan to identify this as a location for a modest amount of housing development. This could take the form of one or two additional houses on the Hollinwood Lane frontage (which the objector regards as infilling) or as (part of) a small development (of say a dozen dwellings) on the corner of Hollinwood Lane and Collyer Road.

15. Such a development, if not part of a larger allocation, would be outside the village development boundary and separated from the village by a tract of open land. For this reason I consider that the smaller objection site (when considered on its own) is quite properly excluded from the village and not allocated for development.
16. Partly for this reason, I would not regard any development – even one house – on this site as infilling. The land in question is not a gap between existing buildings and its development would amount to an extension to a small group of houses that are surrounded by open land. Infilling refers to the consolidation **within** a group of buildings and the use of spaces between them. Even the most modest of the objector's proposals would not fall within this definition. This is more than a technicality because a consistent approach has to be used throughout the countryside where there are many similar small pockets of sporadic development.
17. Moreover, despite there being some communal activities near the site, the bulk of village services are some way away. If another small development is needed in Calverton, it would be better if it were located nearer to the village centre.
18. The objector says that part of his garden previously had buildings on it and that his garden should therefore be regarded as previously developed land. Although there may have been buildings on his land in the past, this would not justify further sporadic development outside the village. He also points to the redevelopment of the disused colliery site to the north and says that this would justify his land being developed, although in my view his land is quite distinct and separate from any land previously associated with the colliery. He is also fearful that the Hollinwood Lane area is in danger of becoming run down and neglected, although this does not amount to a sound reason for allowing sporadic development in the countryside.
19. As for the personal and family reasons he has for wanting to develop his site, these are not a sufficient reason to alter the Local Plan. There may be a need for more affordable housing in Calverton but it is not clear how development on this site would be tied to meeting such a need or how houses built for this purpose would be reserved as affordable housing in the longer term.
20. Accordingly I conclude that the Local Plan should not be modified in response to this objection.

Safeguarded Land

21. For my general views on White Land or Safeguarded Land see under policy H4. As things stand there is no such land at Calverton. As this is one of the three largest villages in the borough I consider it would be prudent if there were, to allow for possible long term development needs. Safeguarded Land would be treated as if it were in the Green Belt at least until the next review of the Local Plan.
22. In my considered view, this is the best candidate for Safeguarded Land designation at Calverton. The other two candidate sites are those at Lampwood Close and Bonner Lane. I consider that both these sites would be more obtrusive and harmful to the character and appearance of the countryside.

23. I conclude that the land allocated for residential development at Hollinwood Lane in the First Deposit should be removed from the Green Belt and designated Safeguarded Land.

RECOMMENDATIONS

24. I recommend no modification to the Local Plan to allocate land for residential development at Hollinwood Lane, Calverton.
25. I recommend that the land allocated for residential development at Hollinwood Lane in the First Deposit should be designated as Safeguarded Land.
-

2.56 H2 DISTRIBUTION OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT ADDITIONAL SITE: SOUTH OF LAMBLEY LANE

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001324	201322	Langridge Homes Ltd

Summary of Objection

The housing allocation South of Lambley Lane should be re-instated.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

Background

1. In the First Deposit the line of the Gedling Colliery / Chase Farm Access Road came close to the existing edge of the urban area south of Lambley Lane. The land between the existing urban area and the road line was allocated for residential development amounting to 119 dwellings. In the Second Deposit the Gedling Colliery / Chase Farm Access Road is shown swinging further out from the urban area. In the Second Deposit the earlier housing allocation has been deleted and the Green Belt and MLA boundaries about the existing edge of the urban area.
2. The objector wants the residential allocation reinstated and, as pursued at the Inquiry, extended in two phases to take up much of the space between the existing urban area and the new road line. The second phase of the development would be accessed from the new road but the first phase would be accessed from Grange View Road and Greens Farm Lane. The objector estimates that phase 1 could accommodate about 140 dwellings and phase 2 about 150 dwellings. The Council says that, if the development were to go ahead, it would be seeking higher densities and numbers. Be that as it may, there would be scope to include structural landscaping on the edge of the development area and an open space network within it. The Green Belt and MLA boundaries would be drawn back to the new road line.
3. I also take into account the objections made to the First Deposit against the allocation of this land, which I regard as supporting the plan as it now stands.

The Main Issue

4. There was much detailed discussion at the Inquiry about the merits of the proposed allocation and the importance of the objection site in terms of its contribution to the Green Belt and MLA. However, in my view the determining issue in this case is far less complex than is implied by weighing the planning merits and demerits of this site and allocation. I consider that the main issue is whether the proposed road line is settled enough to form a sound basis for taking decisions on:
 - the Green Belt boundary;
 - the MLA boundary;
 - a housing allocation.
5. Put briefly, it is my view that the road line is **not** yet sufficiently settled for these purposes. Because of this I consider it would be premature to proceed with the housing allocation in this review of the Local Plan.
6. The Council and the other parties concerned with the Gedling Colliery / Chase Farm development are satisfied that the line of the road shown in the Second Deposit is the best available. Moreover, in general terms, I agree with this assessment. However, the detailed design is still at a very preliminary stage, there has yet to be an Environmental Impact Assessment and there may be statutory procedures to be followed to secure the implementation of the road. Accordingly, the precise road line may change.
7. Any alteration of the road line may (or may not) be small but it cannot at this stage be ruled out. In these circumstances I consider that the road line as presently shown on the Proposals Map is an unsatisfactory basis for determining the position of the Green Belt boundary, the extent of the MLA and whether there is scope for housing here. When the road line is fixed (and the vertical as well as the horizontal alignment is important), it will be possible to assess the impact of the road and reach an informed decision on these related matters.
8. It may be, for example, that the closer the new road is to the existing urban area; the more likely it is that the severed Green Belt and MLA land is thought not to be defensible. In such a circumstance, the view may well be that the severed land is best used for residential development at least up to the point where noise from the road becomes a constraint. It seems to me that the housing allocation in the First Deposit relied upon this sort of reasoning.
9. Conversely the further out the access road is to be, the greater the feasibility of maintaining the severed land between the new road and the existing urban area. Even so, if the gap between the urban area and the new road were very wide, there might still be scope for some “rounding off” of the urban area.
10. I consider that the information that is currently available is not sufficiently detailed or robust enough for me to take these decisions now. Moreover, there are the objections and interests of all those who objected to the (limited in extent) allocation in the First Deposit to take into account as well as the views of the Council and this objector. I therefore consider this matter to be premature for this review of the Local Plan.

Other Matters

11. At the Inquiry there were detailed discussions about the site, its use and character, the landscape, the transport implications of the proposal and other pertinent matters. I have taken these into account but consider that the information available is not, even so, adequate for me to determine exactly where the Green Belt boundary or the MLA boundary should be moved to. I therefore take the view that the only defensible position for these boundaries is hard against the edge of the existing urban area. In such circumstances I consider there is no scope for any of the objection site to be allocated for housing.
12. It follows from the above reasoning that I also consider there is no basis for designating Safeguarded Land at this objection site in the review of the Local Plan.

Conclusion

13. I conclude that the Green Belt and MLA boundaries should not be moved to reflect the proposed line of the Gedling Colliery / Chase Farm Access Road. I also conclude there should not be a housing allocation South of Lambley Lane in this review of the Local Plan.

RECOMMENDATION

14. I recommend that the Green Belt and MLA boundaries should not be moved to reflect the proposed line of the Gedling Colliery / Chase Farm Access Road but should be drawn right up to the edge of the existing urban area.
 15. I also conclude that there should not be a housing allocation south of Lambley Lane in this review of the Local Plan.
-

2.57 H2 DISTRIBUTION OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT ADDITIONAL SITE: YEW TREE LANE

Objector Number **Objection Number** **Objector Name**

About 150 individual objection

Summary of Objection

The GCCF Access Road cuts through suitable development land at Yew Tree Lane. The road should be realigned to release this area for development. Some smaller scale developments could take place here. (Many of the objectors put forward this land as an alternative to development on the Stoke Lane allotments.)

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

1. I note that most of these objections suggested the allocation of land in this area in preference to the allocation in the First Deposit at Stoke Lane allotments. Whether the objectors would wish to pursue their objections now that the Stoke Lane allocation has been removed from the Local Plan I rather doubt. However, because the objections have not been withdrawn I must assume that they do.
2. The Proposals Map shows a relatively small area of open land between the built up area and the line of the Gedling Colliery / Chase Farm Access Road (hereafter, the access road). This land is also shown as being in the Green Belt and in a Mature Landscape Area. The situation is very similar to that of the nearby land South of Lambley Lane, which was allocated for residential development in the First Deposit but not in the Second Deposit.
3. In the case of the land South of Lambley Lane the alignment of the access road changed considerably between the First Deposit and Second Deposit. The position of the access road could be affected here also but to a much smaller extent. Be that as it may, the precise alignment of the access road is not yet known or fixed. It may vary somewhat in the light of detailed design work and the Environment Assessment that are still to be done. I note in this context that the land adjoining this objection site to the southeast is a Nature Reserve.
4. Because of the uncertainty still surrounding the precise position of the access road, I consider it to be too uncertain a basis for defining either the extent of any residential allocation or the Green Belt in this area.
5. I therefore conclude that these objections should not succeed.

RECOMMENDATION

6. I recommend no modification to the Local Plan in response to these objections.
-

2.58 H2 DISTRIBUTION OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT ADDITIONAL SITE: MAPPERLEY PLAINS / (NORTH OF) ARNOLD LANE

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
004520	200786	Mr D & G Kellam

Summary of Objection

Retain part of this allocation as included in First Deposit. Part of the site may be needed for the Gedling Colliery / Chase Farm Access Road (GCCF Access Road) but the rest is available for development. It can be accessed by an in/out access (to Mapperley Plains) with an island.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

1. In the First Deposit there were two relatively small housing allocations to the north and south of Arnold Lane at its junction with Plains Road / Mapperley Plains. There were several objections to these allocations at the time of the First Deposit. The Second Deposit deleted both the allocations. This objection to the Second Deposit seeks the reinstatement of one of the contentious allocations (north of Arnold Lane).
2. I am treating the earlier objections to the First Deposit as support for the plan as it now stands and take them into account here.
3. The original First Deposit allocation was for 13 houses. Only about half the original allocation is unaffected by the proposed GCCF Access Road, so it would now be a very small housing site. In my view the remaining area of land is too small to be considered as a separate allocation in the Local Plan. If my recommendation elsewhere is followed, this land would be part of a larger area of Safeguarded Land.
4. If the remaining land is to be developed, it will need to be considered under policy H5 and the policy for Safeguarded Land. However, the design of the GCCF Access Road is not yet fixed and I have not been told that the proposed access to this site (as indicated on the plan accompanying the objection) has been discussed with the Highway Authority and agreed by them.
5. In all the circumstances I consider that it is premature (and a matter of too great detail) for me to determine the future of this land in the Local Plan. The matters raised by the objectors to the First Deposit allocation can, if still relevant, be taken into account when and if a detailed proposal comes forward.
6. I conclude that the Local Plan should not be modified in response to this objection.

RECOMMENDATION

7. **I recommend no modification to the Local Plan in respect of this objection to the deletion of the housing allocation north of Arnold Lane (at its junction with Mapperley Plains).**

2.59 H2 DISTRIBUTION OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT ADDITIONAL SITE: PLAINS ROAD / (SOUTH OF) ARNOLD LANE

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001935	201550	Trustees of Mrs J M M Wild 1987 Settlement

Summary of Objection

The objection is to the deletion of Plains Road / Arnold Lane (south) allocation. The site is sustainable. It was deleted only for highway/access reasons and later work has shown that these can be overcome (as agreed by the Highway Authority). Therefore there is no legitimate impediment to reinstatement. The site can be developed for 80 dwellings, independently of other proposals. It is available for immediate development.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

1. In the First Deposit of the Local Plan there were two relatively small housing allocations to the north and south of Arnold Lane at its junction with Plains Road / Mapperley Plains. There were several objections to these allocations at the time of the First Deposit. The Second Deposit deleted both the allocations. This objection to the Second Deposit seeks the reinstatement of the allocation south of Arnold Lane.
2. I am treating the earlier objections to the First Deposit as support for the plan as it now stands and take them into account here.
3. The Council confirms that this site was deleted as a housing allocation after the First Deposit because of a highway objection. The Council also confirms that an acceptable means of access has now been agreed with the Highway Authority that takes into account the alignment of the Gedling Colliery / Chase Farm Access Road in this area. The Council confirms that the only objection to the allocation has now been overcome.
4. The Council sees this as a relatively sustainable urban extension, although it would prefer the Gedling Colliery / Chase Farm Access Road to be in place first. In my view this may be desirable but would not be a reasonable requirement for such a small site.
5. There are impressive long distance views from and across this site to the Trent valley. However, the Council says that the purpose of its policy of protecting ridgelines from development is to contain the spread of the urban area rather than to control development within it. This site is regarded as being within the urban area. In any event having looked at the site, I note that the outward views contain long range vistas rather than short distance ones. This leads me to believe that development on the site would not be obtrusive from its immediate surroundings. In long distance views of the site from the golf course and the Trent valley below the site would be seen, if at all, in the context of its surroundings which are generally already developed. Furthermore, the site drops away from the crest of the ridge. This means that the access to the site and layout within it could preserve some vantage-points from which the Trent valley could still be seen. All in all I conclude that the site's development would not harm the landscape or townscape so much as to preclude development. I reach this conclusion in the knowledge of appeal decisions affecting this site.
6. I note the objections to the First Deposit to the effect that there would be too many houses on this site and in this area and that the infrastructure is inadequate. However, I do not accept that a site of this relatively small size would cause undue harm in either

of these respects. If improvements to services were needed because of this site's development they could be secured through developer contributions.

7. As to the objections concerning traffic, the Highway Authority has now accepted that a safe access that is compatible with the Gedling Colliery / Chase Farm Access Road can be provided.
8. The potential capacity of the site is agreed between the (Second Deposit) objectors and the Council at about 80 dwellings.
9. At the Local Plan Inquiry there was considerable discussion about the priority and phasing of this site. In my view it is the sort of site that can make a small but early (and therefore valuable) contribution to improving the housing land supply in the borough. I consider that no impediment should be placed in the way of the site's early development. I therefore see no reason to phase or delay development of this site.
10. I conclude that the site should be allocated for housing in policy H2 of the Local Plan. The text accompanying that policy would need to set out any requirements that development on this site would have to meet, such as special access requirements and any necessary contributions to local services.

RECOMMENDATION

- 11. I recommend that policy H2 of the Local Plan is modified to allocate this site (Plains Road / Arnold Lane: South) for residential development with a capacity of about 80 dwellings.**
 - 12. I further recommend that the text accompanying policy H2 should be modified to set out the requirements that this site's development would have to meet (such as special access requirements and any necessary contributions to local services).**
-

2.60 H2 DISTRIBUTION OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT SITE DESCRIPTION: PARK ROAD, BESTWOOD

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000721	001318	St Modwen Developments Ltd

Summary of Objection

Part of paragraph 2.17 in the First Deposit was objected to.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

1. The contentious words in the First Deposit were: “whereas the existing industrial land at Bestwood Village can be considered as brownfield land and is treated as a policy area rather than a new proposal in employment terms.” This wording was deleted in the Second Deposit and appears to have been replaced by (paragraph 2.21) “Park Road Bestwood is previously developed land.” I consider that this change meets the objection and even if it does not it is an unexceptional statement of fact.
2. I conclude that no (further) modification is needed.

RECOMMENDATION

3. I recommend no modification to the Local Plan in response to this objection.
-

2.61 H2 DISTRIBUTION OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT SUMMARY AND OVERVIEW OF RECOMMENDATIONS

The above recommendations on policy H1 and H2 can be summarised as follows:

Policy H1	Second Deposit	Recommendation	Change
Completions	2665	2670	
Existing Planning Permissions	754	750	
Additional Commitments	384	380	
Urban Capacity	685	640	- 50
Commercial Windfall Allowance	392	390	
Lapsed Permissions	74	70	
Conversions / COUs	143	140	
TOTAL	5097	5040	

Therefore allocated sites in policy H2 are to amount to about 2960 dwellings.

Policy H2 Sites	Second Deposit	Recommendation	Change
Ashwater Drive / Spring Lane	140	140	0
Former Newstead Sports Ground	84	80	0
Gedling Colliery / Chase Farm (see H3)	1118	(1120) 700	- 420
Park Road Bestwood (see policy H6)	224	175	- 49
Stockings Farm	424	360	- 64
Wood Lane	40	40	0
Chartwell Grove	43	40	0
Flatts Lane Calverton	90	90	0
Linden Grove	140	0	- 140
North of Victoria Park	244	0	- 244
Park Avenue Burton Joyce	78	0	- 78
Teal Close	210	0	- 210
Dark Lane Calverton	0	110	+ 110
Howbeck Road	0	50	+ 50
Plains Road / Arnold Lane (south)	0	80	+ 80
Regina Crescent Ravenshead	0	140	+ 140
Top Wighay Farm	0	955	+ 955
TOTAL	2835	2960	

2.62 H3 LAND AT FORMER GEDLING COLLIERY AND CHASE FARM

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000097	000122	3rd Woodthorpe (St Marks) Scout Group

Summary of Objection

The development would come too close to an existing Scout training ground and could interfere with Scout activities. Also, the access to adjoining farmland would need sorting out.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000179	000988	Mr J Hand
000179	200772	Mr J Hand
000179	200773	Mr J Hand

Summary of Objection

Chase Farm should be kept as Green Belt, housing should go into the urban area. The proposal will cause traffic congestion. Opposed to the access road, especially on its Second Deposit alignment because of its impact on amenity, damage to the landscape, impact on wildlife and disruption in the Lambley Lane area.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000413	201618	East Midlands Development Agency

Summary of Objection

The Local Plan is over-optimistic about the extent to which people will switch from cars to public transport.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000559	201303	Dr P Martin

Summary of Objection

Too much traffic would be directed onto Plains Road.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000715	001059	Sport England
000715	001060	Sport England

Summary of Objection

The need to provide sports pitches to serve this development should be specifically referred to.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000717	001504	Nottinghamshire County Council
000717	001505	Nottinghamshire County Council
000717	201429	Nottinghamshire County Council

Summary of Objection

A full Transport Impact Assessment will be needed, including details of public transport. (The County Council considers this a matter of such importance as to threaten the general conformity of the Local Plan with the Structure Plan.)

The access road conflicts with the Structure Plan bypass proposal. (The County Council considers this a matter of such importance as to threaten the general conformity of the Local Plan with the Structure Plan.)

The access road will need to be funded by the developer and open before any dwellings are occupied. It is not clear how the development can be completed by 2011.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001090	002295	Alan Rowe Properties

Summary of Objection

The housing development should be extended to include land at Glebe Farm. Lambley Lane.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001158	002442	Nottinghamshire County Council (Strategic Property)
001158	002443	Nottinghamshire County Council (Strategic Property)

Summary of Objection

There is an over-concentration of the borough's housing land at this site, yet its access and delivery are uncertain. The site is not well related to employment in Gedling and insufficient employment land is being allocated here for this to be a balanced mixed development. There are also practical difficulties.

The land is not all previously developed. The land fulfils a valuable Green Belt function.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001324	002770	Langridge Homes Ltd

Summary of Objection

The number of dwellings should be limited to 1000. None should be occupied before the access road is built. The railway should be a priority and should be funded by the developer(s).

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001327	201430	Gedling Village Preservation Society

Summary of Objection

The extension of the site in the Second Deposit is objected to. GBC's sequential approach is flawed and unfair. Allocate land at Top Wighay Farm instead.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001330	002929	Council for the Protection of Rural England

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001330	201809	Council for the Protection of Rural England

Summary of Objection

Most of the site is greenfield land. It is also important Green Belt. There would be too much development in one area, so phase the site. The Park and Ride proposal is too large. The road would be obtrusive and would not reduce traffic in the long term.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001337	003073	Messrs J N C&T Cutts
001337	200588	Messrs J N C&T Cutts

Summary of Objection

Extend the site to the east of Lambley Lane. Because site is unlikely to deliver as many dwellings as planned, reduce the site and substitute land in Ravenshead.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001344	003126	Slack; Kirkham; Goldby; Grococks (Joint)
001344	201421	Slack; Kirkham; Goldby; Grococks (Joint)
001939	201274	CWS Property

Summary of Objection

Because the site is unlikely to deliver as many dwellings as planned, reduce the site's area and substitute land elsewhere.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001345	003180	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust

Summary of Objection

Not opposed to development in principle but the road should not be included. Increase the density of development on the site. The site has areas with wildlife conservation potential; these need careful treatment and retention. The development brief must be based on an Ecological Assessment.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001620	003834	Gedling Liberal Democrats
001620	003835	Gedling Liberal Democrats

Summary of Objection

The access road is inadequate and will lead to problems on A612.

A survey of surface water run-off is needed.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001664	003935	W Hardy & Sons

Summary of Objection

The site includes Green Belt for development before there has been sufficient examination of alternatives.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001862	004254	Mr D Macknight
001862	201838	Mr D Macknight

Summary of Objection

70% of site is agricultural land and Green Belt, this should not be used, especially Grade 3a agricultural land when lower grade land is available elsewhere. Accessibility to the site is poor. Sewage and drainage facilities are already over-stretched. Change the name of this site and/or look for housing land elsewhere.

The sequential approach has been unfairly applied. Not all brownfield sites have been considered. Delete this allocation and use Top Wighay Farm instead.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001955	004667	Gedling Labour Group

Summary of Objection

All the developers' traffic must use the access road. The requirement for open space can be reduced at this site because of the golf course, Country Park and Lambley Lane recreation ground nearby.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
003835	010545	R.A.G.E.

Summary of Objection

No objection in principle but local shopping facilities would not be viable at this site.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
003932	010766	R.J.B. Mining Ltd

Summary of Objection

The need for, and alignment of the access road is questioned. Lower open space standards could be applied at this site. The site should be extended to maximise the use of despoiled land.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
003945	010777	Priory School

Summary of Objection

The local infrastructure is inadequate, especially education facilities.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
003972	010826	Metro Jennings Ltd
003972	010836	Metro Jennings Ltd

Summary of Objection

More sustainable sites are available elsewhere. It is wrong to assume that the brownfield land is viable and suitable for housing. Development at Gedling Wood Farm would be better,

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
004217	200366	Mr G T Wood
004366	200566	Mrs G T Wood

Summary of Objection

The access/relief road (Second Deposit alignment) is only 23 metres from our house and on an embankment which is only 10 metres away. The visual impact, fumes and noise would harm residential amenity. The road cuts Gedling Village off from the Country Park. Concerns over wildlife.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001193	201830	Mr M Hudson-Scott

Summary of Objection

Concerned about air and light pollution due to the development and local topography; impact on wildlife and congestion.

AND ABOUT 400 INDIVIDUAL OBJECTIONS

ALSO DEALT WITH HERE ARE OBJECTIONS TO POLICY H2 (DISTRIBUTION OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT) THAT RELATE TO GEDLING COLLIERY AND CHASE FARM

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000130	000163	Mr M Eaton
000179	000232	Mr J Hand

Summary of Objection

There are too many houses on one site and in one part of the borough. Retain as Green Belt. Local infrastructure and services are inadequate. Develop only the brownfield parts of this site. Look for other sites in the urban area and elsewhere and increase densities.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000559	000800	Dr P Martin

Summary of Objection

Too much traffic would be generated. Local services are inadequate. Retain the Green Belt and open spaces. Wildlife would be harmed. Find brownfield sites.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001021	002198	Hallam Land Management Ltd

Summary of Objection

Better public transport is needed and is available at other locations. The employment allocation is too small to allow people to live near to their work.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001158	2418	Nottinghamshire County Council (Strategic Property)

Summary of Objection

The reasons for this objection are the same as for the objections to policy H3.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001326	002860	Mr F Rodrigues
001327	002873	Gedling Village Preservation Society

Summary of Objection

There are too many houses on one site and in one part of the borough. Retain as Green Belt, especially Chase Farm. Develop only the brownfield parts of this site. Look for other sites in the urban area and elsewhere and increase densities. This site is not urban fringe. The full Gedling Bypass would need to be built first.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001345	003212	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust

Summary of Objection

The reasons for this objection are the same as for the objections to policy H3.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001193	010869	Mr M Hudson-Scott

Summary of Objection

Loss of wildlife and Green Belt. Traffic noise, pollution and disturbance.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001949	004599	c/o J H Walter Rural Consultants

Because of poor transport facilities this is not a sustainable location, look elsewhere.

AND AVER 130 INDIVIDUAL OBJECTIONS TO POLICY H2

ALSO DEALT WITH HERE IS AN OBJECTION TO POLICY H4 (WHITE LAND) (FIRST DEPOSIT) THAT RELATES TO GEDLING COLLIERY AND CHASE FARM

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001326	002858	Mr F Rodrigues

Summary of Objection

The Council's sequential approach is unfair. Millfield Close Burton Joyce, Top Wighay Farm, New Farm and Teal Close should be allocated for housing (instead of GCCF) to achieve a fairer distribution.

ALSO DEALT WITH HERE ARE OBJECTIONS TO POLICY H4 (MANAGED RELEASE OF HOUSING SITES) (SECOND DEPOSIT) THAT RELATE TO GEDLING COLLIERY AND CHASE FARM

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001939	201274	CWS Property & Development

Summary of Objection

Objection to the scale of housing at Gedling Colliery. The site is dependent on a new road and this will result in a shortfall. Reinstate allocations such as Papplewick Lane to address the shortfall.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000413	201613	East Midlands Development Agency

Summary of Objection

Supports principle of phasing. EMDA is undertaking work to establish scale of development on Gedling Colliery achievable in each phase. Until this work is completed, there is a holding objection to phasing.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000722	201976	Severn Trent Water Limited

Summary of Objection

It is unrealistic to assume the whole of the site will be developed in the plan period.

MANY OTHER OBJECTORS REFER TO THE TIMING OF THE DEVELOPMENT BUT THE COMMENTS HAVE NOT ALWAYS BEEN RECORDED AS OBJECTIONS TO POLICY H4

ALSO DEALT WITH HERE ARE OBJECTIONS TO POLICY H6 (RESIDENTIAL DENSITY) THAT RELATE TO GEDLING COLLIERY AND CHASE FARM

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000413	201627	East Midlands Development Agency

Summary of Objection

Work is being undertaken on the amount of housing and other uses on the site. Until this work is completed there is a holding objection to the number of dwellings.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001330	201811	CPRE

Summary of Objection

The density at this site should be increased by 5% because of the adjacent country park proposal.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
004862	201294	Mr P Dosanjh

Summary of Objection

The density of houses at Gedling Colliery should be increased to protect Green Belt land.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001898	200603	Mr P Smith
001899	200602	Mrs J Smith

Summary of Objection

Too many houses are proposed for the site.

MANY OTHER OBJECTIONS REFER TO THE NUMBER OF DWELLINGS PROPOSED BUT THE COMMENTS HAVE NOT ALWAYS BEEN RECORDED AS OBJECTIONS TO POLICY H6

ALSO DEALT WITH HERE ARE OBJECTIONS TO POLICY T3 (PROPOSED TRANSPORT SCHEMES: GEDLING ACCESS ROAD / RELIEF ROAD AND GEDLING PASSENGER RAIL LINE)

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000130	000162	Mr M Eaton
000130	000165	Mrs G Eaton

Summary of Objection

The proposed road is only an access to the development and will not act as a bypass. A full bypass is needed with traffic calming and restrictions on existing roads.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000160	000210	Carlton Le Willows School

Summary of Objection

Pupils from Burton Joyce attending Carlton Le Willows School would have to cross the new road and this would be unsafe. The road will increase traffic on A612.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000179	000236	Mr J Hand
000559	000799	Dr P Martin

Summary of Objection

The proposed road is only an access to the development and will not act as a bypass. A full bypass is needed with traffic calming and restrictions on existing roads. There is particular concern about increased traffic on Lambley Lane.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000413	000594	EMDA

Summary of Objection

EMDA reserved its position on the First Deposit line of road in order to look at alternatives.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000717	001520	Nottinghamshire County Council

Summary of Objection

The proposed road is an access to development not a transport scheme. The line of the full bypass should be protected. (The County Council considers this a matter of such importance as to threaten the general conformity of the Local Plan with the Structure Plan.) (Also, the Highway Authority says that no dwellings should be occupied on the Gedling Colliery / Chase Farm site until the access road is completed.)

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001158	002444	Nottinghamshire County Council (Strategic Property)

Summary of Objection

The function of the proposed Relief/Access/Bypass Road is confused. The road should precede the proposed housing and long-term transport proposals should not be protected (PPG12). There should be a strong presumption against a new road unless other options are impractical. 1430 houses probably cannot support the cost of the road. The proposal is premature until the Structure Plan bypass proposal is formally reviewed.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001324	002863	Langridge Homes Ltd
001324	201323	Langridge Homes Ltd

Summary of Objection

The relief road should not be seen as a long-term project. Also the alignment should be further out from the built up area. An explanation of why the Gedling Relief Road is not in the plan should be added

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001326	002856	Mr F Rodrigues
001327	002874	Gedling Village Preservation Society
001862	004195	Mr D MacKnight

Summary of Objection

The proposed road is only an access and not the full bypass. A full bypass is necessary if congestion is to be avoided. The proposal is not in accord with the bypass proposal in the Structure Plan.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001330	003007	Council for the Protection of Rural England

Summary of Objection

A relief road is unnecessary and would increase the general level of traffic. It would harm the Green Belt and countryside.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001337	003080	Messrs J N C & T Cutts

Summary of Objection

The road should be realigned further from the built up area.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001345	003223	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust

Summary of Objection

The road would harm the landscape, the countryside and wildlife.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001620	003837	Gedling Liberal Democrats

Summary of Objection

An extension is needed from this road to the Colwick loop road.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
003972	010827	Metro Jennings Ltd

Summary of Objection

The alignment will harm Gedling village and does not respect the topography. The road should be further from the built up area. Funding is not certain.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
003981	010868	English Heritage

Summary of Objection

The road would harm the setting of Gedling House (Grade II listed) and the landscape.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
004217	200366	Mr G T Wood
004366	200566	Mr G T Wood

Summary of Objection

The realignment in the Second Deposit would have a very harmful impact on properties in Lambley Lane.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001158	003651	Mr J Finn

Summary of Objection

Concern about noise from trains on the rail line in nearby homes.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
4900	201514	Mr J Broomhead

Summary of Objection

With the reduced number of houses in the Second Deposit, the rail proposal is not viable. Bus and trams proposals in Nottingham emphasise the inappropriateness of a single rail spur.

AND OVER 400 INDIVIDUAL OBJECTIONS

ALSO DEALT WITH HERE ARE OBJECTIONS TO POLICY T4 (PARK AND RIDE – GEDLING COLLIERY)

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000179	000233	Mr J Hand
000432	000614	Lambley Parish Council
001158	002453	Nottinghamshire County Council (Strategic Property)
001193	010870	Mr M Hudson-Scott
001193	201831	Mr M Hudson-Scott
001324	002768	Langridge Homes
001326	002866	Mr F Rodrigues
001327	002869	Gedling Village Preservation Society

AND ABOUT 150 INDIVIDUAL OBJECTIONS

Summary of Objections

The scheme will draw traffic to an already congested area with unsuitable roads. It will cause harm to road safety, amenity and the environment. It is also said that the reduction in the number of houses (in the Second Deposit) will exacerbate this problem.

Particular fears about traffic in Lambley with vehicles accessing the facility from east of Nottingham. This is a rat-run already, using country lanes.

Some objectors raise the possibility of increased crime.

One objector supports the proposal if the railway line is made secure (concern for children playing).

It is also said that the site is not within a transport corridor and there is a lack of demand here.

ALSO DEALT WITH HERE ARE OBJECTIONS TO POLICY ENV26 (CONTROL OVER DEVELOPMENT IN THE GREEN BELT)

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001021	002196	Hallam Land Management Ltd
001949	010876	c/o J H Walter Rural Consultants

AND 5 INDIVIDUAL OBJECTIONS

Summary of Objections

The site is in the Green Belt and should remain so. This is an attractive tract of farmland. Priority should be to develop brownfield sites. Also the impact of the access road on Gedling Wood is objected to.

IN ADDITION MANY OBJECTORS TO POLICIES H2 AND H3 REFER TO THE GREEN BELT.

ALSO DEALT WITH HERE ARE OBJECTIONS TO POLICY E1 (ALLOCATION OF EMPLOYMENT LAND OBJECTION SITE: FORMER GEDLING COLLIERY)

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000413	201612	East Midlands Development Agency

Summary of Objection

There may be scope to increase employment area at Gedling Colliery beyond 3 ha. EMDA is exploring this.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000706	001020	Mr G Smith

Summary of Objection

There is no need for more employment land. Keep as Green Belt.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000717	001518	Nottinghamshire County Council

Summary of Objection

A full Transport Impact Assessment is needed. (The County Council considers this a matter of such importance as to threaten the general conformity of the Local Plan with the Structure Plan.)

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001345	003311	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust

Summary of Objection

Site has potential as protected wildlife area; leave wholly or partly undeveloped.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001258	004353	Mr C Brocklehurst
001558	003652	Mr J Finn

Summary of Objection

The site is not suitable because of HGVs on unsuitable roads.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001552	003615	Mrs P Weaver
001555	003627	Mr B Lakin

Summary of Objection

New employment land is not needed, there is enough elsewhere.

ALSO DEALT WITH HERE ARE OBJECTIONS TO POLICY C2 (COMMUNITY FACILITIES FOR MAJOR DEVELOPMENT SITES) IN AS FAR AS THE OBJECTIONS RELATE TO THIS SITE

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001025	004357	Mrs M Hunt
001030	002219	Mr S Hill
001210	004494	Mr F Kelsey

Summary of Objection

Enough school places should be provided within the development at Gedling Colliery / Chase Farm to avoid the need for trips by car to existing schools.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001158	002456	Nottinghamshire County Council (Strategic Property)
001345	003255	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust

Summary of Objection

Opposed as a consequence of opposition to the whole Gedling Colliery / Chase Farm development.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

Terminology

1. I shall refer to these proposals as “Gedling Colliery / Chase Farm”, abbreviated to “GCCF”. When I refer to “the site” or “the allocation” I shall be referring to the whole of the proposed development. When I refer to the “housing allocation” or the “employment allocation” I shall be referring to those specific parts of the whole.
2. I shall refer to the associated road proposal as the “GCCF Access Road” or “the access road”. This is to be distinguished from an older proposal for a Gedling Bypass or Gedling Relief Road, which was included in the Structure Plan and previous Local Plans. I shall call these older proposals the “Gedling Relief Road”, the “relief road”, “GRR” or the “bypass”.

Context

3. This is the largest development area proposed in the Local Plan and it has ramifications throughout the plan. It has also given rise to a large number of objections. As set out above, the policies to which there have been objections arising from this proposal are:

ENV26 (Control Over Development in the Green Belt),
 H2 (Distribution of Residential Development),
 H3 (Land at Former Gedling Colliery and Chase Farm),
 H4 (Managed Release of Housing Sites),
 H6 (Residential Density),
 E1 (Allocation of Employment Land)
 T3 (Proposed Transport Schemes),
 T4 (Park and Ride),
 C2 (Community Facilities for Major Development Sites)

4. There are also a lot of objections (and there was a full session of the Housing Round Table) about the possible timing of development at GCCF and its relationship to the overall supply of housing land in policies H1 and H2.
5. Although objector 1158 has objections listed above they said at the Local Plan Inquiry that they do not object to the principle of development at GCCF.
6. For convenience I deal with all these matters and all the objections relating to them and GCCF here.
7. There are also three objections (one each) to policies ENV27 (Re-Use of Buildings in the Green Belt), ENV28 (Extensions to Dwellings in the Green Belt) and ENV29 (Replacement of Dwellings in the Green Belt) that purport to be related to GCCF. In my view the linkage is tenuous and I deal with these objections in the context of the Environment policies.

Site Selection and the Principle of Development

8. Many objectors to this proposal, especially local residents, start by asserting that the Council is providing too much land for (residential) development overall. As will be seen from my detailed consideration of policies H1 and H2, I do not share this view.

9. It is also frequently said that land within the urban area should be used before Green Belt land is taken. Whilst I very much agree with this approach, there are just not enough urban sites in the borough to avoid developing a substantial amount of Green Belt land. Some of the sites referred to in this context (for example the former EMEB offices at Coppice Road) were already developed by the time of the Local Plan Inquiry and were no longer available. However, they have been included in both the Council's and my calculations.
10. Even amongst objectors there is widespread – but not universal – acceptance that the land that was formerly part of the colliery is previously developed land and should be redeveloped. This is certainly my view. Having established this, the issue to be resolved is how much more land needs to be developed to achieve a viable allocation. Linked to, but separate from, this is the issue of how much land should be taken out of the Green Belt to create a clear and defensible boundary for the Green Belt.
11. In resolving these issues, a major consideration is the large area covered by the former colliery's spoil heaps. This is an important topographic feature in the landscape that effectively separates the land to the southwest from the wider Green Belt to the north and east. The future of the spoil heaps is not entirely clear because their re-working for minerals and reclamation as a country park was no longer certain at the time of the Local Plan Inquiry. This area looks likely to remain a substantial physical barrier that cannot be developed because of less than stable ground conditions.
12. At the start of Local Plan preparation the Council undertook a "sieve analysis" to establish which parts of the Green Belt could be regarded as (relatively) free from the sort of constraints that should preclude development. No doubt taking the separating effect of the spoil heaps into account, GBC decided that all the open land on the Gedling side of the heaps should be regarded as relatively free from constraint and potentially available for development. I cannot fault this reasoning, which seems to me to be both reasonable and consistent with the Council's assessment of the Green Belt elsewhere in the borough.
13. I take this view even though greenfield agricultural land at Chase Farm is identified as being (relatively) free from constraint. If the necessary amount of housing land is to be found in the borough a considerable amount of Green Belt / greenfield / agricultural land will be required either here or elsewhere. There is nothing in the evidence presented to me that suggests that the intrinsic qualities of the land now allocated for development at GCCF in any of these respects warrants its protection as a priority. For example the agricultural land involved is of mixed quality and it is difficult to sustain an objection on this basis – the Ministry of Agriculture does not seek to do so.
14. I note in this context that the western "finger" of development included in the First Deposit allocation was deleted in the Second Deposit. This reduces the use of greenfield land in the development. This change may go some way towards meeting some of the objections to the First Deposit concerning the loss of open farmland. However, I realise that this land is still removed from the Green Belt and is affected by the access road.
15. Some objectors complain that the sieve analysis was biased and that this part of the borough was treated "unfairly". Thus far in the site selection process I cannot see any

reason to take this view. I tried to explore what was meant by “unfair” during the Inquiry and, as far as some objectors were concerned, they seemed to be saying that development should be spread evenly throughout the borough. This is not a view I share because not all parts of the borough have the same characteristics and merits. Be that as it may, such an approach is the antithesis of planning, which ought to be a reasoned process for deciding where development should be located. To seek to “spread it around” as an end in itself would amount to a denial that the location of development can be planned rationally.

16. But perhaps it is the next part of the site selection process that objectors feel is unfair. What followed was the Council narrowing down of the wider search pool to specific allocations. In this the Council favoured urban extensions and this is in accord with government guidance and the Structure Plan. For this reason I find no fault in this as a guiding principle in the allocation process. I note that GCCF has been a consistent element in the Council's thinking throughout this process.
17. Objectors refer to other sites that they would prefer as alternatives to GCCF. The most commonly referred to alternative sites (*and my comments upon them*) are as follows:
 - previously developed land (*agreed, but part of this allocation is previously developed land and there is not enough of this sort of land elsewhere to make the allocation at GCCF unnecessary*);
 - urban sites (*again agreed, but there are not enough of these sites to replace GCCF*);
 - land at Top Wighay Farm (*but my view is that land at Top Wighay Farm will be needed in addition to, not instead of, GCCF*);
 - New Farm Redhill (*development at New Farm would be less clearly contained by topography, more prominent and more harmful visually than GCCF. New Farm is also affected by traffic congestion, perhaps with less prospect of a viable solution being found than at GCCF*);
 - land in villages (*generally less sustainable locations and less in accord with government guidance and the Structure Plan. In any event, not enough land could be found in the villages to provide an adequate alternative to GCCF*).
18. Thus, having considered the matter in principle, my assessment is that land at GCCF is needed for, and suitable for, relatively large-scale development. Furthermore on the basis of the analysis so far, I see some merit in maximising the amount of land to be allocated here. I say this because this land is so physically self-contained (because of the spoil heaps) and because the area is an extension to the urban area that does not intrude into the wider Green Belt. It is also the case that some of the land is previously developed rather than being exclusively greenfield land and the reliance on greenfield land has been reduced in the Second Deposit. I consider that achieving a substantial development at GCCF would have planning merits and would be one of the best ways of satisfying the need to find developable land in the Local Plan.
19. I recognise that this leaves to one side, for the moment, transport and traffic considerations but I shall explore these in detail now.

The Access Road

20. The Gedling Relief Road was included in policy T3 in the First Deposit but is not listed there in the Second Deposit. Nevertheless the access road is part of the Local Plan and part of the GCCF proposal – policy H3 (a)(i). I therefore deal with the proposed road, and all the objections to it, here.
21. Objections to the First Deposit said the Local Plan is confused (and confusing) about the relationship between the proposed access road and the older GRR or bypass proposal. In the Second Deposit the access road has, in effect, been removed from policy T3 and is mainly referred to in policy H3. I consider this removes any confusion. It is now clear that there is no proposal in the Local Plan called “relief road” or “bypass” and the only proposal in the plan is the “access road”. It seems to me that this is how most objectors understand the situation.
22. There is an unresolved objection to the First Deposit from the County Council (717 1505) that the proposed development prejudices the protected line of the bypass that is included in the Structure Plan. However, the Structure Plan bypass proposal is not included in the Local Transport Plan. The Local Plan says (paragraph 2.28) that although the Gedling By-pass is identified as a long term proposal in the Structure Plan, it is clear there is no likelihood of public funds becoming available for its construction in the plan period. I have no evidence that indicates otherwise. In these circumstances, bearing government guidance in mind, such a long-term and uncertain proposal should not be included in the Local Plan. If the access road is built, this would make the bypass proposal even less likely to proceed as a scheme in its own right. I conclude that the Local Plan is right not to protect a bypass as well as the access road.
23. Moreover, I do not consider this is a matter on which the Local Plan can be said to be “out of general conformity” with the Structure Plan and that the Local Plan as a whole should be overturned.
24. I see no need to list the current proposal for a new road in policy T3 as well as policy H3, as some suggest. I deal with the northern section of the protected bypass (Mapperley Plains to Arno Vale) where I consider the County Council's objection to policy R1.

The Traffic Objection to the Development

25. One of the most widespread objections to the GCCF development is that the existing roads in the area are congested and unsafe and simply cannot, must not, take any more traffic. Therefore, because the development would generate traffic it should not go ahead. The situation – congestion and safety – in Gedling village is particularly acute but other roads and areas are mentioned (for example Lambley Lane).
26. My understanding of the two Councils' evidence is that the Planning Authority (GBC) and Highway Authority (NCC) generally agree with this overall assessment. Indeed, the landowners/developers appear not to disagree in principle either. (There is a caveat to this agreement as far as the landowners/developers and GBC are concerned relating to a possible first phase of development, which I shall return to later.) Thus on the basis of the technical and other evidence presented to me I have no reason to disagree with the proposition that the road system in this part of the borough has already reached or exceeded its safe capacity.

27. However, the Planning Authority, Highway Authority and landowners/developers also agree that with the construction of a single carriageway access road (connecting GCCF to the A612 in the south and Mapperley Plains in the north) the existing road network would not have to carry additional traffic. Indeed, they say there would be some scope for reducing through-traffic on the existing roads by diverting traffic onto the access road. This assessment is based on detailed and comprehensive traffic predictions that have not been challenged or shown to be inadequate or faulty. I have no evidence that would lead me to disagree with or reject this proposition, which in my view successfully counters the “traffic objection” to the proposed development.

The Access Road in Principle

28. The proposed access road has been objected to, as it were, from both sides. There are those (mainly residents in Gedling) who say the proposed road is not big enough to act as the Gedling Bypass they want and were led to expect by the Structure Plan. On the other side, there are those (for example CPRE, the Wildlife Trust and residents who would be directly affected by the road) who say the road would harm amenity and the environment to such an extent that it should not be built at all.
29. The proposed road is being designed as an access to the GCCF development. In a sense it would be an improper inducement to permit the development if it was designed to achieve materially more than this. Nevertheless, if built (especially in conjunction with the proposed A612 new alignment), the access road would change the road network northeast of Nottingham. The new road would become the most direct route not only for traffic to and from GCCF but also for through-traffic between A612 and Arnold. This could be reinforced by appropriate sign posting (for strangers to the area) and by traffic management measures (to influence local drivers). This would bring about some relief from through-traffic on the existing roads, for example in Gedling village. Heavy goods vehicles in particular could be re-routed onto the new road.
30. The organised local objectors at the Inquiry did not accept this. Although I probed their views, I am not entirely clear why. They had no evidence to demonstrate that what was being claimed was unlikely to happen. It seemed they felt they “deserved” a “full” bypass and were prepared to wait for as long as it took to get one. They said they were prepared to wait forever provided the GCCF development was also prevented.
31. Frankly, as was probably apparent at the Inquiry, I find it difficult to understand this. My understanding of current transport policy suggests that a publicly funded bypass would take a very long time indeed. In the meantime traffic conditions in Gedling village are likely to get worse. It seems to me that the pursuit of the perfect (as these objectors perceive it) is the enemy of the good (because it prevents them from accepting anything less). I do not know why it is assumed a bypass would be a dual carriageway.
32. However, to an extent this is beside the point because the test to apply to the road and development proposals is not so much “will they improve traffic conditions?” as “will they make matters worse?” Even if local residents are right that the new road would do little or nothing to ease traffic on existing roads, I still have no evidence that the GCCF development and the road (taken together) would cause a significant worsening in local traffic conditions. Therefore, even if I accept completely that traffic conditions in and around Gedling are as bad as people say, I have no persuasive evidence that the GCCF allocation would make them worse provided the access road is also built.

33. As far as the objectors in principle to a new road are concerned, it seems to me that they would also object to a bypass. I note that a bypass was included in the Structure Plan and was protected in much the same position as the access road in the First Deposit of the Local Plan. Two issues arise: first, would the road be so damaging as to outweigh what I see as the planning benefits of achieving a substantial development at GCCF and second, is the alignment of the proposed road the best available.
34. In reaching a view on these matters I am hampered by the lack of a full Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA). An EIA would provide considerable information on which to base a decision and could also change some aspects of the proposed road design. But working on the information I have and looking at the principle, I consider I can reach a robust view on whether the road (and thus the whole allocation) should be retained in the Local Plan. The impacts that need to be assessed include:
- the effects on residential properties and their amenity;
 - the effects on the landscape and countryside;
 - the effects on wildlife;
 - the impact on the setting of Gedling House.

The Effect of the Road on Homes

35. As far as residential amenity is concerned, there are a relatively few properties that would be close enough to the road to suffer **material** harm to their outlook or from traffic noise. For example, it does look (on the basis of the plans available at the Inquiry) as if objectors 4217 and 4366 (Mr & Mrs Wood who live in the property in Lambley Lane that is closest to the currently proposed alignment) would be quite severely affected. However, I have no details of the mitigation measures (possibly changed levels, landscaping and screening) that could be included in the scheme. Neither do I know what land and properties would be bought as part of the scheme (and Mr & Mrs Wood said they would prefer to move than suffer severely reduced amenity). Even so and in spite of this lack of detail, at this stage and in principle I see no reason why a satisfactory solution could not be arrived at.
36. Other properties and objectors (for example those living in Glebe Farm View such as objector 179, Mr Hand) would also be affected but are further from the currently proposed alignment. Whilst I understand the basis for their objections, it does not seem to me that they are so near to, or so affected by, the road that the scheme is called into question because of the impact on them.
37. On balance I consider that, as far as the likely impact on residential amenity is concerned, at this stage the scheme should be retained and work progressed on the detailed design, mitigation measures and land-take. The Second Deposit alignment would affect fewer homes than the First Deposit route.

Impact on the Landscape

38. That there would be an impact on the landscape is undeniable but again the extent of cuttings, embankments, landscaping and mitigation measures is not known yet. The indications are that in the most sensitive parts of the route the road would be in cutting, reducing its impact. It also seems to me to be pertinent that there is a road scheme in the Structure Plan in this general area (the GRR) and that the Highway Authority (and others) would be pressing for its retention, all the more if the access road were abandoned. If the alignment of the access road was changed for good reason between

the First and Second Deposits similar considerations would also be likely to arise if the GRR were being implemented. So comparison with a completely untrammelled future may not be entirely fair to the current proposal.

39. There are also fears that whatever road line is adopted would become the edge of the urban area with development taking place out to that line. This would exacerbate the impact of the road on the landscape and countryside. GBC proposed such “rounding off” in the First Deposit, although now the road line has been moved further out they take a different view. I support them in their current stance (see objections to land south of Lambley Lane) and consider that such an approach is tenable, especially if the road is far enough away from the existing edge of the urban area.
40. Thus, on balance I consider that the impact of the proposed access road on the landscape and countryside is not so demonstrably harmful that it warrants removing the proposal from the Local Plan. Further work on the design and EIA should be allowed to proceed so that a more informed decision can be taken in due course.

Other Matters

41. As far as the impact on wildlife is concerned, the same is true with even more force. The EIA will go into the impact on wildlife and appropriate mitigation measures in great detail. I note that Mr Hand says there are bats roosting in the buildings at Glebe Farm and others are concerned about birds. However, the Wildlife Trust does not appear to have any specific concerns. In the circumstances I have no reason to suppose that these matters cannot be left to the EIA to resolve.
42. As far as the setting of Gedling House and the objection from English Heritage are concerned, there would undoubtedly be an impact, although again comparison with the impact of the GRR scheme is relevant. There may be scope for considering an alteration to the alignment, the extent of cuttings and mitigation measures. However, I do not rule out the possibility of an acceptable outcome at this stage and expect that the EIA would explore this issue in detail.

The Access Road Alignment

43. Between the First Deposit and the Second Deposit the proposed alignment of the access road in the Local Plan was changed. The effect is to take the road further away from the built up area at Lambley Lane. The net result is that fewer (but different) homes would be close to the line of the road.
44. The road would be deeper into the countryside so that its direct impact on the landscape might be greater although, paradoxically, it might be easier to resist development in the gap between the existing built up area and the road. It would also be deeper in cutting in places, which might reduce its visual impact.
45. In other respects the impact of the changed route appears to me to be broadly neutral. The Council produced a paper setting out their reasons for the change and I find this is very persuasive. Thus, on the information available to me, I consider that the Second Deposit line is to be preferred. However, I would expect the EIA to explore this matter in detail so that a more robust decision is possible. In the meantime there are insufficient grounds to recommend that the line in the First Deposit is reintroduced into the Local Plan.

Development and Occupation in Advance of the Road

46. I have already referred to the unresolved difference between the Highway Authority (NCC) and GBC and the landowners/developers. What is at issue is whether any of the houses can be occupied before the access road is completed. The Highway Authority (supported by local opinion) says that conditions on nearby roads are so bad that no such dispensation should be written into the plan (although I did detect that there might be some small room for manoeuvre nearer the time). GBC and the landowners / developers see the advantages of early occupation because it would improve the cash flow and thus the viability of the overall development.
47. The Highway Authority produced a full and detailed technical case to substantiate its stance, but the reasons advanced in support of the relaxation seemed to me, at best, tenuous. I was not given detailed evidence to support the case that there is a need to increase the viability of the overall proposal by this means. I therefore consider that the case has not been made and there should be a presumption in the Local Plan against the occupation of any dwellings at GCCF before an access road is built.
48. Objector 001955 wants the Local Plan to go further because they say that all the developers' traffic should use the access road. This would have the effect of delaying the start of building (as opposed to occupation) until the road was finished. I have no evidence, and the Highway Authority did not suggest, that the construction of houses had to wait for the road. This would be a very severe constraint on development of the site and on balance I consider it would not be justified.

Conclusions on the Access Road

49. What I am considering here is the principle of the proposed GCCF access road in the context of the Local Plan. I do not have enough information to be taking a final decision on every detail of the road nor is it necessary that I do so. On this basis, and in the light of the evidence presented to me, I reach the following conclusions:
- the access road is a necessary component of the GCCF development;
 - the road would not be so damaging (or so ineffective) that it should be deleted from the Local Plan;
 - but further detailed design and environmental impact work will be needed;
 - on the basis of the evidence before me, the alignment in the Second Deposit is preferable to that in the First Deposit;
 - the GCCF access road should therefore be retained as a proposal in the Local Plan on the Second Deposit alignment;
 - the requirement that the access road is operating before any of the GCCF dwellings are occupied should be written into the Local Plan;
 - there is no need or reason to protect the line of a Gedling bypass in the Local Plan in addition to the access road.

The Passenger Rail Line

50. There is one objection to this proposal from a resident living close to the railway line. I accept that railway lines can be the source of noise and vibration and can cause disturbance to those living nearby. On the other hand this will not be a main line, will not be very busy and is unlikely to involve trains travelling at great speed or all hours of the night. I do not know (and it is too early to say) whether additional screening or noise barriers will be proposed. However, I do feel sure that the railway will be made secure to minimise the risk of trespass, which is a concern raised by another objector.
51. Another objector says that the rail proposal is inappropriate because bus and tram improvements elsewhere in Nottingham indicate that a single (heavy) rail spur would not be viable. I have no evidence as to the sort of transport that should be provided here. The objector may be right that a dedicated bus or tram route would make the best use of the route. Even if this is correct, it does not suggest to me that the protected alignment should be abandoned.
52. There will be clear and substantial planning, transport and communal benefits arising from the proposed passenger services. The benefits would be for residents in the new housing and for existing residents in the area. Taking all these things into account I conclude the protected rail alignment at GCCF should be retained in the Local Plan and on the Proposals Map.

Park and Ride

53. The proposed Park and Ride at GCCF has given rise to a considerable number of objections, the main reason being fears that the proposal would attract vehicles into the area and onto already congested roads. The Council says that only a small, local facility is planned so that its impact on the surrounding area will also be small.
54. It seems to me that users of the facility are likely to be one of the following:
- residents in the new GCCF development, in which case if they use the new facility to Park and Ride, their cars would be kept off local roads;
 - residents in the existing surrounding area whose journey pattern would be altered. This could reduce traffic on some roads but increase it on others. But it is difficult to see why the overall effect would be harmful;
 - longer distance travellers, some of whom may drive through the Gedling area now but others who would be attracted to the area to use the Park and Ride. Most of these would come to the Park and Ride on the access road (which is likely to be built before any Park and Ride opens), although there might be an increase in people coming from and through Lambley.
55. This brief analysis leads me towards the conclusion that most of the fears expressed by objectors are a rather one-sided view of the likely outcome. However, I acknowledge that if traffic through Lambley was materially increased some further action would be needed. It remains to be seen whether the combined effect of the proposed access road and the Park and Ride would increase traffic through Lambley or any other existing community – it is not obvious why it should. I consider that this matter can be left for review closer to the time of implementation.

56. I also see no reason to regard this proposal as being particularly likely to lead to more criminal activity because parked cars are likely to be less vulnerable on a properly managed car park. However, if there were a problem surveillance of the car park could be increased.
57. There are clear transport and sustainability advantages in persuading people to transfer from their cars to public transport, even for part of their journey. This is recognised in government guidance, which is generally supportive of Park and Ride. In any event, if the facility is small this will limit the numbers involved. I see no reason to suppose that there would be insufficient demand to support a small facility of this kind here, even with the reduced number of dwellings at GCCF in the Second Deposit.
58. It seems to me that the proposed rail link would have great benefits for the surrounding area and its residents (existing and proposed). Such a short spur railway may be of marginal viability and will only succeed if it is well used. The proposed Park and Ride is one way of increasing its use and improving its viability.
59. Taking all these things into account I conclude that the proposed Park and Ride facility should be retained in the Local Plan. However, this needs to be kept under review because my understanding is that this is not (yet) a confirmed proposal in the Local Transport Plan. It would clearly be undesirable to sterilise developable land if the Highway and Transport Authority do not adopt the Park and Ride proposal. I consider that the designation of a Park and Ride facility at GCCF should be reviewed at the time of the modifications and again at the start of development at GCCF.

Other Public Transport Issues

60. I note the County Council's original objection to the First Deposit saying that more information was needed on public transport services to this development. Apart from the rail link and the Park and Ride, upon which the development is not dependent (and which therefore may not be implemented until after the rest of the development), it is intended to access the site by bus – with existing services augmented and extended to serve the GCCF site. My understanding is that what is needed has been agreed in principle with the County (and Borough) Council. Certainly I have no evidence that what is proposed is unacceptable. In any event I consider it is not necessary to explore these service improvements in detail in a Local Plan Inquiry.
61. I therefore consider that improved public transport accessibility can be achieved by augmented and improved bus services to the site. I consider that this matter is adequately covered by policy H3 (a)(ii).

Housing

62. I have already reached some general conclusions about the suitability of this site for development. I deal here with other matters that have been raised in the objections.

Viability and Scale

63. Many objectors accept that there is a case for developing the previously developed land at Gedling Colliery but believe that the scale of development should be restricted to the 400 dwellings that can be accommodated on the colliery land. The Council's response is that this site will be expensive to develop, not least because of the access road. The Council says that 400 dwellings would not be enough to generate and justify

such an investment and I note that some professionally represented objectors express doubts as to whether even 1100 dwellings are enough for this purpose. The proposed access road for the whole site is single carriageway and could not be significantly smaller or less expensive if only part of the whole allocation was developed. I have no doubt at all that a significantly smaller allocation would not be viable.

64. In view of this I have reached the conclusion that the allocation stands or falls as a whole and there is no scope for making smaller or partial allocations at GCCF.

Services

65. It is acknowledged by the Council that existing local services will need to be improved and augmented if residential development on the scale proposed goes ahead (see policies H3 (a)(iv) and C2). However, I consider there would be merit in the Local Plan being more explicit on the issue of developer contributions for enhancing the services needed in connection with new development generally. As far as GCCF is concerned, objectors refer in particular to sewage disposal, education and primary health care. It is not my role to usurp the role of the agencies responsible for providing such services and I rely on their views when these are reported to me or on their objections (or lack of them) if not.
66. Thus, even though some objectors have conducted surveys of existing schools and doctors' practices, I am not persuaded that the state of such services is a sufficient reason to move the planned housing elsewhere. The proposed GCCF development is a sizeable housing scheme and this number of new dwellings would necessitate a review and expansion of local services wherever they were located. The responsible authorities know about the proposals and have not said there will be insurmountable problems in catering for new residents. It is clear at this and other sites that the Council is proceeding on the assumption that it can ensure developers make appropriate contributions to enhance local services if need be.
67. However, the decisive consideration is that these matters are likely to arise wherever the borough's new housing is located. They do not, therefore, appear to me to be a very useful means of choosing between possible locations.
68. Even so, I conclude that the Local Plan would be easier to understand if policy H3 dealt explicitly with all the developer contributions that will be needed at this site for the provision of new services.

Land North and East of Lambley Lane.

69. In the Second Deposit the line of the access road was changed and the boundary of the developable area was adjusted to reflect this. This involved the addition of an area of land to the allocation at Glebe Farm. I consider that this meets the objection to the First Deposit from objector 001090, in as far as this can be established before the road line is fixed in detail. However, the change has given rise to objections.
70. I have seen the drawings of the road in this area as they stood at the time of the Local Plan Inquiry. I realise that these may change as the detailed design work and the environmental assessment progresses. It will also be necessary to allow for embankments, landscaping and a separation distance between housing and the road

in this location. Bearing all these things in mind, I am not at all sure that there will in practice be much scope for built development in this area.

71. However, I have concluded in principle that the scope for development at GCCF should be maximised. There is no reason to treat this small area as an exception to this general approach and I consider that the boundary of the (notional) developable area should seek to maximise the amount of housing that can be delivered. I therefore conclude that the definition of the Second Deposit allocation should not be modified.
72. As to extending the allocation onto land east of Lambley Lane, this would involve land that I consider (below) should be retained in the Green Belt. I conclude that this objection (001337 / 003073) should not succeed.

Density

73. The Council's paper on how they calculated densities for the various allocations (CD A33) indicates that at GCCF they took into account the facilities that are planned for the site. These include a new primary school, a local shopping centre and the Park and Ride (railway station). Even though RAGE doubt whether local shops will be viable I have no reason to suppose that this range of local services could not be supported on this site. On this basis I consider the Council's approach to densities reasonable.
74. Many objectors say that the number of houses proposed at GCCF is too high but they seldom say whether they seek lower densities or a smaller development area. I suspect in most cases, given other comments, that they want a smaller site. Be that as it may, I have no planning reasons to recommend lower densities.
75. A few objectors seek higher densities, particularly in view of the proposal in the Local Plan for a country park. However, the future of the spoil heaps was far from certain at the time of the Local Plan Inquiry and cannot be relied on as a reason for increasing densities.
76. I therefore conclude that the overall capacity of this site should be approximately 1120 dwellings as indicated in the Second Deposit version of the Local Plan.

Employment

77. There are fewer objections to the employment allocation at GCCF. As will be apparent from my consideration of employment land in policy E1, I take the view that there is a need for new employment allocations in the Local Plan. The need in the east of the borough is strengthened by my recommendation to delete the allocation at Teal Close. The need at GCCF is especially strong because of the new housing that is planned there. The provision of local employment would assist in the creation of a balanced community and reduce the necessity for commuting away from the area.
78. Therefore I welcome the EMDA objection (at the time of the First Deposit) saying that there may be scope for more than 3 ha of employment land. I am not aware of their latest thinking on this matter but consider that any opportunity to increase the amount of employment land (even up to a doubling of the 3 ha) should be taken if this can be achieved without a loss of housing capacity. I would regard an increase of this scale as modest in the context of the borough as a whole. Such an increase would have little impact on the overall need for employment land elsewhere in the borough.

79. I consider I have already dealt with the transport issues arising from this part of the overall development (including objection 717 1518). Although it was not argued in detail in relation to the employment allocation, it seems to me logically consistent of the Highway Authority to say that the employment development should also be dependent on the prior construction of the access road. The Green Belt and traffic issues raised by objectors in the context of policy E1 are not materially different from those I have already discussed above in relation to the housing allocation and the access road.
80. I therefore conclude that in general terms policy E1 should not be modified in connection with this site and allocation unless a modest increase in the provision can be achieved. However, a requirement for the prior construction of the access road should be added to the Local Plan.

Nature Conservation

81. I note the objection from the Wildlife Trust concerning sites with nature conservation potential at GCCF. Other objectors also refer to wildlife at the site and in the area. However, apart from references to bats at Glebe Farm, these are not either site specific or species specific. (In other words I have not been given much detail of what and where is causing concern.) Be that as it may, the information I have does not lead me to conclude that the GCCF development should not go ahead.
82. However, I accept that this consideration may be an important influence on the detailed planning of the area and the distribution of built development and open spaces within the site. I note that clause (a)(vii) of policy H3 refers to “opportunities to enhance bio-diversity within the site linking the Country Park to green areas beyond via a network of green corridors and appropriately designed open areas”. I have already said that it is my understanding that the reference to the Country Park may not now be appropriate and will recommend that consideration should be given to updating this aspect of the policy. Otherwise I had supposed that the words “enhance bio-diversity” was meant to encompass nature conservation. But for the avoidance of doubt I consider that the words “and enhance nature conservation” should be added.

Timing and Phasing at GCCF

83. The likely timing and phasing of the development at GCCF is a contentious matter, although this is not always reflected in the objections to policy H3. Indeed most of the objectors on this matter express support for the GCCF development in principle. What is at issue is how quickly the GCCF development can proceed and the effect this will have on how much housing land has to be found elsewhere in the borough.
84. The Council's position is that GCCF should proceed as quickly as possible and they have produced a detailed programme to show the development can be completed by 2011. Objectors say this is unrealistic, mainly for two reasons:
- the planning and implementation process that has to precede the building and occupation of the first houses is necessarily so complex that it will take longer than the Council assumes;
 - the time left within the plan period will then be too short for over 1000 dwellings to be built, sold and occupied (all in one area) by 2011.

85. I share completely the Council's objective that GCCF should be implemented as soon as possible. However, the process will be very complex, especially because the road has to be built first and this is dependent upon a full Environmental Impact Assessment and may involve a further Public Inquiry and Compulsory Purchase Orders. Even so I do not say it is impossible for the development to be completed by 2011, although taking everything into account it seems unlikely. But for me what has to be decided is not whether the process **can** be completed in this time but whether it is wise to **rely on** it being done by 2011. In my view the uncertainties are so great that it is not.
86. I have already said that the allocation stands or falls as a whole and that in my view there is no scope for making smaller or partial allocations at GCCF. Before embarking on the construction of the access road the landowners/developers will – reasonably – need to be assured that they can recoup their investment. For this reason I consider it will be necessary for the whole project (or at least all the 1120 dwellings) to be included in the Local Plan and committed at the outset. No planning impediment should be put in the way of achieving implementation as soon as possible, so phasing within this site is not desirable. However, for the purposes of deciding how much housing land is needed elsewhere in the borough, I consider that it would be reasonable and realistic to assume that only 700 dwellings are likely to be completed by 2011.
87. Furthermore, I consider that the uncertainties and consequences are so great that delivery at GCCF should be closely and regularly monitored and especially at three specified dates; 2006, 2008 and 2010. The results of any substantial delay in delivery at GCCF will have an impact outside this site as well as within it. Formal monitoring of progress at GCCF at these dates will allow an appropriate response. I am making recommendations concerning another site that are intended to enable appropriate responses to be made in the event of a substantial delay in implementation if it does occur (see policy H4 Safeguarded Land).
88. I have already dealt with the issue of whether the access road needs to be in operation before any of the dwellings are occupied.

Green Belt / Safeguarded Land

89. I consider it is obviously the case that land allocated for development at GCCF should be removed from the Green Belt. I do not include the access road in this. The issue that arises is where should the Green Belt boundary in this general area be drawn.
90. I discuss the generality of whether there should be Safeguarded Land (also referred to as White Land in the First Deposit) under policy H4. I conclude that there should be. I also conclude that the best way to secure the future of this Safeguarded Land against pressures for piecemeal development will be to have more of it rather than less. However, my view of the Green Belt and Safeguarded Land around GCCF would be the same irrespective of whether I thought that more or less such land should be identified in the borough as a whole.
91. The need is for a clear and defensible boundary for the Green Belt, following easily discerned physical features on the ground. Some attention was given to this matter at the Local Plan Inquiry. A particular point that was made was that it is unsafe to rely on the (current) alignment of the access road as a Green Belt boundary because the road line is still subject to change and uncertainty in detail. Furthermore, it does not relate to

physical features on the ground that exist now. (Whether the road – when built – would be a suitable boundary is another matter to be addressed in future reviews of the Local Plan.) I asked the Council to consider this matter and I also take into account the Council’s Green Belt sieve map and the views expressed by objectors.

92. With all this in mind, I have come to the view that the most satisfactory boundary for the Green Belt in this general area would be as follows:
- leaving Mapperley Plains at Spring Lane (as now);
 - following Spring Lane to the junction with Lambley Lane;
 - following Lambley Lane to opposite Glebe Farm;
 - tightly following the rear of properties in Glebe Farm View (as now);
 - thereafter tightly following the edge of existing development to the southeast (as now).

93. I recognise that this removes a considerable area from the Green Belt and that this will be unacceptable to some in principle. However, much of the land involved is colliery spoil heap and my understanding is that it cannot be built on anyway. To that extent its future would not be affected by whether or not it is included in the Green Belt. Be that as it may, what I propose would create a very clear and defensible Green Belt boundary along Spring Lane, Lambley Lane and the existing edge of the built up area.

Community Facilities at GCCF and Policy C2

94. As far as the objections to policy C2 are concerned, I have already said that it is not my role to usurp the role of the agencies responsible for providing services such as schools. Ideally school facilities would be provided close to the homes of pupils but an exact balance cannot always be achieved. It could be wasteful to attempt to achieve and maintain such a balance because demand will fluctuate in each school’s catchment area over the years. I consider it would be unreasonable to expect the Local Education Authority to ignore any spare capacity that may exist in existing schools when planning new ones. In any event it is my understanding that parental choice may affect where children go to school.
95. I sympathise with people who live near a school (as in fact I do myself) and find their lives disrupted by “the school run” but consider that wider issues are involved. Be that as it may, I consider it would be inappropriate to modify the Local Plan for this reason.
96. The other objections to policy C2 do not appear to be seeking changes to that policy.

Detailed Objections to the Policy Wording and Text

97. Sport England wants the references in the policy and text to open space provision to specifically mention sports pitches. The Council says that it intends to return to this matter later, perhaps in supplementary planning guidance. However, I see no harm in acceding to Sport England’s request. If, after further study, it turns out that the need for pitches arising from development at this site is to be met elsewhere, this can be reflected in the planning brief for the allocation.
98. I conclude that the need to provide sports pitches to serve the needs of future residents should be referred in this policy and the text accompanying it.

99. The County Council (Highways and Transportation) has also suggested detailed amendments to the wording of the policy and accompanying text, some aspects of which I have already dealt with. As to the rest:

- NCC wants it clear beyond doubt that the access road is to include a satisfactory junction at Mapperley Plains. I consider this is entirely reasonable and necessary (I discuss this matter in more detail in relation to an objection to policy T3 (objection 514/727), where I conclude that this junction design should also include any traffic management measures to be introduced on the roads leading to this junction);
- NCC wants a clause added saying that the access road is to be designed to serve as part of the Gedling bypass as well as an access road. It has not been explained to me what practical difference this would make. If the difference is minimal there seems little point in adding it as a requirement. If the difference is material, I question whether it would be proper for the Highway Authority to insist on this as a requirement for a developers' access road. On balance I conclude this should not be added;
- Lastly NCC wants the road design to take account of a future northern extension of the road to Arno Vale. I also discuss this possibility in the context of policy R1. In view of the (acknowledged) fact that a northern extension to the road is unlikely to materialise during the lifetime of the Local Plan, I consider this to be unreasonable;
- I have already dealt with the question of the prior construction of the access road.

100. NCC's evidence also goes into some detail about how the route of the proposed access road is to be safeguarded with suggested alignments and areas of interest. In my view this goes beyond what is needed for the Local Plan. For the avoidance of doubt I do not, therefore, recommend or endorse what is suggested in this regard.

101. It seems to me that the main reason for the various devices NCC suggests is to safeguard an alignment for a bypass in the event of the GCCF development not going ahead. I have little sympathy for this. In part this may be because I view the GCCF development so positively. But this not my only reason. The Local Plan, when it is adopted, should represent the best assessment of what can and should happen in the area. If a major component of that plan subsequently falls away for some reason, it would be necessary to look at these things (and especially this part of the borough) afresh. The prospects for a bypass in those circumstances are at best remote, as NCC accepts. Government guidance says the Local Plan should accord not so much with the Structure Plan as with the Local Transport Plan as far as major transport proposals are concerned. A Gedling bypass is not part of the LTP.

102. It may be that by the time of modifications the situation will be clearer and areas of interest will be an unnecessary complication. In any event, I record my firm opinion that unjustifiable blight should be avoided.

Other Matters Raised in Objections***Scouting***

103. The local scouts have expressed concern about the impact of the allocation on their training ground at the corner of Plains Road and Arnold Lane. They do not want the use and enjoyment of their training ground diminished by the close proximity of housing.
104. This objection was to the First Deposit. The western “finger” of development in the First Deposit allocation was removed in the Second Deposit. This effectively maintains an open gap between the area to be developed at GCCF and the scout site. But the scout land may still be affected by (or be close to) the access road. Even so, maintaining an open gap between the scout land and the main development area may go some way to meeting this objection. I would also expect it to be the case that, if any of their land is needed for the road, the scout association would be compensated.
105. Whatever the outcome, I am sympathetic to the needs of the scout movement. I hope their reasonable needs can be met during the design and implementation of the development and access road. However, this sympathy does not extend to thinking that they (or any other landowner) can expect to be immune from all change in their environment. In this particular case I conclude that their particular concerns should not stand in the way of the GCCF development.

Modal Transfer

106. In the Second Deposit paragraph 2.29 of the Local Plan had added to it: “In order to assist in achieving a 14% modal transfer, the site should aim to achieve 40% non-car trips and this issue is addressed in the Transport Assessment for the Site.” EMDA object that this may be over optimistic. (Although much may depend on how “trips” are defined and whether short walks are counted as trips.) Nevertheless, paragraph 2.29 may well be optimistic. However, the statement in the plan does not appear to me to be binding and certainly does not say that the development will be halted if this cannot be achieved. I take the view that in matters such as this it is as well to adopt an optimistic objective. I therefore conclude that no modification to the wording is necessary.

Surface Water

107. One objector identifies surface water run off as a potential problem at this site. I have no evidence on this but cannot believe that this will not be taken into account when the site is designed and developed. I see no need to change the Local Plan.

Sustainability

108. One objector alleges that this is not a sustainable location. This is an urban extension site. Policy H3 (a)(ii) sets out required public transport improvements. There is also the rail line proposal. I do not agree with this objection.

Carlton Le Willows School

109. I note the objection from Carlton Le Willows School about the perceived danger to pupils walking to school from Burton Joyce because they would have to cross the access road. However, although it is a matter of detailed design, I am sure safe pedestrian facilities would be provided. I conclude that no modification to the Local Plan is called for.

Overall Conclusions

110. In summary, despite the objections to these housing and employment allocations and the access road that will service them, I conclude that the proposed development at GCCF is an important and desirable part of the Local Plan. I conclude that it should be retained in the Local Plan and afforded the highest possible priority.
111. I accept the capacity of the site is 1120 dwellings but only 700 of these should be taken into account when calculating the need for housing land elsewhere.
112. I conclude that the access road on the alignment included in the Second Deposit should be retained in the Local Plan. The road is to incorporate a satisfactory junction at Mapperley Plains (including any traffic management measures on the approach roads). The access road is a precondition for the development at GCCF and should be treated as such, with no dwellings being occupied before its completion.
113. The employment allocation at GCCF should be retained in the Local Plan and expanded somewhat by a modification if it transpires that there is scope for doing so. The prior construction of the access road is a reasonable requirement in relation to the employment proposal also.
114. I conclude that the designation of a Park and Ride facility at GCCF should be retained in the Local Plan but should be reviewed at the time of the modifications and again at the start of development at GCCF.
115. I conclude that improved public transport accessibility can be achieved by augmented and improved bus services to the site. I conclude that this matter is adequately covered by policy H3 (a)(ii) and that no modification to the plan is required in this respect.
116. Minor wording changes to policy H3 and the text accompanying it are needed, for example references to the Country Park may need to be deleted. Moreover I accept that by the time the plan comes to be modified further updating may be needed. I conclude that the council should revise the text and incorporate revisions in the adopted plan.
117. I conclude that the Local Plan would be easier to understand if policy H3 dealt explicitly with all the developer contributions towards the provision of new services and facilities that will be needed at this site. The material currently to be found in policy C2 should be incorporated in policy H3.
118. I have defined a clear and defensible boundary for the Green Belt in this area.

RECOMMENDATIONS

119. **I recommend policy H3 and the proposals for development at Gedling Colliery / Chase Farm should be retained in the Local Plan. I further recommend that the capacity of the site is 1120 dwellings.**
120. **I recommend that, in calculating the need for dwellings elsewhere in the borough, it is assumed that only 700 of the 1120 dwellings will be built by 2011.**

121. I recommend that policy H3 is modified to include the requirement that the Gedling Colliery / Chase Farm Access Road shall be completed before any of the dwellings are occupied.
122. I recommend that the Proposals Map should show an alignment for the Access Road as in the Second Deposit. The road is to incorporate a satisfactory junction at Mapperley Plains (including any traffic management measures on the approach roads to that junction).
123. I recommend that policy H3 and the accompanying text is modified to take account of the latest information concerning the future of the colliery spoil heaps and the prospects for creating a Country Park.
124. In addition I recommend that clause (a)(vii) of policy H3 is modified by adding the words “and enhance nature conservation” after the words “enhance biodiversity”.
125. I recommend policy H3 is expanded to deal explicitly with the developer contributions towards the provision of new services that will be needed at this site and that the material currently in policy C2 is incorporated in policy H3.
126. I recommend that policy H3 and the text accompanying it should be modified to refer to the provision of sports pitches as well as open space.
127. I further recommend that policy H3 and the text accompanying it is updated at the time modifications are drafted to reflect this report and changes in circumstances since the Local Plan Inquiry.
128. I recommend that in general terms policy E1 is not modified in as far as it relates to land at Gedling Colliery, unless the size of the allocation can be increased by a modest amount. I recommend that the requirement to construct the access road before any employment development is brought into use should be added to the plan.
129. I recommend that policy T4 is not modified in as far as it relates to land at Gedling Colliery and Chase Farm. However, I also conclude that the designation of a Park and Ride facility at GCCF should be reviewed at the time of the modifications and again at the start of development at GCCF.
130. I recommend that the rail access alignment into the site should continue to be protected and the alignment shown on the Proposals Map (as now).
131. I recommend that the Green Belt boundary in this area should follow Spring Lane, Lambley Lane and the edge of existing development to the southeast of Lambley Lane.
132. I recommend that land that is removed from the Green Belt but not allocated for development should be designated and protected as Safeguarded Land.

2.63 H4 WHITE LAND - GENERAL

OBJECTIONS ACCEPTING THE PRINCIPLE OF WHITE LAND (IN THE FIRST DEPOSIT) BUT DISPUTING SOME OF THE DESIGNATED AREAS

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001158	002445	Nottinghamshire County Council (Strategic Property)

Summary of Objection

The policy is supported in principle but specific sites are disputed. In particular some of the White Land at Top Wighay Farm should be allocated for development and the area of White Land extended northwards. In addition the following White Land designations are disputed: Lampwood Close Calverton, The Spinney Bestwood and Teal Close.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001324	002771	Langridge Homes Ltd

Summary of Objection

The policy is supported in principle but specific sites are disputed. The following White Land designations are disputed: Top Wighay Farm, Teal Close, The Spinney Bestwood. Additional White Land should be identified as follows: part of Gedling Colliery, on the peripheries of villages inset in the Green Belt and on the edge of the main urban areas of Arnold and Carlton.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001344	003127	Slack; Kirkham; Goldby; Grococks (Joint)

Summary of Objection

The location of White Land is disputed. Changes to the Green Belt boundary are suggested at Calverton to allow development east of the village and to return the Lampwood Close area to the Green Belt.

ALL THE SITE SPECIFIC ASPECTS OF THE ABOVE OBJECTIONS ARE DEALT WITH ELSEWHERE

OBJECTIONS TO THE PRINCIPLE OF WHITE LAND (IN THE FIRST DEPOSIT)

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001161	002548	Mr C Preston

Summary of Objection

Allocations of White Land are likely to be targeted by developers instead of other sites. There is no reference to PPG3, reliance should be placed on the latest guidance and information.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001955	004670	Gedling Labour Group

Summary of Objection

The identification of White Land is objected to. Reliance should be placed on the latest guidance and information, not out of date information. Only one other Nottinghamshire Planning Authority is identifying White Land. The policy should be comprehensively reviewed. Particular objections are made to White Land at Top Wighay Farm and Lampwood Close.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
003891	010652	Mr M Birkett

Summary of Objection

The purpose of the White Land policy is not clear. It will result in the erosion of the Green Belt by stealth. The amount of land removed from the Green Belt is excessive and calls into question the assumptions that underlie it (assumptions used to calculate land requirements up to 2021). Land removed from the Green Belt should be kept to the minimum needed for development with only a percentage allowed in excess of this.

ALL THE SITE SPECIFIC ASPECTS OF THE ABOVE OBJECTIONS ARE DEALT WITH ELSEWHERE

OBJECTION THAT AREAS OF WHITE LAND SHOULD BE DEVELOPED (INSTEAD OF GEDLING COLLIERY / CHASE FARM)

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001326	002858	Mr F Rodrigues

Summary of Objection

The Council's sequential approach is unfair. Millfield Close Burton Joyce, Top Wighay Farm, New Farm and Teal Close should be allocated for housing (instead of GCCF) to achieve a fairer distribution.

THIS OBJECTION IS DEALT WITH IN THE CONTEXT OF POLICY H3

OBJECTIONS IN PRINCIPLE TO THE DELETION OF WHITE LAND (IN THE SECOND DEPOSIT)

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000309	201500	House Builders Federation

Summary of Objection

Greater clarity is needed in respect of government guidance requiring White Land or Safeguarded Land.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001324	201317	Langridge Homes Ltd

Summary of Objection

The deletion of White Land is counter to PPG2, it should be reinstated. White Land sufficient to accommodate about 2000 dwellings should be included in the Local Plan. Additional White Land should be identified at part of Gedling Colliery, on the peripheries of villages inset in the Green Belt and on the edge of the main urban areas of Arnold and Carlton.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001948	201945	Aldergate Properties Ltd

Summary of Objection

The deletion of White Land is counter to PPG2, it should be reinstated. White Land should be identified in sustainable locations to provide Safeguarded Land.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
003851	201328	Barratt (East Midlands)
003853	201326	Mr & Mrs R W Burton

Summary of Objection

The deletion of White Land is counter to PPG2, it should be reinstated. Additional White Land should be identified at Woodborough.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001339	201927	Environment Agency

Summary of Objection

It is noted that the White Land adjacent to Teal Close is to be kept in the Green Belt. This land may be affected by compensatory works adjacent to Ouse Dyke as part of the employment allocation.

THE SITE SPECIFIC ASPECTS OF THE ABOVE OBJECTIONS ARE DEALT WITH ELSEWHERE

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions***Background***

1. Policy H4 (White Land) in the First Deposit was a policy to control development in White Land until 2011. Planning control was to be similar to controls over development in the Green Belt. Although the policy did not say this explicitly it was implied and the accompanying text reinforced this. Relatively large areas were identified on the Proposals Map as White Land, giving rise to numerous objections.
2. In the Second Deposit (which is how the plan now stands and as I am considering it), the H4 (White Land) policy has been deleted and the number H4 used for another policy with a different purpose. Nearly all the White Land previously identified on the Proposals Map is either allocated for development or returned to the Green Belt. The Council took the in principle view that it was not going to identify White Land in this review of the Local Plan.
3. However, in practice, some areas of unallocated land remained between the built up area and the Green Belt, although there is now no policy to control development within them. The largest of these areas is Mapperley Golf Course. (It is not strictly correct to say that there is no policy in the Local Plan to control development at Mapperley Golf Course because it is protected in its present use by policy R5 unless and until an alternative and equivalent provision is made elsewhere. However, once that condition has been satisfied there would be no Local Plan policy that could be applied to the site of the golf course.)

4. In my view this is anomalous. Either the remaining areas of White Land need to be put (back) into the Green Belt or there is a need for a policy to control development within them. My understanding is that Mapperley Golf Course has a long and contentious history in planning terms. The Council also owns it. For whatever reason, I was unable to discover what the Council's preferred approach is to this dilemma: return the golf course to the Green Belt or reinstate policy H4? Be that as it may, I consider that the present position rather undermines the Council's stated view that it does not have, and does not want, White Land in the Local Plan as a matter of principle.
5. One could therefore say that in reality the issue is not so much "why not have any White Land in the Local Plan?" but "why have so little (or so much) White Land in the Local Plan?"

PPG2

6. As some objectors to the Second Deposit point out, one basis for identifying land that is neither allocated for development nor in the Green Belt is to be found in PPG2. This says:
 - The essential characteristic of Green Belts is their permanence. Their protection must be maintained as far as can be seen ahead.
 - Where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt boundaries should not be changed unless alterations to the Structure Plan have been approved which necessitate such a revision. (*As is the case here.*)
 - When drawing Green Belt boundaries in development plans, Local Planning Authorities should take account of the need to promote sustainable patterns of development. They should consider the consequences for sustainable development (for example in terms of the effects on car travel) of channelling development towards urban areas inside the inner Green Belt boundary, towards towns and villages inset within the Green Belt or towards locations beyond the outer Green Belt boundary. (*The latter does not arise in Gedling.*)
 - When Local Planning Authorities prepare new or revised structure and local plans, any proposals affecting Green Belts should be related to a time-scale which is longer than that normally adopted for other aspects of the plan. They should satisfy themselves that Green Belt boundaries will not need to be altered at the end of the plan period. (*2011 in this case.*)
 - In order to ensure protection of Green Belts within this longer time-scale, this will in some cases mean safeguarding land between the urban area and the Green Belt which may be required to meet longer-term needs. Regional/strategic guidance should provide a strategic framework for considering this issue.
 - In preparing and reviewing their development plans authorities should address the possible need to provide safeguarded land. They should consider the broad location of anticipated development beyond the plan period, its effects on urban areas contained by the Green Belt and on areas beyond it and its implications for sustainable development. In non-metropolitan areas these questions should in the first instance be addressed in the Structure Plan, which should where necessary indicate a general area where Local Plans should identify safeguarded land.

- Annex B to PPG2 gives further advice on Safeguarded Land, which is also sometimes known as White Land. This includes cross-references to PPG 3, PPG13 and PPG7.
- The Annex also says that development plans should state clearly the policies to safeguard land over the period covered by the plan. Policies should make it clear that the land is not allocated for development at the present time, and keep the land free to fulfil its purpose of meeting possible longer-term development needs.
- Policies should provide that planning permission for the permanent development of Safeguarded Land should only be granted following a Local Plan review which proposes the development of particular areas of Safeguarded Land. Making Safeguarded Land available for development in other circumstances would thus be a departure from the plan.

7. I have quoted at length to show the full chain of reasoning that needs to be taken into account in considering White Land, or Safeguarded Land (as I shall call it from now on, to distinguish it from the specific areas identified in policy H4 in the First Deposit).

The Principle

8. Many objectors who are opposed to losing any (or even just their favourite bit) of land from the present Green Belt will not be convinced by PPG2's references to the permanence of the Green Belt. But PPG2 makes it clear that the two main bastions of long term protection are:
- requiring a strategic review before detailed boundary changes are made;
 - looking beyond current plan horizons when deciding what the Green Belt boundary should be.
9. These are the factors that have secured the long-term integrity of the Green Belt in this area since its definition in the late 1980s and early 1990s. These factors are also what is needed to secure its integrity in the future. Had the Green Belt boundary not left enough scope for longer-term needs when it was drawn up in the 1980s, it would not have lasted so well until now.
10. It is clear that this review of the Local Plan is taking place within the context of an approved Structure Plan. This not only indicates that the Green Belt boundary should be reviewed but gives clear guidance on the factors to be taken into account during the review (Structure Plan policy 1/5, which also cross references to policies 1/1,1/2,1/3 and 1/4). Structure Plan policy 1/5 on the review of Green Belt boundaries specifically refers to safeguarding any land to be released from the Green Belt that is not needed for development by 2011.
11. Taking into account PPG2 and the Structure Plan, I conclude that this Local Plan review should not attempt to limit the extent of the land to be released from the Green Belt to exactly, or even approximately, that which is needed for development until 2011. I consider that a "safety valve" is needed to secure the longer-term security of the Green Belt boundaries now being determined.
12. In fact there are already two sources of such flexibility in the Local Plan, although the Council would not happily acknowledge either. The first is Mapperley Golf Course (and the other small areas of land without a notation). The second is any "carry-over" from

the Gedling Colliery / Chase Farm allocations that arises if that area is not all developed by 2011. (Although the latter can only be counted if more land is allocated in the first instance in anticipation of a possible shortfall.) But in my view these are not enough to defend the Green Belt against development pressures in the longer term.

The Council's Reasons

13. The Council's attitude to White Land changed because of the Inspector's Report into the Ashfield Local Plan. That Inspector accepted that it was not necessary to identify Safeguarded Land to meet longer-term needs in Ashfield. I understand the Ashfield Local Plan has been adopted without any Safeguarded Land. GBC adopted the Ashfield Inspector's reasons and his conclusions when it deleted the H4 White Land in the Second Deposit. Essentially GBC's stance has two strands.

Lack of Long Term Guidance

14. First, as argued in Ashfield, although the Structure Plan provides the context for a review of the Green Belt until 2011, there is no longer-term guidance. Moreover, the strategic context is a fast moving target. Regional guidance is being reviewed. There are signs that Nottingham City may increasingly be able to retain more of the development pressures that arise within it. Who is to say how much land will be needed after 2011? Who is to say that **any** greenfield land will be needed for development after 2011? If we get it wrong and identify too little Safeguarded Land, there will be a need for another review of the Green Belt sooner rather than later. If we get it wrong and identify too much Safeguarded Land we may have weakened control over development by taking land out of the Green Belt needlessly.
15. My first comment on this is that Ashfield and Gedling are not entirely comparable. My understanding is that Ashfield has areas beyond the Green Belt whilst Gedling does not. This provides a "safety valve" in Ashfield that is not available in Gedling. Also the Ashfield Local Plan identified more land for development than was required by the Structure Plan, thus creating a surplus that could be "carried forward" and act as a safety valve. This is not the case in the Gedling Local Plan, even the Second Deposit.
16. In the meantime the Broxtowe Local Plan Inspector has reported and recommends the identification of Safeguarded Land there. So even a simplistic argument for inter-authority consistency is no longer clear-cut.
17. In any event PPG2 is clear that when Local Planning Authorities prepare new or revised structure and local plans, any proposals affecting Green Belts should be related to a time-scale which is longer than that adopted for the other aspects of the plan. The Planning Authority is to satisfy itself that Green Belt boundaries will not need to be altered at the end of the plan period. When reviewing a local plan this will inevitably involve looking beyond the time horizon in the current Structure Plan.
18. For these reasons I consider that the case against identifying Safeguarded Land is not persuasive. Also, the clear implication of PPG2 is that more rather than less Safeguarded Land should be identified.

Comparability

19. But I sense that underlying GBC's stance is a more "political" concern. South Nottinghamshire is a relatively small area made up of only a few councils, the majority

of which seek less rather than more housing development. Ashfield has adopted a Local Plan with no Safeguarded Land. Another district (it is said) is achieving much the same thing by failing to review its Local Plan at all (as could have been said of Gedling in the mid-1990s). In these circumstances there is a perceived risk that when the time comes to find more land for development, the districts that have already drawn back their Green Belt boundaries and identified Safeguarded Land will be “soft targets”.

20. I am in no position to give any assurances in this regard. All I can say is that, if things did turn out to be determined in this way, it would be manifestly unsatisfactory in terms of sub-regional planning. Whatever mechanisms exist or are created to carry out regional and sub-regional planning would have failed if the long term future distribution of development were to be determined by decisions on Safeguarded Land taken now. This being the case, I take the view it would be wrong for this consideration to influence me in making my recommendations on Safeguarded Land.
21. In my view, similar fears are apparent in the various parts of Gedling borough, with individuals and groups trying to protect their own patches. Such attitudes are supported by the suspicion that, whatever the Local Plan says, once land is taken out of the Green Belt it is no longer protected as strongly and will be inexorably nibbled away.
22. Again I will not be here to ensure this is not the outcome. All I can do is frame a policy that makes this less likely. I would also say that the *more* land that is identified as Safeguarded Land, the harder it would be to erode it piecemeal without a full-scale and comprehensive review, although I realise that this will not be an immediately attractive notion. In any event the guidance in PPG2 makes it quite clear that Safeguarded Land cannot be developed without a full review of the Local Plan.

Conclusions on the Principle

23. Therefore, taking account of PPG2 and the Structure Plan I conclude that Safeguarded Land should be identified in the Local Plan. Or, put another way, I conclude that the currently rather meagre amount of Safeguarded Land in the Local Plan should be increased considerably and protected by a policy designed for that purpose (see below). This is in accord with the guidance in PPG2 and is not, in my view, in any way inconsistent with the current versions of PPG3 and PPG13.

How Much and Where?

24. As far as the amount is concerned, I consider that I do not need to be precise. Indeed to this extent I accept the Council's argument that there is no guidance available. All I can say is that there needs to be enough Safeguarded Land to avoid the necessity for another review of the Green Belt in 2011 or whenever the Local Plan is next reviewed (which should be before 2011). In general terms something in the order of the amount identified by GBC in the First Deposit appears to me to be about right.
25. As to where Safeguarded Land should be, there are several good pointers, principally:
 - in sustainable locations (PPG2 / the Structure Plan);
 - the edge of urban areas (urban extensions); (PPG3 / the Structure Plan);
 - in identified transport corridors (PPG3 / the Structure Plan);
 - on the edges of inset villages (but not the smaller washed-over villages) (PPG2 / the Structure Plan);

- but not where the coalescence of settlements would occur if development took place (the Structure Plan);
- and not where the major ridgelines around Nottingham would be breached (the Structure Plan);
- in areas identified by GBC's sieve map analysis of the Green Belt;
- bearing in mind the need wherever possible to establish clear Green Belt boundaries that follow physical features (PPG2 / the Structure Plan).

26. Using these criteria I consider it will be possible to assess objection sites as they arise to determine, site by site, whether a Safeguarded Land designation is appropriate.

The Policy

27. The first thing I have to say about a policy to control development in areas of Safeguarded Land is that in my view it is very definitely **not** a housing policy. I say this for three reasons. First, its purpose is to control (and prevent) permanent development during the plan period. Second, it is not a foregone conclusion that all (or any) Safeguarded Land will need to be developed – that will depend on the need to find greenfield land for development in future Local Plan reviews. And third, even if development does eventually take place, it may not be housing.
28. I conclude, therefore, that the policy to control Safeguarded Land should be in the Environment chapter of the Local Plan.
29. As to what form the policy should take, some examples from elsewhere have been given to me. However, on reflection I consider there would be merit in modelling the Local Plan policy as closely as possible on the Structure Plan. With all this in mind:

Policy ENVX (Safeguarded Land)

The land (shown white on the Proposals Map) not included within the Green Belt that is

- (a) outside the existing urban areas,**
- (b) not in the settlements inset in the Green Belt,**
- (c) and is not included in any allocation for development in this Local Plan;**

shall be safeguarded from inappropriate development until a future Local Plan review is adopted that proposes it for development.

The appropriateness of development will be established by considering proposals as if they were in the Green Belt and applying policies ENV26, ENV27, ENV28, ENV29 and ENV30.

30. There is one caveat I would add, which should be referred to in the text accompanying the policy. I am recommending elsewhere that the housing land supply at Gedling Colliery / Chase Farm is formally monitored in 2006, 2008 and 2010. Should such monitoring reveal that progress at that site is significantly slower than I have assumed in this report **and** this is causing a material shortage in the supply of housing land in the borough, steps should be taken to ease the shortage of housing land. This may need to involve the early release of some Safeguarded Land. If this is the case the first area to be considered should be an expansion of the development area at Top Wighay Farm.

31. Otherwise the text accompanying this policy should be along the lines of the text accompanying policy H4 in the First Deposit.

Conclusions

32. I conclude that the Local Plan should identify substantial areas of Safeguarded Land by removing land from the Green Belt that is not needed for development before 2011. I conclude that this land should be safeguarded from inappropriate development by a policy in the Environment chapter of the Local Plan. In essence such land is to be treated as if it were in the Green Belt. I have drafted a policy for this purpose.
33. I have identified the only situation in which I consider this strict approach may need to be departed from.
34. I have identified criteria for assessing objection sites for their suitability as Safeguarded Land. I will use these criteria in individual site assessments and report on each site elsewhere in this report.

RECOMMENDATIONS

35. **I recommend the Local Plan should identify substantial areas of Safeguarded Land by removing land from the Green Belt that is not needed for development before 2011.**
36. **I recommend that this land should be safeguarded by a policy in the Environment chapter of the Local Plan as follows:**

Policy ENVX (Safeguarded Land)

The land (shown white on the Proposals Map) not included within the Green Belt that is

- (a) outside the existing urban areas,**
- (b) not in the settlements inset in the Green Belt,**
- (c) and is not included in any allocation for development in this Local Plan;**

shall be safeguarded from inappropriate development until a future Local Plan review is adopted that proposes it for development.

The appropriateness of development will be established by considering proposals as if they were in the Green Belt and applying policies ENV26, ENV27, ENV28, ENV29 and ENV30.

37. **I recommend that the text accompanying this policy should be along the lines of the text that accompanied policy H4 in the First Deposit, except that it should also refer to the one possible exception to the policy that may arise before 2011 (see above).**
38. **For my recommendations on particular sites and Safeguarded Land, see the parts of this report where I deal with individual sites (see below).**

2.64 H4 WHITE LAND (IN THE FIRST DEPOSIT) BURTON JOYCE

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001590	003768	Mrs J Hambly

Summary of Objection

Land between the River Trent and the Trent ridge would produce uneconomical small plots for any future development. Any large-scale development would have a detrimental effect on the village. The village boundary should be maintained and no White Land should be designated in this area.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

1. There is no White Land around the village of Burton Joyce in the Second Deposit. The Green Belt is drawn tightly up to the village’s inset boundary on all sides. I consider that this objection has already been met.
2. I conclude that no modification to the Local Plan is needed.

RECOMMENDATION

3. I recommend no modification to the Local Plan in response to this objection.

2.65 H4 WHITE LAND (IN THE FIRST DEPOSIT) EAST OF LAMBLEY LANE, HILLSIDE FARM BURTON JOYCE, DORKET HEAD FARM

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001337	003075	Messrs J N C&T Cutts
001337	003076	Messrs J N C&T Cutts
001337	003077	Messrs J N C&T Cutts

Summary of Objection

Insufficient land has been designated White Land. Three sites are suggested.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

1. These objections were made to the First Deposit in which substantial areas of land were designated as White Land. The objectors have given me no evidence to support their claim that the amount of land was inadequate and without such evidence I have no reason to agree with them. On the face of it their claim is not justified.
2. As far as Lambley Lane is concerned, I have already given detailed consideration to where the Green Belt boundary should be in the context of policy H3. I have concluded that Lambley Lane itself provides a clear, defensible and appropriate boundary. This objection site is on the “wrong” side of that boundary in a sensitive and prominent position. To remove this land from the Green Belt would intrude into prominent open country, destroy the clarity of the Green Belt boundary I have proposed and weaken

the Green Belt. Even if more Safeguarded Land were required, this would be a harmful and weak candidate for removal from the Green Belt. This site performs badly in relation to the criteria I have identified above.

3. The objection site at Burton Joyce is rising land “behind” the village. Although it is defined by field boundaries it would create a far weaker boundary for the village and the Green Belt than following the edge of the existing built up area, as is the case now. If this land were removed from the Green Belt, there would be no logic to the boundary thus created. Even if more Safeguarded Land were required, this would be a harmful and weak candidate for removal from the Green Belt. This site performs badly in relation to the criteria I have identified above.
4. The Dorket Head objection site is a relatively small area of land in the northwest quadrant of the crossroads. It is surrounded by the Green Belt in all directions and its exclusion would make no sense unless substantially more land is also removed. The site is on the top of one of the ridges that contain the built up area of Greater Nottingham and which the Structure Plan says should not be impinged on. This site is in the most prominent and sensitive location and it performs very badly in relation to the criteria I have identified above. Even if considerably more Safeguarded Land were required, I think this would be just about the last site in the borough I would recommend for removal from the Green Belt.
5. I conclude that these objections should all fail, both in general terms and because of the particular qualities of the objection sites.

RECOMMENDATION

6. **I recommend no modification to the Local Plan in response to these objections.**
-

2.66 H4 WHITE LAND (IN THE FIRST DEPOSIT) LAMPWOOD CLOSE CALVERTON

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001158	002445	Nottinghamshire County Council (Strategic Property)

Summary of Objection

The policy is supported in principle but specific sites are disputed. The following White Land designations are disputed: Lampwood Close Calverton, The Spinney Bestwood and Teal Close.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001344	003127	Slack; Kirkham; Goldby; Grococks (Joint)

Summary of Objection

The location of White Land is disputed. Changes to the Green Belt boundary are suggested at Calverton to allow development east of the village and to retain the Lampwood Close area in the Green Belt.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001955	004670	Gedling Labour Group

Summary of Objection

All White Land should be deleted from the Local Plan. White Land at Lampwood Close is particularly objected to.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000018	000018	Mrs M Brackenbury
000119	000151	Mr T Brackenbury
003860	010593	Mr P Beeden

Summary of Objection

Land at Lampwood Close should be retained in the Green Belt.

AND ABOUT 30 OTHER INDIVIDUAL OBJECTIONS

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

1. These objections were made at the time of the First Deposit of the Local Plan. The Second Deposit reinstated the objection site to the Green Belt. I therefore regard the objections as having been met. Accordingly I recommend no modification to the Local Plan in response to these objections.
2. Although at the time of the First Deposit there were objections that this land should be allocated for residential development (see under policy H2 above); there have not been objections to the Second Deposit seeking the reinstatement of the White Land designation here. I therefore have no reason to consider this issue or this site further.
3. I conclude that the Local Plan, as it now stands, should not be modified.

RECOMMENDATION

4. I recommend no modification to the Local Plan in respect of these objections to the removal of land at Lampwood Close from the Green Belt.

2.67 H4 WHITE LAND (IN THE FIRST DEPOSIT) NORTH OF MAIN STREET, WOODBOROUGH

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
003851	010573	Barratt (East Midlands)
003853	010581	Mr & Mrs R W Burton

Summary of Objection

Not enough land has been identified for development after 2011 (in the First Deposit). The White Land at Lampwood Close Calverton and The Spinney, Bestwood should be deleted. White land should be identified at Woodborough.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

1. I have already dealt with the related objections from these objectors in the part of the report (policy H2) where I considered whether land should be allocated for residential development north of Main Street, Woodborough. I reached the conclusion that the Local Plan is right not to classify Woodborough as an inset village in the Green Belt.
2. As far as identifying White Land around Woodborough is concerned, PPG2 (as noted above) indicates that Safeguarded Land may be identified around inset villages and towns but makes no allowance for it around smaller settlements. I therefore consider it would be inappropriate to identify Safeguarded Land at Woodborough.
3. For these reasons this site performs badly in relation to the criteria I have identified above.
4. I conclude that there should be no Safeguarded Land at Woodborough.

RECOMMENDATION

5. I recommend no modification to the Local Plan in response to these objections.
-

2.68 H4 WHITE LAND (IN THE FIRST DEPOSIT) CORNWATER FIELDS RAVENSHEAD

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001337	003074	Messrs J N C&T Cutts

Summary of Objection

Insufficient land has been designated White Land to meet longer-term development needs. This site should be designated as White Land.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

1. I deal with this objection under policy H2 where I also consider an objection that the land should be allocated for residential development.

RECOMMENDATION

2. For my recommendation on this objection see my consideration of this site under policy H2.
-

2.69 H4 WHITE LAND (IN THE FIRST DEPOSIT) NEW FARM

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001776	004076	Mr & Mrs J Lamin
001778	004081	Mrs P Lamin

Summary of Objection

The decision not to allocate land for residential development at New Farm is supported.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

1. These representations are clearly in support of the plan as it now stands. For this reason it is not necessary for me to consider them in detail. However, I take them into account when I consider New Farm under policy H2.

RECOMMENDATION

2. I recommend no modification to the Local Plan in response to these objections. (However, see the New Farm section of this report under policy H2)
-

2.70 H4 WHITE LAND (IN THE FIRST DEPOSIT) TEAL CLOSE

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001158	002445	Nottinghamshire County Council (Strategic Property)
001324	002771	Langridge Homes Ltd

Summary of Objection

The policy is supported in principle but specific sites are disputed, including land at Teal Close.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000134	000170	Gedling Wildlife Group
000180	000262	RSPB
000609	002046	Ashley Travis Garage
000888	002103	Mr W Moore
001331	003008	Netherfield Wildlife Group
001331	003009	Netherfield Wildlife Group
001331	003010	Netherfield Wildlife Group
001331	003011	Netherfield Wildlife Group
001932	004512	Nottinghamshire Birdwatchers
003835	010553	R.A.G.E.

AND OVER 300 INDIVIDUAL OBJECTIONS

Summary of Objection

The designation of land at Teal Close as White Land is opposed, mainly because of the adverse impact any development would have on wildlife (principally migrating birds) at and near the site. Other reasons given for opposing any development on this land include flood risk, poor access, traffic congestion, loss of open land, loss of Green Belt and contamination on the site.

A small number of objectors supported early development of this land in preference to allocations elsewhere.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

1. These objections are considered in the parts of this report where I consider the allocation in the Second Deposit of (most of) this land for development (see under policies E1 and H2).

RECOMMENDATION

2. For my recommendations on the future of this land see under policies E1 and H2.

2.71 H4 WHITE LAND (IN THE FIRST DEPOSIT) THE SPINNEY BESTWOOD

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001158	002445	Nottinghamshire County Council (Strategic Property)
001324	002771	Langridge Homes Ltd

Summary of Objection

The policy is supported in principle but specific sites are disputed, including The Spinney Bestwood.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000532	000759	Mrs L Purdeu

Summary of Objection

The Spinney should not be built on, there are plenty of brownfield sites and vacant properties. Development would increase traffic on Moor Road, the school too small for more children.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

1. These objections are considered in the part of this report where I deal with objections to policy H2 and this site.

RECOMMENDATION

2. For my recommendations on the future of this site see under policy H2.
-

2.72 H4 WHITE LAND (IN THE FIRST DEPOSIT) TOP WIGHAY FARM

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001021	002200	Hallam Land Management Ltd

Summary of Objection

Delete the White Land designation at Top Wighay Farm. Development should be promoted where transport services are already operating. Land south of Newstead is to be preferred to Top Wighay Farm as a development area or, failing that, as White Land.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001025	004621	Mrs M Hunt

Summary of Objection

Objection – no reason given.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001325	002852	Papplewick Parish Council

Summary of Objection

Disagree in principle with identifying White Land in the Local Plan because there is no requirement to do so in the Structure Plan. But if there is to be White Land it should be kept to a minimum. Top Wighay Farm should not be developed or designated as White Land. The site is wrongly described because it is in Linby.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001949	004601	The Marshall Family c/o J H Walter Rural Consultants

Summary of Objection

The land between Joe's Wood and Wighay Road should not be designated White Land because it is less suitable for development than land south of Newstead. The reasons Top Wighay Farm is less suitable include transportation, accessibility, visual impact and opportunities for regeneration.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001158	002446	Nottinghamshire County Council (Strategic Property)

Summary of Objection

The land at Top Wighay Farm designated as White Land should be allocated for development. The White Land should be extended northwards.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001324	002771	Langridge Homes Ltd

Summary of Objection

The policy is supported in principle but specific sites are disputed, including Top Wighay Farm.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001955	004670	Gedling Labour Group

Summary of Objection

All White Land should be deleted from the Local Plan. White Land at Top Wighay Farm is objected to.

THE COUNCIL DID NOT REGISTER ALL OF THE ABOVE OBJECTIONS AS RELATING TO THIS SITE. HOWEVER THEY ALL DO REFER TO IT EXPLICITLY.

IN ADDITION THERE WERE ABOUT 12 OBJECTIONS TO THE WHITE LAND DESIGNATION AT THIS SITE IN THE FIRST DEPOSIT THAT HAVE BEEN WITHDRAWN. I REGARD THESE AS SUPPORT FOR THE PLAN AS IT NOW STANDS AND CONSIDER THEM HERE ALSO.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

1. These issues are dealt with in the part of this report where I consider proposed development at Top Wighay Farm (see under policies E1 and H2).

RECOMMENDATION

2. For my recommendations on these objections see under policies E1 and H2.

2.73 H4 MANAGED RELEASE OF HOUSING SITES (IN THE SECOND DEPOSIT) GENERAL OBJECTIONS

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
004013	200059	Mr D Armiger
000722	201980	Severn Trent Water Limited
001948	201945	Aldergate Properties Ltd

Summary of Objection

The phasing mechanism requires more thought. Requiring total completion of phase 1 before releasing phase 2 is unreasonable and could lead to second phase being held up indefinitely, especially as timings expected for phase 1 are unrealistic.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000717	201442	Nottinghamshire County Council

Summary of Objection

The phasing policy is welcomed but wording changes are suggested.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001158	201960	Nottinghamshire County Council (Strategic Property)

Summary of Objection

The phasing policy is unrealistic because of too much reliance on the Gedling Colliery site. The approach in the Cherwell Local Plan is preferred.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001324	201316	Langridge Homes Ltd

Summary of Objection

The phasing period is too short to be sensible. Follow Ashfield Local Plan and delete phasing.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001682	201412	Mr J Lesquereux

Summary of Objection

The phasing policy appears to soften the concept of the Green Belt – is this the intention?

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

1. As I believe I made clear during the Local Plan Inquiry, I take the view that the phasing policy in the Second Deposit is unreasonable and unworkable as it stands because it requires the completion of Phase 1 before Phase 2 starts. During the Inquiry the Council and others gave some thought to this issue, for which I thank them. There were also responses to my suggestion that phasing might be more reasonable if the first phase ended in, say, 2008 rather than 2006.
2. I think it is fair to say that in general the house builders are against the imposition of a phasing policy as this can only make life more difficult for them, especially in the context of a relatively short plan period. I acknowledge that the time between the adoption of the Local Plan and 2011 will be relatively short.
3. I am now able to look at the issue of phasing in the light of my recommendations on which sites should be allocated. There are two relatively large sites and several smaller ones. Looking at this pragmatically my views on the larger sites are:
 - I have said that GCCF should go ahead as soon and as fast as possible. The main impediment is completion of the access road, which should precede occupation. Other than that I see no need for phasing;
 - the other large site is Top Wighay Farm. Whether or not the start of this development is held back, it is unlikely to be started before 2006 and perhaps later. Beyond that, a large site tends to phase itself because there is a limit to how many houses can be built and sold each year. In all the circumstances I can see little justification for a phasing policy here.

4. Regarding the smaller sites, as the Local Plan Inquiry progressed I became increasingly drawn to the conclusion that, for whatever reason, housing land in Gedling has been in short supply for several years. I came to the view that this has contributed to a lower delivery of housing than is either desirable or was envisaged in the Structure Plan. I therefore consider that what is needed now is an injection of readily developable land. This is best achieved by a variety and range of sites in different locations and of different sizes. It is not possible to know with certainty in advance which small sites will come forward first or how long each site will take to start or finish. Any artificial impediments to early development – phasing for its own sake – can only serve to frustrate an improvement in the short-term supply of housing land (and then housing).
5. If there are specific reasons for holding back the development of a site (such as, for example, the need for the access road at GCCF), these should be stated in the text accompanying the policy dealing with that site (which will usually be policy H2). However, it is my understanding that apart from GCCF only Chartwell Grove is subject to such a constraint. In such circumstances it is simpler to add a note to this effect to the text in the Local Plan than to use the complex tool of a phasing policy.
6. As far as Calverton is concerned, the Council was worried by an accumulating backlog of unfinished planning permissions in the village. It appeared to me that this problem was solving itself by the time of the Local Plan Inquiry. Or perhaps the Council's restrictive policy had worked. Be that as it may, I see no need for such a constraint in the future and I am inclined to believe it is a rather inefficient way of achieving what the Council wanted in any event.
7. Generally I consider that any attempt to phase development between the adoption of the Local Plan and 2011 could have untoward consequences by restricting the supply of housing land. It must be remembered that a key objective of PPG3 and subsequent guidance is to maintain an adequate supply of new houses so that everyone has the chance to be properly housed.
8. I conclude that in the circumstances of Gedling and this Local Plan, there is no need for a phasing policy for residential development.

RECOMMENDATION

9. **I recommend that policy H4 (Managed Release of Housing Sites) is deleted from the Local Plan.**
 10. **I recommend that the text accompanying policy H2 is expanded to say that the site at Chartwell Grove cannot be developed until the GCCF Access Road has been built.**
-

2.74 H4 MANAGED RELEASE OF HOUSING SITES (IN THE SECOND DEPOSIT) VARIOUS SITE- SPECIFIC OBJECTIONS

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
003886	200015	J Taylor
003992	200016	Sol Homes
004005	200037	Mr G Briggs
004863	201280	Mr B Seaton
004867	201314	Mr M J Lewis

Summary of Objection

Flatts Lane Calverton can be brought forward for development now. It is not Green Belt and can be completed prior to 2006.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000722	201976	Severn Trent Water Limited

Summary of Objection

Sites at Stoke Bardolph should be developed sooner rather than later.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000722	201978	Severn Trent Water Limited

Summary of Objection

Linden Grove should be released early

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001942	201428	Dr Kapur

Summary of Objection

Land north of Park Avenue Burton Joyce should be released early.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

1. In view of my recommendation above that the phasing policy should be deleted from the Local Plan, I consider it is unnecessary to consider these objections further. In addition I note that I am recommending the deletion of two of the allocations referred to.

RECOMMENDATION

2. I recommend no modification to the Local Plan in response to these objections.
-

2.75 H4 MANAGED RELEASE OF HOUSING SITES (IN THE SECOND DEPOSIT) GEDLING COLLIERY / CHASE FARM

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001939	201274	CWS Property & Development

Summary of Objection

Object to scale of housing at Gedling Colliery; dependent on new road; will result in shortfall. Reinstate allocations such as Papplewick Lane to address shortfall.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000413	201613	East Midlands Development Agency

Summary of Objection

Supports principle of phasing. Undertaking work to establish scale of development on Gedling Colliery achievable in each phase. Until completed, lodge holding objection to phasing.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000722	201976	Severn Trent Water Limited

Summary of Objection

It is unrealistic to assume the whole of the site will be developed in the plan period.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

1. For convenience and to avoid unnecessary repetition these objections are dealt with in the part of this report on policy H3 (Land at Former Gedling Colliery and Chase Farm)

RECOMMENDATION

2. For my recommendations see policy H3.
-

2.76 H5 RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT ON UNIDENTIFIED SITES WITHIN THE URBAN AREA AND THE DEFINED VILLAGE ENVELOPES

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
003981	201646	English Heritage

Summary of Objection

The removal of the reference to 'character' from this policy is objected to. Character encompasses more than just appearance and its protection is promoted in PPGs. Reinstate the word 'character' to the policy, as is the case, for example in policy R12.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001664	003936	W Hardy & Sons

Summary of Objection

The Lambley village envelope is disputed. (Although I think this objection should refer to policy ENV30 because Lambley is a “washed over” village (see below for explanation), I deal with it here because the objection form referred to policy H5.)

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001948	004578	Aldergate Properties Ltd

Summary of Objection

Ravenshead is an inset village in the Green Belt. It is unlikely to give rise to many conversions or much infilling. This increases the case for the allocation of land for residential development in Ravenshead.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

1. This policy relates to the control of development within urban areas and inset villages in the Green Belt.

Character

2. In the First Deposit, this policy required development in the urban area and village envelopes to have regard to the character of the area and not to result in the loss of open spaces which contribute to the character of the area. In the Second Deposit the word character is deleted, although development is still not to result in the loss of open spaces that make an important contribution to the appearance of the area. English Heritage seeks the reinstatement of “character” as a consideration. EH says that the character of built up areas is as important as it is in rural areas and relates to more than just the appearance of the area.
3. My understanding is that what prompted the Council to make the changes they have, was the fear that retaining the character of an area as a requirement for development would make it harder to achieve the higher densities and windfall developments that are so important to the Local Plan. I think the Council is fearful that local residents would always oppose higher densities, redevelopment and intensification because they were not in character with surrounding housing (which has usually been at lower densities than those now envisaged).
4. I consider the issues surrounding density later in this report but government guidance is clear that higher densities than in the past are preferred. This will reduce the amount of greenfield land that has to be developed. Some appeal decisions by the Secretary of State have made it clear that low densities in surrounding areas are not a sufficient reason to allow low densities on sites that could accommodate more dwellings.
5. I agree that the character of an area can be an important matter but it is also a rather nebulous concept, which different people will interpret in their own way. It is clear from their representation that English Heritage are using the term to refer to issues of urban design, and building style rather than referring to density. But others could seek to use

the concept to oppose the achievement of higher densities irrespective of whether any real harm would be caused to the area. I also note that policy H14 stipulates that new housing should be designed to have regard for the character of the area in which it is to be built.

6. On balance I consider it safer (and less open to misinterpretation) to leave policy H5 as it is in the Second Deposit.
7. The analogy with the rural areas and policy R12 is not, in my view, a sound one because it is the very character of the countryside as such that may be at risk in rural areas. And of course within Conservation Areas the statutory duty to have regard to the character or appearance of the area would remain.
8. I conclude that no modification is needed.

Lambley

9. Objection 001664 / 003936 is part of a series of objections from W Hardy and Sons of Jericho Farm, Lambley. These seek more development opportunities in rural areas.
10. The bulk of the rural areas in the borough are in the Green Belt. Generally any development, other than that which has to be in the open countryside, is to be concentrated in villages. This is in accord with government guidance.
11. The Local Plan treats the villages in the Green Belt in one of three ways:
 - it excludes (or “insets”) the built up area of the village from the Green Belt notation so that limited development may take place within the village;
 - it includes (“washes over”) the village in the Green Belt but defines an “infill boundary” within which infilling will be allowed (see policy ENV30);
 - it includes (“washes over”) the village within the Green Belt without any “infill boundary “ so that Green Belt policies apply throughout the village.
12. This approach is in accordance with the guidance from government in the current PPG2 (paragraph 2.11). I therefore consider that the approach is acceptable.
13. GBC collected data on the services and character of each rural settlement and has categorised the villages as follows:
 - ***Inset Villages:*** Bestwood, Burton Joyce, Calverton, Newstead and Ravenshead;
 - ***Washed over Villages with Infill Boundaries:*** Lambley, Linby, Papplewick and Woodborough;
 - ***Washed Over Villages Without Infill Boundaries:*** all the smaller settlements, including Stoke Bardolph.
14. Having studied the Council's data and considered objections on the matter, my own view is that this categorisation is reasonable and justified. Certainly as far as Lambley is concerned, I have no doubt that it is correctly categorised. It is a small settlement with few facilities and it is not an appropriate location for any development beyond infilling. The boundary around the village is quite tightly drawn to reflect this.

15. Although the objectors are not specific about where they want the infill boundary changed, I have looked in detail on the ground at the boundary on the Proposals Map and can find no fault in it. I am certainly of the view that it should not be extended to include any of the sporadic development around the village, Jericho Farm or the houses between the farm and the village.
16. I conclude that no modifications to policy H5 or the Lambley Infill Boundary are justified.

Ravenshead (objector 1948)

17. I have dealt with the issue of whether land should be allocated for residential development at Ravenshead under policy H2. I have recommended that some land should be allocated and further land should be designated as Safeguarded Land. Unfortunately for this objector neither recommendation affects the site that they own.
18. Although ostensibly an objection to policy H5, in my view this objection relates more to policy H2. It is not clear that the objector is seeking any change to policy H5 or, if they are, what it is. I conclude that no modification to policy H5 is required.

RECOMMENDATION

- 19. I recommend no modification to the Local Plan in response to these objections.**
-

2.77 H6 RESIDENTIAL DENSITY

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000061	000080	Mrs S Lane
001161	002547	Mr C Preston
001349	003330	Mr J Smith
001620	003836	Gedling Liberal Democrats
001955	004672	Gedling Labour Group
003921	010737	Mr P Wilkinson

Summary of Objection

Higher densities and smaller dwellings are needed. Higher densities would accord with PPG3 and reduce the amount of Green Belt land needed for development.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000309	000436	House Builders Federation

Summary of Objection

The policy is too rigid and how it will be used is not clear. There are potential conflicts between high densities and the character of the area. It is not clear how distances from facilities are to be measured. Also, sites may be close to one facility but poorly related to others.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000717	201444	Nottinghamshire County Council

Summary of Objection

When calculating higher densities, the relevant distances should be 400m to bus services and 800m to rail.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000721	001251	St Modwen Developments Ltd
000721	200285	St Modwen Developments Ltd

Summary of Objection

The policy is too rigid and goes beyond PPG3. Densities should also respond to site characteristics and market demand.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000722	201982	Severn Trent Water Limited

Summary of Objection

The policy is too rigid and how it has been applied to individual allocations in the plan is not clear. The text of the plan should be expanded to explain how a range of factors may, in practice, reduce the densities that can be achieved. "Quality Transport Routes" should be defined.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000777	200134	Mr D Lawson

Summary of Objection

The densities are too high and should be reduced. 50 dph is more suited to city centres. Specific changes to the policy and text are suggested.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001158	002447	Nottinghamshire County Council (Strategic Property)
001158	002449	Nottinghamshire County Council (Strategic Property)
001158	201961	Nottinghamshire County Council (Strategic Property)

Summary of Objection

The policy should specify how each allocation is affected. The policy should distinguish between existing and proposed facilities. Criteria (b) and (c) are criticised as is the suggested reduction in parking provision. Gross or net densities should be specified. The policy is too rigid and how it has been applied to individual allocations in the plan is not clear. The text should refer to the guidance in PPG3. Detailed criticisms of the revised policy and text in the Second Deposit are made.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001324	201319	Langridge Homes Ltd

Summary of Objection

The policy is too rigid and the densities are unrealistically high on the edge of a conurbation. Higher densities are proposed than in nearby areas. It is flawed to require higher densities near schools where family housing is appropriate. Redrafting to reduce target densities from 40 (+) dph to 35 dph is suggested.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001330	002936	CPRE
001330	201811	CPRE

Summary of Objection

The policy should be redrafted to reflect PPG3 (wording suggested) and achieve higher densities (than in the First Deposit). At Second Deposit the only change suggested relates to achieving a higher density at Teal Close. Parking standards also need to be revised to accord with PPG3 and achieve the desired densities.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001337	003078	Messrs J N C&T Cutts

Summary of Objection

The policy is too rigid because it says planning permission will not be granted unless specified densities are achieved. The text at paragraph 2.38 is incompatible with this and allows greater flexibility. Neither the policy nor the text acknowledge the importance of the character of different sites and locations.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001338	003082	Birch Homes Ltd

Summary of Objection

The policy should be amended to take account of the impact of higher densities on the surrounding areas. It is not always possible to build at densities of 40 dph without harming the local environment.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001334	003030	Jaycee (Nottingham) Ltd.
001334	201382	Jaycee (Nottingham) Ltd.
001334	201386	Jaycee (Nottingham) Ltd.
003851	010574	Barratt (East Midlands)
003851	201327	Barratt (East Midlands)
003853	010582	Mr & Mrs R W Burton
003853	201325	Mr & Mrs R W Burton

Summary of Objection

The policy is too restrictive and inflexible. More emphasis should be given to each site's circumstances and character. High densities may not be possible on all sites. The policy is not in accord with PPG3 in seeking such high densities. Specific wording changes are suggested.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
003981	201647	English Heritage

Summary of Objection

In addition to physical constraints, the character of designated areas (eg Conservation Area or Special Character Areas) may constrain high densities. Specific re-wording suggested.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
004893	201460	County Land & Business Association

Summary of Objection

High densities are not always appropriate in rural areas. The character of villages and their infrastructure could be harmed. Each village needs a range and variety of housing.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

1. The need for a policy on residential densities is generally accepted. The density policy is important for its own sake but also because of the impact it has on the amount of land to be allocated. The density policy in the First Deposit gave rise to several objections that densities were too low, leading to too much greenfield land being allocated for development. The Second Deposit increased the proposed densities and reduced the amount of land allocated. But this has given rise to a reaction both in general terms (dealt with here) and in relation to particular sites (usually dealt with site by site in policy H2 in conjunction with objections to the principle of the allocation concerned). There are also complaints about the rigidity of the policy, its clarity, its application, detailed elements of it and its relationship to the guidance in PPG3.
2. PPG3 (paragraph 58) says planning authorities should avoid developments that make inefficient use of land (particularly less than 30 dph net) and should encourage housing that makes more efficient use of land (between 30 and 50 dph). There should be greater intensity of development in locations with good accessibility, such as district and local centres and around good quality public transport corridors. The guidance clearly wishes to eliminate wasteful densities, especially those below 20 dph. However, it imposes no upper limit on densities and encourages up to 50 dph in suitable locations. Parking standards are to be re-examined because of the influence they have on densities in development. It is clear the guidance attaches importance to achieving higher densities through good design and not at the expense of it.
3. For sites large enough to be allocations the plan now proposes densities of between 30 and 50 dph net depending on the location, with densities of 40 and 50 dph being required close to specified facilities. Parking standards will be relaxed in locations where higher densities are appropriate. The only respect in which the Local Plan's policy clearly departs from the guidance in PPG3 is that it identifies proximity to a school as a reason for increasing densities above 30 dph, which is not something to be found in PPG3.
4. Therefore it seems to me that in general terms those who at the First Deposit wanted higher densities have won the argument in principle, at least as far as GBC is concerned. The approach in the Second Deposit generally complies with the guidance in PPG3. Accordingly I do not accept the general arguments that the proposed densities are too high or that the policy should be diluted. I note that very little evidence is advanced in support of lower densities being reintroduced into the Local Plan. That the currently proposed densities are higher than have been achieved in the borough in the past is not a reason to lower the intended density in new development. Indeed, the opposite could be true because past development will have ensured that there is already a supply of lower density housing in the area and higher densities are now needed to ensure a greater range and variety in the local stock. I have no demographic evidence that small, high density, dwellings are not needed in this area and would be surprised if this were uniquely the case in Gedling.
5. However, increasing densities near schools (but in the absence of other services or good public transport) would be, in my view, misguided. As more than one objector points out, locations near schools may be ideal for family housing (which is likely to mean larger dwellings and lower densities). In any event, journeys to school are a

small proportion of all the trips generated by the average household. If short (walked) journeys to school are to be achieved only at the expense of longer (car) journeys to work, shops and everything else, this will hardly improve overall sustainability. I accept that the “school-run” is a very visible and tangible proof of society’s reliance on the car at present but I suspect that what is needed is a deeper change in habits and attitudes than can be achieved simply by increasing housing densities near schools.

6. On the other hand living near a superstore can mean that residents use that store for their day to day needs as well as for larger periodic shopping trips. To this extent such shops function as local centres for the immediate neighbourhood. On this basis I accept that this is a valid consideration when determining where higher densities are likely to be justified. However, in practice I note that none of the housing allocations in the Local Plan are in such a location.
7. I do not accept that high densities necessarily harm the character of areas currently with low density housing in them. What determines the character of an area is a complex matter as is how the residents view the character of the area in which they live. However, it is clear to me that high densities are not to be achieved by sacrificing good design and such matters as privacy. The general approach advocated by PPG3 and other recent government guidance is that the opposite should be true. I accept GBC’s evidence that to place reliance on the existing character of an area as a guide to what density new development should be could undermine the implementation of the policy and its aims.
8. If, as English Heritage fears, specific conflict arises between the density policy and a conservation policy such conflicts can and should be explored and resolved explicitly by weighing the two policies rather than by including an “escape clause” in this policy. However in my view, the occasions where the density of a proposal by itself (and not in conjunction with, for example, poor siting and design) would harm the established character of a designated area are likely to be very few and far between. In practice few, if any, allocations are in Conservation Areas.
9. Neither can leaving things to be resolved on a site by site basis – relying on the characteristics of each site and market demand – be used to achieve the higher densities that are sought both by GBC and central government. Given the generally limited level of housing allocation in rural areas, I see no reason to make a special exception in villages. In any event, I have no evidence that what the villages currently lack is medium and low-density housing. There is no indication that the supply and range of housing in any village would be harmed by higher density new development.
10. The most common criticism of the policy as it now stands is that it is inflexible and will impose an unjustified constraint on developers. To some extent this encourages me to anticipate that the policy can and will deliver what is intended! Rewording the policy so that it talked in terms of “encouraging” rather than “requiring” higher densities could be seen as a general weakening of intent and I see no reason to do this.
11. This is not to say that exceptions to the policy will not occur and the text in the plan indicates that physical constraints and preserved trees, in particular, may be sound reasons for lower densities occurring on some sites. In view of experience during the public inquiry I would add “access constraints” as another reason why high densities

may not be achieved on some sites. I consider that such caveats are adequately and appropriately dealt with in the text rather than in the policy itself. But to highlight other potential reasons to depart from the policy could only serve to weaken it.

12. There is also some criticism of the policy’s transport clause. Initially it was suggested at First Deposit that the term “any quality transport route” was unclear and certainly it should say “any quality public transport route”. However, this is now made clearer in the revised paragraph 2.39 of the plan.
13. The Highway/Transportation Authority (NCC) point out that the threshold distance of 400m is usually used in relation to bus stops while 800m usually refers to the distance from a railway station. I accept that this is true but see no necessity to be bound too strictly by this convention, especially in corridors not served by a rail line. In reality accessibility decreases progressively and not in steps and NCC offers no convincing evidence as to why a high quality bus route should not be accorded significant weight.
14. NCC has also suggested in evidence that an alternative approach would be to base the calculations on the frequency of services at peak times. This would mean higher densities close to routes (bus or rail) with more than two services an hour and the highest densities near routes with more than four services an hour. This is getting very complicated and it is not clear how much difference it would make in practice. Be that as it may, I note that this is a retreat from the original stance that a distinction should be made between bus routes and rail routes. Without some clearer evidence that the outcome would be materially different I am reluctant to impose a more complicated methodology. In any event I consider that NCC over-states the case when they describe the policy as it stands as “not sustainable”.
15. I conclude that the case for changing the mechanism for this calculation has not been substantiated by the County Council.
16. The stated intention to relax parking standards in accessible locations is in accord with the guidance in PPG3 and in my view is an essential part of the policy.
17. It is true that the plan as currently drafted is not entirely clear as to how the density policy has been applied to each allocated site, although more detailed explanations were produced in evidence at the public inquiry (Core Document A33). Whilst more detailed material could have been included in the plan its absence will not impair implementation, although it may have made things difficult for those who wish to understand or object to the policy. For example, my understanding (in light of Core Document A33) is that the calculations used to determine the capacity of each site in the plan allow for different densities on different parts of each site. The plan could, with advantage, have explained this. But the policy is not flawed because it did not.
18. Some objectors produced illustrative layouts for particular sites in order to test the density assumptions in the plan. Whilst I have no particular quarrel with any of the layouts put before me, they each represent only one possible way of developing the site. I do not consider it is my role as a Local Plan Inspector to be examining the details of the layout at each site. Suffice it to say, therefore, that the layouts I have seen do not, to my mind, conclusively prove that the Council’s density assumptions are unattainable at any of the sites.

19. I note that the policy only applies to sites above 0.4 ha in size. In my view the failure to provide guidance for smaller sites is an omission that, in view of their cumulative potential, should be rectified. I suggest that a clause to deal with this is added to the policy.

Overall Conclusions

20. I conclude, therefore, that in general this policy is sound and in accordance with current government guidance. However, I conclude that the proximity of a school should not, by itself, lead to an increase in the density of new development.
21. The scope of the policy should be extended to refer to smaller sites.
22. I also conclude that more guidance could be given in the plan itself as to how this policy has been applied to each of the residential allocations in the Local Plan.
23. Clause (d) of the policy should refer to “any quality public transport route” and that paragraph 2.38 should refer to access constraints.

RECOMMENDATIONS

24. I recommend that policy H6 is modified by the deletion of clause (b) and the alteration of clause (d) to refer to “any quality public transport route”.
25. I recommend that a clause be added at the end of the policy along the lines of: “The wasteful development and redevelopment of sites smaller than 0.4 ha will be discouraged. Such sites should provide as many appropriately designed dwellings as possible consistent with the protection of privacy, amenity and highway safety.”
26. I recommend that the words “or an access constraint” be added to paragraph 2.38 after “where a clear physical constraint”.
27. I recommend that consideration is given to including in the plan (either in the text accompanying policy H6 or in the table of sites in policy H2) a more detailed explanation of how policy H6 has been applied to each of the allocations in the Local Plan.
-

2.78 H6 DENSITY – ASHWATER DRIVE

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000717	201433	Nottinghamshire County Council

Summary of Objection

Because of the increased density, this development is only acceptable with two accesses onto Spring Lane or an internal circuit route with a wide connection to Spring Lane. In any event with the increased number of dwellings a full Transport Assessment will be needed. The Local Plan should specify these requirements.

Inspector's Note

1. This objection is dealt with earlier in this report, where this site is considered in relation to Policy H2.
-

2.79 H6 DENSITY – CHARTWELL GROVE

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
003829	200601	Residents of Chartwell Heights & Grove

AND ABOUT 15 INDIVIDUAL OBJECTIONS

Summary of Objection

The proposed density is too high. There are concerns about the increase in traffic, the effects on wildlife and the impact on the Green Belt.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
004909	201529	Standon Homes (1993) Ltd

Summary of Objection

Although it relates primarily to the phasing of development, GBC recorded this as an objection to Policy H6.

Inspector's Note

1. These objections are dealt with earlier in this report, where this site is considered in relation to Policy H2.
-

2.80 H6 DENSITY – TEAL CLOSE

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001330	201811	CPRE

Summary of Objection

The density proposed for this site should be higher.

Inspector's Note

1. As I am recommending that this site is deleted from the Local Plan, I see no need to consider the issue of density any further (see under Policy H2).
-

2.81 H6 DENSITY – GEDLING COLLIERY / CHASE FARM

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000413	201627	East Midlands Development Agency

Summary of Objection

Work is being undertaken on the amount of housing and other uses on site. Until this is completed there is a holding objection to the number of dwellings.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001330	201811	CPRE

Summary of Objection

The density at this site should be increased by 5% because of the adjacent country park proposal.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
004862	201294	Mr P Dosanjh

Summary of Objection

Density of houses at Gedling Colliery should be increased to protect Green Belt land.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001898	200603	Mr P Smith
001899	200602	Mrs J Smith

Summary of Objection

Too many houses are proposed for the site.

Inspector's Note

1. These objections are dealt with earlier in this report, where this site is considered in relation to Policy H3.
-

2.82 H6 DENSITY – LAND NORTH OF PARK AVENUE, BURTON JOYCE

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000702	201277	Burton Joyce Parish Council
004007	200046	Burton Joyce Floodwatch Committee

AND ABOUT 20 INDIVIDUAL OBJECTIONS

Summary of Objection

The density proposed for this site is too high.

Inspector's Note

1. These objections are dealt with earlier in this report, where this site is considered in relation to Policy H2.
-

2.83 H6 DENSITY – STOCKINGS FARM

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
004029	200091	Mr C Moodie

(Headteacher, Richard Bonington School Primary & Nursery School)

AND ABOUT 20 INDIVIDUAL OBJECTIONS.

Summary of Objection

The proposed density is too high, especially in the second deposit Local Plan. There is particular concern regarding the capacity of the Richard Bonington School Primary & Nursery School and because of the amount of traffic likely to be generated.

Inspector's Note

1. These objections are dealt with earlier in this report, where this site is considered in relation to Policy H2.
-

2.84 H6 DENSITY – PARK ROAD, BESTWOOD

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000721	200279	St Modwen Developments Ltd

Summary of Objection

The density in the Second Deposit is too high. The dwelling capacity of 170 in the First Deposit should be reinstated.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
004578	201279	Bestwood St Albans Parish Council

Summary of Objection

The Parish Council wants any future housing development to meet the need for sheltered accommodation for the elderly.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions***Policy H6***

1. I have recommended above that the close proximity of a school to a site should not, by itself, be regarded as a reason for raising the density of development above 30 dph (net). This is one of the few sites that would be directly affected by the above recommendation.

Villages in the Green Belt

2. The Local Plan treats the villages in the Green Belt in one of three ways:
 - it excludes (or “insets”) the built up area of the village from the Green Belt notation so that limited development may take place within the village;
 - it includes (or “washes over”) the village in the Green Belt but defines an “infill boundary” within which infilling will be allowed (see policy ENV30);
 - it includes (“washes over”) the village within the Green Belt without any “infill boundary “ so that Green Belt policies apply throughout the village.
3. This approach is in accordance with the guidance from government in the current PPG2 (paragraph 2.11). I therefore consider that the approach is acceptable.

4. Having collected data on the services available in each village and its character GBC has categorised the villages as follows:
- ***Inset Villages:*** Bestwood, Burton Joyce, Calverton, Newstead and Ravenshead;
 - ***Washed over Villages with Infill Boundaries:*** Lambley, Linby, Papplewick and Woodborough;
 - ***Washed Over Villages Without Infill Boundaries:*** all the smaller settlements, including Stoke Bardolph.
5. Having studied the Council's data and considered objections on the matter, my own view is that this categorisation is reasonable and justified. I reach this conclusion even though – in my view – Bestwood, Newstead and Woodborough are middle order settlements with a rather limited range of facilities. This would suggest that they all should be treated as washed over villages with infill boundaries. However, I accept that the character and circumstances of Bestwood and Newstead are such that they would benefit from some limited development and diversification. In addition there are particular reasons why the housing allocations in Bestwood and Newstead have been included in the plan.

Objector 0721

6. Thus, as far as Bestwood is concerned, my acceptance of the Council's categorisation is not because I consider the village is well served by existing (or planned facilities). In fact a school is the only facility highlighted by the current policy H6 that is in the village.
7. GBC's reasons for allocating this site are that it is underused but previously developed land and that Bestwood – as an old mining village – would benefit from an increased range of housing and a broader social mix. I accept this is a sound reason for allocating the site for housing and do not consider that the need to retain existing employment (either generally in the Borough or in Bestwood in particular) is so pressing as to override it. However, the wish to achieve some diversity in house types and a better social mix point to it being inappropriate to seek an especially high density on this site.
8. At the public inquiry GBC argued for a site capacity of 224 dwellings (as in the Second Deposit), whilst the landowners/objector argued for a capacity of 175 based on a layout they had produced. There was not complete agreement on how densities should be calculated for the site or the surrounding area but GBC's figure is based on a density of 50 dph on just over half the site and 40 dph on the rest. The landowner regards 175 dph as achieving about 35 dph over the allocation site as a whole. In practice these figures indicate approximately consistent approaches to the measurement of density (224 divided by 45, multiplied by 35 equals 174).

Conclusion on Objector 0721

9. In all the circumstances outlined above I conclude that the capacity of this site should be 175 dwellings. However, this does not imply acceptance of the layout presented at the inquiry, which is a development control matter to be determined later.

Objector 4578

10. As far as the objection from the Parish Council is concerned and the local need for sheltered housing, when the site is developed a certain amount of affordable housing will be required under policy H16 of the Local Plan. It would be going beyond my remit for me to determine what form this affordable housing should take. In any event, I have no information to enable me to do so. I conclude, therefore, that whether sheltered housing for the elderly should be provided on this site is a matter to be determined at the planning application stage in the light of a detailed analysis of housing need in the area at the time the proposal is being considered.

RECOMMENDATION

11. I recommend that the Local Plan is modified so that the capacity of the housing allocation at Park Road Bestwood is 175 dwellings.

2.85 H7 REPLACEMENT DWELLINGS

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001345	003194	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust

Summary of Objection

The policy is supported in principle but replacement dwellings should only be allowed if proposals take into account sustainable development issues.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

1. The policy relates to the replacement of dwellings in urban areas and village envelopes. These locations will normally be sustainable. Other policies in the Local Plan will control the design and layout of buildings.
2. I conclude that it is unnecessary to modify this policy.

RECOMMENDATION

3. I recommend no modification to the Local Plan in response to this objection.

2.86 H10 LIVING OVER THE SHOP

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001158	002450	Nottinghamshire County Council (Strategic Property)

Summary of Objection

The policy sets a standard for parking in relation to such developments whereas they should be encouraged, if necessary by relaxing parking requirements. Delete the policy or replace it with a statement of support.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

1. I have to say I read this policy in a different light than the objector. I see the policy as removing (and therefore relaxing) parking requirements in all but the largest examples of this type of development. The text accompanying the policy makes clear the Council's support for this type of development.
2. I conclude there is no need to change or delete the policy.

RECOMMENDATION

3. I recommend no modification to the Local Plan in response to this objection.
-

2.87 H11 RESIDENTIAL HOMES

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001158	002452	Nottinghamshire County Council (Strategic Property)
001158	002454	Nottinghamshire County Council (Strategic Property)

Summary of Objection

The first clause raises spurious certainty for treatment of applications and sets tests that cannot be applied by reference to the policy or the text. Tests in (c) are subjective and in an inappropriate form for a local plan. The accompanying text does not differentiate between new buildings and conversions.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

1. The objector seeks changes to the policy without indicating what these are. For my part I find the policy acceptable in that it defines areas where such development may take place and then sets reasonable criteria for assessing individual proposals. No reasons are advanced as to why conversions of existing buildings should be treated differently from new buildings.
2. I conclude that no changes to the policy or text are needed.

RECOMMENDATION

3. I recommend no modification to the Local Plan in response to these objections.
-

2.88 H13 COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001158	002469	Nottinghamshire County Council (Strategic Property)

Summary of Objection

The policy is insufficiently broad. It should indicate the factors that will be taken into account under the policy.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

1. Apart from the addition of “normally”, the objector seeks the addition to the policy of “Such comprehensive considerations are to include physical linkages and the provision of social; and physical infrastructure (both on and off the site).” I am not sure I understand what this means or how it relates to prejudicing comprehensive development. In any event the problem with trying to be specific in a situation like this is that one runs the risk of leaving something out. To my mind the Local Plan policy is short, sharp and easily understood as it is.
2. I do not normally advocate the use of the word “normally” in policies.
3. I conclude the suggested modifications would detract from the Local Plan.

RECOMMENDATION

4. I recommend no modification to the Local Plan in response to this objection.
-

2.89 H14 DESIGN OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001158	002470	Nottinghamshire County Council (Strategic Property)

Summary of Objection

Criterion (b) sets tests that are too subjective and complex and cannot be applied by reference to the policy or text alone. A simple statement that good design will be encouraged is preferred.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001161	002549	Mr C Preston

Summary of Objection

The Local Plan lacks commitment to working with numerous agencies such as the police on crime, “greens” on cycle routes and Friends of the Earth on ecological matters. Such bodies should be consulted before development takes place.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001345	003200	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust

Summary of Objection

Development should be designed to incorporate as many energy efficient and renewable energy features as possible. A criterion should be added to the policy to this effect.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001948	004583	Aldergate Properties Ltd

Summary of Objection

Criterion (a) is too rigid. The aims of reducing crime and avoiding “dead street frontages” can be met in a variety of ways.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

General

1. Objector 1161 seeks the wider involvement of bodies (such as the Police) and groups (such as Friends of the Earth). Whilst the Council does not oppose this, it says that they will be consulted as and when individual proposals arise. It does not seem to me to be possible, sensible or necessary to attempt to write consultation proposals and procedures into the Local Plan.
2. Objector 1345 is concerned about energy efficiency. The Council says this is already addressed in policy ENV6, although I note that policy only refers to major development. Whilst it may be uneconomic for small developments to incorporate expensive technology to harness renewable energy sources, I see no reason why all development should not be designed to be energy efficient. I therefore accept that a third clause should be added to the policy referring to energy efficiency.

Criterion (a)

3. Objector 1948 finds this criterion to be too rigid and says the aims of avoiding dead street frontages and reducing crime can be met in other ways. At a time when government guidance is calling for imaginative design in conjunction with achieving higher densities, I agree. In addition, in larger developments where there is a hierarchy of roads, it may not be appropriate for dwelling to face the main highway.
4. In the circumstances I conclude that a wording closer to that suggested by the objector is preferable:
 - (a) dwellings should be sited and designed to relate to each other and to the roads, footpaths and open spaces in the surrounding layout;
 - (b) residential development should be laid out and designed in such a way as to reduce the risk of crime;

Criterion (b)

5. Objector 1158 says that criterion (b) is too subjective and complex. However, to reduce the clause to nothing more a requirement for good design is no less subjective and is only deceptively simple. In my view the reference in the policy to the factors to be taken into account in determining the suitability of a design is both helpful and appropriate.
6. I note that the Second Deposit added a reference to Supplementary Planning Guidance on design to the text, as suggested by this objector.
7. Having just agreed to the removal of the word “character” from policy H5, I am surprised to find it here!

Overall Conclusions

8. I conclude that the policy could usefully be modified.

RECOMMENDATION

9. I recommend that policy H14 be reworded as follows:

Planning Permission will be granted for new residential development if the following design criteria are met:

- (a) dwellings should be sited and designed to relate to each other and to the roads, footpaths and open spaces in the surrounding layout;
 - (b) residential development should be laid out and designed in such a way as to reduce the risk of crime;
 - (c) the proposals are of a high standard of design which has regard to the surroundings and does not adversely affect the area by reason of their scale, bulk, form, layout or materials;
 - (d) dwellings should conserve energy and use it efficiently.
-

2.90 H16 AFFORDABLE HOUSING

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000061	000079	Mrs S Lane

Summary of Objection

(First Deposit) Affordable housing is not just for problem families, although misconceptions about this cause public concern. The definition of affordable housing should be expanded to include housing for purchase, first time homes, retirement homes and homes for divorced people. This is likely to include high density flats or maisonettes, which are in short supply in Gedling.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000186	000268	Mrs M Meadows

Summary of Objection

(First Deposit) The study of affordable housing should be more holistic and cover a wider area. It should include village dependent communities on the edge of the urban fringe.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000309	000437	House Builders Federation
000309	201501	House Builders Federation

Summary of Objection

(First Deposit) Following Circular 6/98, the Local Plan should indicate how many affordable homes are needed. It is unacceptable to have a general policy requirement and also to require studies at each site. The base need is assessed as 1034 dwellings. Some affordable housing should be financed from right to buy receipts and not by the private sector. The definition of affordable housing should include low-cost market housing as well as subsidised housing.

(Second Deposit) In view of Circulars 6/98 and 1/97, the HBF objects to a blanket requirement on all sites and seeks a specific requirement for each site. The Local Plan focuses on social rented housing too much and pays insufficient regard to low-cost market housing. The plan ignores the definition of affordable housing in Circular 6/98. The plan should not seek affordable provision in perpetuity. More attention should be paid to local housing need, site conditions and size and economics as in paragraph 10 of Circular 6/98.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000392	000553	Mr R Holehouse

Summary of Objection

(First Deposit) Because there are no large housing sites in Woodborough, there is no opportunity to provide affordable housing to meet local needs.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000717	001508	Nottinghamshire County Council

Summary of Objection

(First Deposit) It is likely that further work will be required to quantify the level of affordable housing to be provided. (No further evidence or comment submitted.)

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000777	001220	Mr D Lawson

Summary of Objection

(First Deposit) It is unsatisfactory to rely on studies submitted by applicants. The South Nottinghamshire Study should be used with a sounder definition of affordable housing and a realistic price level.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001158	201962	Nottinghamshire County Council (Strategic Property)
001158	002401	Nottinghamshire County Council (Strategic Property)

Summary of Objection

(Second Deposit) The changes are objected to. The policy should not specify amounts or a percentage but should be determined at the planning application stage by housing need surveys and negotiation.

(First Deposit) Paragraph 2.1 of the Local Plan is objected to because the relationship between Local Plan and the Council's Housing Strategy is not properly explained. The Housing Strategy says there is a need for 1,300 new affordable homes 1996 – 2011 but there is no reference in the Local Plan to this figure or how it will be met. The Local Plan's under-provision of housing land does not aid the housing strategy.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001324	002772	Langridge Homes Ltd
001324	201320	Langridge Homes Ltd

Summary of Objection

(First Deposit) The policy should be more flexible, in particular allowing for financial contributions for off-site provision. A consistent approach is needed, not individual studies and negotiations at each site.

(Second Deposit) This objector no longer objects to policy H16 but would like to see a justification for 20% provision. The objector also believes that the Local Plan should not express a tenure preference.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001328	002907	Government Office for the East Midlands
001328	201546	Government Office for the East Midlands

Summary of Objection

(First Deposit) The policy should reflect the advice in paragraph 9 of Circular 6/98. The plan should include enough of the results of the South Nottinghamshire Study to indicate how the Local Plan's requirement for affordable housing has been arrived at. The definition of affordable housing in the plan does not follow paragraph 9(a) of the Circular. Paragraph 9(b) of the Circular says the plan should say how many affordable homes are needed. Paragraph 10 of the circular says regard should be paid to site size, suitability and economics. Eligibility criteria are also needed. More detail and supporting information is needed in the plan.

(Second Deposit) The improvements in the Local Plan regarding definition and eligibility are acknowledged but more clarification is still needed. More information is needed in the Local Plan to justify the 20% requirement. Reliance cannot be placed on other documents. The total requirement is still missing. There is still no mention of site size, suitability and economics.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001337	003079	Messrs J N C&T Cutts

Summary of Objection

(First Deposit) Concern is expressed over the Local Plan's text and the requirement for individual surveys of need with each planning application. This is contrary to Circular 6/98 and PPG3.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001338	003083	Birch Homes Ltd

Summary of Objection

(First Deposit) The Local Plan fails to define what constitutes affordable housing, which should include low-cost market housing as indicated by Circular 6/98. The objector agrees that there will be occasions when affordable housing is inappropriate but this should be incorporated in the policy.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001341	003108	McCarthy & Stone (Developments) Ltd

Summary of Objection

(First Deposit) Circular 6/98 should be followed. There is a need to provide affordable housing but this should not override the provision of housing for other needs (eg housing for the elderly). A flexible policy is needed so that each site and situation can be dealt with appropriately. Circular 6.98 paragraph 10 indicates there may be constraints on sites to be taken into account. An alternative wording for the policy is suggested.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001345	003176	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust

Summary of Objection

(First Deposit) The policy should indicate the quantity of affordable housing required. Affordable housing catering for actual need should be given priority. The phased release of land could also be used to give priority to affordable housing. The Draft RPG indicates that 30% of region's housing should be affordable housing and this needs to be addressed more clearly. The requirement for affordable housing should be expressed in absolute terms not as a proportion of the total.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001937	004534	Mr N Foster c/o FPD Savills

Summary of Objection

(First Deposit) Circular 6/98 should be followed. Local need surveys may reveal that there is no need for affordable housing on particular sites. A maximum affordable provision of 25% provision should be set for all sites. An alternative wording for the policy is suggested.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001948	004577	Aldergate Properties Ltd
001948	201946	Aldergate Properties Ltd

Summary of Objection

(First Deposit) Detailed wording amendments are suggested. The affordable requirement should be set for particular allocated sites. Unallocated sites should be a matter of negotiation. The affordable provision in each case should have regard to the local supply and demand for affordable housing.

(Second Deposit) There should not be the same requirement for every site, it will vary (up or down). The Local Plan does not define affordable housing.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
004893	201461	County Land & Business Association

Summary of Objection

Affordable housing should be an issue in its own right rather than just as an adjunct to applications for full priced housing on a larger scale.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

1. Although there are some common threads running through many of the objections, I am struck by how disparate they are. This will make for a rather “bitty” report from me.
2. When the Local Plan Inquiry closed the government had embarked on a consultation about affordable housing policies in Local Plans. This has not been completed at the time of my writing this. I have given the consultation document little weight because the outcome was not clear at the time the Local Plan Inquiry closed. The Council may need to take any change in the guidance into account when considering this report and making modifications.
3. The Government Office has come down rather hard on the lack of explicit reasoning in the Local Plan and others have made similar criticisms. It seems to me the Council has not helped me (or themselves) by failing to respond more positively to these criticisms and expanding on the explanation in the plan instead of relying on external documents.
4. There is some agreement (although not universal) that the Second Deposit is an improvement on the First Deposit. I also note how few objectors wanted to discuss this matter during the Round Table and during Local Plan Inquiry sessions. There is also a paucity of written representations in support of the objections to this policy. I therefore have the feeling that the heat has gone out of this issue, although this will not stop me giving due consideration to the objections.
5. Perhaps one of the reasons there were not more representations is that relatively few sites are affected. In the Second Deposit there were 11 allocated sites larger than 1 ha with a total housing capacity of 2795 dwellings. If my recommendations are followed there would be 12 such sites with a capacity of 2920 dwellings. A 20% provision of affordable housing would thus fall within the range 560 (Second Deposit) to 585 (my recommendations).

The Definition of Affordable Housing

6. There is much complaint, mainly in relation to the First Deposit, that affordable housing is not defined or that any definition does not follow the guidance in the circular.
7. In particular, the HBF and others sought the extension of the definition of affordable housing to include low-cost market housing and a reference to this was included in the text of the Second Deposit. To this extent I consider that the HBF and similar objections to the First Deposit have been met.

8. The expanded definition still does not specifically mention first time buyers, the elderly or divorced people. However, the needs of these groups will not be met entirely in affordable housing and I have no information about the amount of need in each group. I therefore consider that the policy and text need not refer to sectors of demand such as those mentioned.
9. The HBF and others are still concerned that the Local Plan places too much emphasis on social rented housing and pays insufficient regard to low-cost market housing. The Council explains that this is because most of what was the Council housing stock has been sold and the rented sector is where most of the need is. I find this plausible and convincing. I therefore accept that the priority given in the Local Plan to social rented housing is justified.
10. I consider that the issue of definition is now dealt with in an acceptable way. This includes the matter of specifying eligibility for affordable housing.

The Overall Level of Need and Its Justification

11. There are three main complaints about the overall level of affordable housing that is sought by the Local Plan:
 - that the overall 20% requirement cannot be justified and is wrong;
 - that the Local Plan does not contain enough information to explain how the figure is derived;
 - that receipts from Council house sales should be used to provide new affordable homes.
12. The Council relies on the South Nottinghamshire Affordable Housing Study, which was an inter-authority co-operative venture to assess the need for affordable housing across the whole of this housing market area. This has been accepted by other Local Plan Inspectors (eg Ashfield) as a sound basis for Local Plan policies. Indeed no objection seeks to cast any doubt on this study and its results, although the HBF did question whether all the need it revealed should properly be met by private house builders. The Council's Technical Paper 4 uses this study to derive a total need in the borough of 1296 dwellings. In this light the requirement in the Local Plan (see above – a range between 560 and 585) seems modest and I have no evidence that would lead me to reject it. (I recognise that some affordable housing may have been built since the study but house prices and incomes may have changed as well. Be that as it may, I have no evidence on these matters.)
13. I therefore consider that the 20% overall requirement should be retained.
14. As to the criticism that the Local Plan is not explicit about how this figure has been arrived at, I cannot but agree. I consider that an additional paragraph should be added to the text of the plan to rectify this omission. The new material should also indicate the total level of need and the total provision that will be achieved by the Local Plan policy. In the light of objection 1158 / 2401 reference could also be made to the Council's Housing Strategy and the level of need for affordable housing identified in that document.

15. As far as receipts from Council house sales are concerned, I am not an expert in the field but I imagine that the use of such receipts is governed by all sorts of rules and restrictions. Without some evidence on the matter I am not inclined to the view that this source of funds can make up the identified shortfall in the provision of affordable housing.

Specific Figures for Each Site?

16. If the overall figure of 20% is retained, should it apply to all sites or should there be variations from site to site that nevertheless achieve this overall result?
17. The Council says none of the sites in the Second Deposit are so remote that they would not or could not contribute to meeting the overall need and that there is no reason to treat any of them differently. Although there are objections that variation should be allowed for as a matter of principle, I cannot recall a single objection that argues for a variation on a specific site. (Certainly I do not recall any builder pointing out that a site of theirs could exceed 20% and this would be necessary if some sites are to provide less.) The sites I am recommending are not the same as those in the Second Deposit but I see no reason for taking a different view about any of them.
18. The reality is that all the borough is in a single housing market area that covers South Nottinghamshire. The priorities used during site selection have given priority to urban extensions, sites with good accessibility and larger villages. The sites should, therefore, all be capable of meeting general needs in the wider area. Also I have no evidence that site conditions or any other consideration threatens the viability of any of the selected sites if the 20% requirement is applied. I believe that all the objection sites I am recommending were supported by representations that assumed the provision of 20% affordable housing and in some cases this was presented as one of the site's virtues.
19. All in all I have no evidence that would lead me to expect that any of the sites recommended for allocation should provide more or less than 20% affordable housing.

Site by Site Surveys (First Deposit)

20. At the First Deposit the HBF took issue with the requirement for a study of housing needs for each site as it arose. (Objections 777 / 1220, 1324 / 2772 and 1337 / 3079 agree, although objection 1158 / 201962 takes the opposite view.) This had been included in the text of the First Deposit but was removed in the Second Deposit.
21. Having considered whether there are reasons to depart from the overall figure in particular cases (and having reached the view that there are none apparent at this time), I consider the obligation to provide detailed need surveys at every site is an unnecessary burden.

Site Size, Conditions and Economics

22. However as several objectors point out, the size, condition and economics of each site are important considerations in the current Circular. In view of this I consider that the following sentence should be added to the text, "Any departure from the expected 20% provision would need to be justified by the size, site conditions or economic viability at a specific site." This could be inserted as the second sentence of paragraph 2.51 (after "accordance with Circular 6/98").

In Perpetuity

23. The Second Deposit says (paragraph 2.51) “low-cost market housing may be granted subject to conditions and/or legal agreements which maintain control over occupancy.” This does not say that only agreements controlling occupation in perpetuity will be acceptable and it is in keeping with the spirit of the Circular. I do not consider it is my proper role to determine the precise wording of conditions and legal agreements, which should be left until the time when they are needed. I consider the Local Plan should not be modified in this respect.

Off Site Provision

24. I have no reason to anticipate that on-site provision cannot be made at every allocation. Indeed, all the evidence submitted in support of housing sites indicates that affordable housing can and will be provided. To include a general exemption in the Local Plan would fly in the face of current guidance. I consider the Local Plan should not be modified in this respect.

Priority for Affordable Housing and Phasing

25. Objection 1345 / 3176 wants priority given to the provision of affordable housing through a phasing mechanism. This goes some way beyond what is envisaged by current government guidance, the Structure Plan or the Council. It is also at odds with my acceptance that the 20% requirement should apply at every site and could put at risk the achievement of the Structure Plan requirement to provide 8000 dwellings in total. In any event I am not recommending a general phasing policy in the Local Plan. For these reasons I consider the Local Plan should not be modified in this respect.

Other Needs, Including the Elderly

26. One allocated site is restricted to sheltered housing because of highway constraints. No doubt some of the affordable housing provided under the terms of policy H16 will also meet the housing needs of particular groups in society. However, not all provision for the elderly will be in affordable housing. Also, I have no evidence that there is a particular local need in this sector that needs to be addressed in the Local Plan. I consider the Local Plan should not be modified in this respect.

Rural Affordable Housing

27. In as far as I understand objection 000186 / 000268, it appears to be seeking more affordable housing in villages to serve rural needs. The Council says that the study on which the policy is based covered the whole borough (and beyond) so that the needs of the villages and rural areas were taken into account.
28. New housing in rural areas is to be in villages. Broadly speaking the amount of new housing in each village is dependent on the size of the village and level of services. In larger settlements there are housing allocations that will include affordable housing. In medium sized villages infilling may occur and this could cater for local needs. In smaller settlements and the countryside there is to be no new housing except that which has to be there (eg agricultural workers' dwellings). It is difficult to imagine circumstances in which a need for affordable housing would best be met in remote rural locations.
29. I therefore see no reason to alter the Local Plan in this respect.

30. As far as Woodborough is concerned, I have no evidence there is a particular local housing need that can only (or best) be met in that settlement. It is a relatively small village with few services and facilities. It is not on the face of it an ideal location for affordable housing compared to, say, nearby Calverton that has a far wider range of services and better public transport. In any event the objection site proposed by objector 392 is somewhat removed from the centre of the village and its facilities. It is therefore not an obviously suitable location for affordable housing.
31. I consider the Local Plan should not be modified in response to objection 392 / 553.

Alternative Wordings

32. Some objectors put forward alternative policies or detailed wording amendments for the policy. In view of the above considerations I see no merit in adopting any of the changes proposed.

Conclusions

33. I therefore conclude there is no need to modify policy H16 of the Local Plan. However, I conclude that the text accompanying the policy should be modified by the addition of the following:
- a paragraph explaining in more detail how the requirement for affordable housing has been arrived at. The new material should also indicate the total level of need and the total provision that will be achieved by the Local Plan policy. Reference could also be made to the Council’s Housing Strategy and the level of need for affordable housing identified in that document.
 - a new second sentence in paragraph 2.51; “Any departure from the expected 20% provision would need to be justified by the size, site conditions or economic viability at a specific site.” – to be inserted after “accordance with Circular 6/98”.

RECOMMENDATIONS

34. I recommend no modification to policy H16.
35. I recommend that the text accompanying the policy should be modified by the addition of the following:
- a paragraph explaining in more detail how the requirement for affordable housing has been arrived at. The new material should also indicate the total level of need and the total provision that will be achieved by the Local Plan policy. Reference could also be made to the Council’s Housing Strategy and the level of need for affordable housing identified in that document.
 - a new second sentence in paragraph 2.51; “Any departure from the expected 20% provision would need to be justified by the size, site conditions or economic viability at a specific site.” – to be inserted after “accordance with Circular 6/98”.

2.91 HOUSING – GENERAL OBJECTIONS NOT ALREADY CONSIDERED ABOVE

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000061	000082	Mrs S Lane

Summary of Objection

(First Deposit) There are an increasing number of elderly people but there is no mention of provision for them except in policy H11 (Residential Homes). But policies H16 and H6 could both be relevant. Purpose built accommodation is needed but will not all be affordable housing. More attention needs to be given to this expanding sector of the population.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000715	001061	Sport England

Summary of Objection

(First Deposit) The Local Plan does not include any general policies relating to the provision of open space in new housing development.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001158	002401	Nottinghamshire County Council (Strategic Property)

Summary of Objection

(First Deposit) Paragraph 2.1 of the Local Plan is objected to because the relationship between the Local Plan and the Council's Housing Strategy is not properly explained. The Housing Strategy says there is a need for 1,300 new affordable homes 1996 – 2011 but there is no reference in the Local Plan to this figure or how it will be met. The Local Plan's under-provision of housing land does not aid the Housing Strategy.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001330	002947	Council for the Protection of Rural England

Summary of Objection

(First Deposit) There is concern about the amount of Green Belt land released in the Local Plan and that this will be developed before previously developed land is used. A new policy is suggested that would require the sequential release of land and monitoring windfall sites to minimise development on Green Belt sites.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001336	003061	Hucknall Against Rural Development

Summary of Objection

(First Deposit) The objectors refer to PPG3 and the need for phasing. Brownfield sites should be developed before greenfield sites. The allocation for new housing should be reduced because of windfalls.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001339	003093	Environment Agency

Summary of Objection

(First Deposit) The Housing chapter refers to brownfield development. This should be in line with policy ENV3. Sites should be suitable for use, with an acceptable potential risk of harm. Contamination must be remediated and any potential harm to groundwater dealt with.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001955	004622	Gedling Labour Group

Summary of Objection

(First Deposit) PPG3 states that in exceptional circumstances the Green Belt may be reviewed. The Structure Plan in 1996 was adopted in different circumstances.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
003891	010655	Mr M Birkett

Summary of Objection

(First Deposit) The Housing chapter gives little weight to the use of brownfield land – there is only one mention of it. A large area of greenfield land (Chase Farm) is included in the Gedling Colliery proposal. The chapter lacks clarity, innovation, vision and direction. (No specific changes are sought.)

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

Provision for the Elderly (Mrs Lane)

1. One housing allocation is specifically for sheltered housing because of highway constraints. Some affordable housing and other housing in general allocations may also be designed for the elderly. Increased densities (in the Second Deposit) may also lead to more small houses and flats. However, the objector is right that explicit attention is not paid to the needs of this group.

2. Although I do not doubt that the proportion of the elderly in Gedling will increase, just as it is doing in most places, I have no projections as to the need for specialised housing for this or any other group. In my experience it is usual for Local Plans not to deal with the needs of specific groups in quantified terms. The assumption is made that if there is an unmet need in terms of affordable homes these will be provided as part of the affordable housing quotas and that otherwise the market will determine what is needed. As I have said above, other pressures (on densities) may also assist in the provision of suitable dwellings as well as reducing the need to build on Green Belt land. However, I do not have the information on which to base policies designed to ensure that housing which is suitable for the elderly is provided. In any event this would be such a departure from normal practice that I believe it would only be acceptable if it were based on very compelling statistical evidence of an unmet need in the area covered by the Local Plan.
3. In the circumstances I consider no change in the Local Plan is justified. I feel bound to say, however, that this does mean that the objector is entirely wide of the mark.

Open Space in Residential Development (Sport England)

4. The Council says that the provision of open space in new development is dealt with in policy R3, which is true. However, as I make clear elsewhere, I consider that the Local Plan would be improved if there were a general policy outlining all the requirements affecting developers in one place. Policy R3 could be retained by all means but it should be explicitly referred to in the general policy. It follows that if such a policy is to cover all the obligations being placed on developers, it should include (or cross-refer to) sports pitches.

GBC's Housing Strategy (Objector 1158)

5. As far as objection 001158 / 002401 is concerned, I have already dealt with it in as far as it relates to policy H16. As to the introductory paragraph to this chapter, in my view a simple cross-reference to the other document is all that is required rather than a full and carefully reasoned reconciliation of the two documents. In my view there is no need to modify the Local Plan to achieve this.

New Policy on the Sequential Release of Land (CPRE)

6. CPRE seek a new policy aimed at minimising the development of Green Belt land. Whilst I accept that what CPRE are seeking is in accord with PPG3, it is clear by now I part company with them on the total amount of land that is needed for development and the urgency with which it has to be found. In these circumstances I am not hopeful that the amount of Green Belt land needed for development can be reduced or that the suggested policy would make a material difference to the outcome.
7. I also note that in the Second Deposit the revised paragraphs 2.13 to 2.16 go into greater detail about the search sequence than was previously the case.
8. I therefore consider that there is nothing to be gained by modifying the Local Plan in response to this objection.

Hucknall Against Rural Development

9. Like CPRE (above) this objector wants to use phasing to minimise the release of greenfield land. I have already dealt under policy H1 with the particular matter raised,

which is the contribution of industrial sites to the windfall assumptions. Other than this, I do not disagree with what the objector seeks except to say that I do not share their belief that enough brownfield land can be found to satisfy the Structure Plan requirement or to reduce the amount of greenfield land that is needed. I consider that no change to the Local Plan is justified in response to this objection.

The Environment Agency

10. The EA are right to be concerned about development on contaminated land but as they also acknowledge this matter is dealt with by policy ENV3. They do not suggest any modification to the Local Plan and I do not consider any is necessary.

Gedling Labour Group

11. PPG2 (paragraph 2.6) says that once the general extent of a Green Belt has been approved it should be altered only in exceptional circumstances. If such an alteration is proposed the Secretary of State will wish to be satisfied that the authority has considered opportunities for development in the urban areas contained by the Green Belt and beyond it. Similarly, detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans should be altered only exceptionally. Where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt boundaries should not be changed unless alterations to the Structure Plan have been approved, or other exceptional circumstances exist which necessitate such revision.
12. In my view these conditions are met in Gedling and, notwithstanding the age of the Structure Plan, no modification to the Local Plan is justified for these reasons.

Mr Birkett

13. This objector may be right that the Local Plan lacks innovation and vision but without some concrete suggestions for improvement it is difficult to assess this. I note that the revisions to the text of the plan (paragraph 2.16 in the Second Deposit) refer to previously developed land but I doubt that this will satisfy the objector. Also since the objection the amount of greenfield land allocated for development at Chase Farm has been reduced and the alignment of the GCCF Access Road has been changed. Whether this addresses the objector’s concerns I do not know. Be that as it may, the objector has not said what changes he actually wants and I consider I cannot therefore make a positive recommendation.

Conclusions

14. Most of these objections have been dealt with, one way or another, elsewhere in this report. The objections to which I am most positively inclined are those from Sport England and I shall return to the matters they raise under policies R3 and C2.
15. I therefore conclude that no modifications are justified in response to these objections.

RECOMMENDATION

16. I recommend no modification to the Local Plan in response to these objections.

4.1 E1 ALLOCATION OF EMPLOYMENT LAND – GENERAL OBJECTIONS

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001330	002953	CPRE
001330	201812	CPRE

Summary of Objection

The Structure Plan requirement was based on the land that was available in Gedling at the time. If some of this land has been developed for other uses, new sites need not make up the “shortfall”. The Local Plan can and should provide 10% less than the Structure Plan guideline. Thus only 41 ha are needed and the Local Plan now exceeds this, especially if vacant sites in established employment areas are taken into account. No large new allocations - at Top Wighay Farm (First Deposit) or Teal Close (Second Deposit) - are needed or desirable. The need for more land should be reassessed at the time of the next Structure Plan review. Nottingham City can now find more land than previously thought.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001343	003118	Post Office

Summary of Objection

The policy does not encompass employment-generating uses (such as Post Office sorting offices and other public service providers) that are comparable to (and compatible with) B1, B2 and B8 uses. This would be in accordance with PPG12.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001344	003128	Slack; Kirkham; Goldby; Grococks (Joint)
001344	201423	Slack; Kirkham; Goldby; Grococks (Joint)

Summary of Objection

(First Deposit) The proposed employment allocations are an unnecessary encroachment onto greenfield and Green Belt land. Locate employment allocations in less sensitive locations

(Second Deposit) The objection is reiterated.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001345	003294	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust
001345	003295	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust
001345	003296	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust
001345	003297	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust
001345	003298	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust
001345	003300	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust
001345	003301	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust
001345	003315	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust

Summary of Objections

A general revision of the approach in this chapter is required. Reliance should not be placed on the Structure Plan's “hectares required” approach and more emphasis should be placed on the environment and regeneration. The allocations in the Local Plan are not in sustainable locations. Economic health should be achieved within the existing settlement boundaries. Analysis of past trends would show that less employment land is needed than the Local Plan allocates. Moreover sites should be developed at higher densities to reduce the amount of land needed. General trends in society (service industries, flexible hours, and advances in IT and communications) also reduce the need for employment development. The need for new business parks or industrial estates is questioned.

The structure plan figure is a guideline not a precise target; less land is needed.

The emphasis should be on high-density development, numbers of jobs and not the amount of land.

The Local Plan places too much emphasis on a range and choice of sites for developers and not enough on preserving undeveloped land from development. Too much land is provided and 80% of jobs created are not on employment land.

The selection of employment allocations should be based on a sequential approach and not on market considerations.

More small sites close to residential areas should be proposed to minimise the need to travel.

Too much land is allocated. The amount and the locations are not sustainable. Better use should be made of existing employment land and buildings. The sites at Calverton should be taken into account.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001664	003938	W Hardy & Sons

Summary of Objection

There is no policy for small businesses outside the allocated areas. There is no allowance for the expansion of existing employment in the Green Belt.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001951	004611	Kirkby & District Conservation Society

Summary of Objection

Paragraph 4.7 should not refer to land "previously" in the Green Belt as several allocated sites are on land that is in the adopted Green Belt. Also, the reasons for removing land from the Green Belt are not given.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
004858	201270	Mr T Thorpe

Summary of Objection

There is no need for open land to be used for industrial development; there is ample space at the Colwick Industrial Estate. Open areas should be retained or converted to sports facilities.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001324	201321	Langridge Homes Ltd

Summary of Objection

In most respects LH support the Local Plan. LH are concerned that employment land should not be used for other purposes.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions***The Amount and Distribution of Employment Land (Objector 1330)***

1. The Council (and I) accept that the amount of land the Structure Plan says is needed is only a guideline. However, this is not the same as saying the Local Plan should aim to under-provide by 10% as a matter of policy. But I note and accept that take-up rates in recent years have been low, although this may have been due in part to a shortage of suitable land. However, in general terms I accept that although the Structure Plan is the best guidance we have, it is not imperative that all the 70 ha are provided.
2. Taking into account development since 1991, the Council says that there are 53 ha still to be identified in this Local Plan review, whereas CPRE puts the need at 41 ha (the difference only partly being explained by CPRE’s willingness to “under-provide” by 10%). The bulk of the remaining difference is made up of land that was previously allocated for employment purposes (defined as Use Classes B1 – B8) but which has been developed for other uses. The Council says this should not be taken into account as employment land and certainly as far as retail uses are concerned, I agree with them. This means that I am prepared to accept a figure in the range between the Council’s 53 ha and CPRE’s 41 ha as a broad guideline indicating the approximate order of magnitude of what has to be found.
3. In reaching this view I place little reliance on the CPRE arguments that more land than anticipated by the Structure Plan is likely to be found in Nottingham City or that the Structure Plan needs reviewing. There may indeed be a need to review the Structure Plan but in my view until this takes place the Local Plan should rely on the adopted Structure Plan.
4. Although this anticipates what is to come in the following pages, my views on each of the smaller sites in the Second Deposit policy E1 are as follows:

Victoria Park, Netherfield – no change	3.6 ha
South of Victoria Park – delete	0
Gedling Colliery – could be increased but only 3 ha certain (see H3)	3.0 ha
Metallifactory – delete	0
Hazleford Way Newstead – no change	2.0 ha
Hillcrest Park Calverton – no change	3.0 ha
Calverton Colliery – no change	9.0 ha
Total	20.6 ha

5. In reaching this figure I have not included some land that CPRE would include for reasons that will become clearer in what follows. In brief, I have rejected land at Metallifacure for Green Belt and environmental reasons and the land South of Victoria Park because I regard it as too uncertain. Also I have no basis for concluding that part of the land at Teal Close can be developed in isolation from the rest.
6. Although I have no evidence on this, I am somewhat concerned that nearly half of the land in smaller sites is at Calverton involving land that may prove difficult to develop and unattractive to developers. Be that as it may, it represents something of a skewed distribution in my view.
7. However, the outcome is that considerably more land is needed and the only practical way of achieving anything approaching what is required is by the release of one of the two large sites that have been proposed: Teal Close (Second Deposit) or Top Wighay Farm (First Deposit).
8. In view of this I conclude that CPRE's general objections to the amount of employment land should not succeed in replacing the Structure Plan guidance, although I also conclude that the Structure Plan guideline need not be met in full.

Appropriate Uses on Employment Land Allocations (Objector 1343)

9. The Council says that, although the definition of the uses that are appropriate on allocated employment sites is based on the Use Classes Order, uses such as Post Office sorting offices would also be acceptable. Indeed, the Council has granted planning permission for a sorting office on an employment site. Even so, GBC has not agreed to any modification of the Local Plan.
10. However, the policy is worded in such a way that it would appear to exclude uses like sorting offices because it lists the Use Classes that are acceptable on each allocation. My understanding of the text of the plan is that this is done to exclude Use B2 (General Industry) from at least one of the allocated sites where it would be inappropriate. I do not think it is intended that all uses not encompassed by the Use Classes would necessarily be excluded from all (or any of) the allocated sites. Where, after all, are such uses to go?
11. On reading the policy I am also concerned that there seems to be a problem in relation to the allocation at the former Calverton Colliery. There are no Use Classes listed for this site at all but policy E8 indicates that B1, B2 and B8 uses would all be allowed there. Otherwise I note that all the sites except one are listed as being suitable for the full range of B1, B2 and B8 uses. So the reason for framing the policy as it appears to be only to exclude B2 uses from the site at Hillcrest Park Calverton (presumably because it is a mixed use allocation where there will be some housing).
12. I realise that the practice of defining employment in terms of Use Classes is derived from the Structure Plan (policy 2/1 and the notes attached to it) but in any event that policy is meant to be a guideline and not precise and exact target. I also realise that the amount of land needed (and the way past completions have been calculated) relates to the definition of what constitutes employment but again the Structure Plan seems to me to acknowledge that we are not dealing with a very precise science in this respect.

13. So, notwithstanding the reasons for using Use Classes, I am inclined to regard policy E1 as, at the least, over fussy. More importantly, it does not appear to describe very accurately the reality of what the Council does or intends to do. For all these reasons I consider that the format and wording of the policy should be couched in more general terms. I would prefer something less proscriptive, such as: "The following sites on the Proposals Map are allocated for employment generating uses and development (other than retailing and other uses appropriately sited in shopping and local centres)." If it is intended to exclude some classes of use from any of the sites this could be done in parenthesis. For example "Hillcrest Park Calverton (not suitable for general industry or uses likely to be incompatible with housing)". Alternatively such caveats could be included in the text accompanying the policy.
14. I conclude that the policy should be modified along these lines.

The Amount and Distribution of Employment Land (Objector 1344)

15. Although I have evidence from this objector in connection with some of their other objections, this relates primarily to residential development, the Green Belt and the Mature Landscape Area east of Calverton. The deletion of the employment allocation at Top Wighay Farm (First Deposit) and the substitution of Teal Close (Second Deposit) do not appear to have met their objection to policy E1. The objector also does not approve of the employment allocations in Calverton. But they have not suggested which other sites in "less sensitive" areas they consider suitable for employment. In the absence of any evidence to explain their objections to policy E1, I am unable to discern what they want or whether it is part of a coherent view of the borough's needs. I conclude that the policy should not be modified in response to these objections.

The Amount and Distribution of Employment Land (Objector 1345)

16. I have read the Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust objections to the Employment chapter in the Local Plan closely and with interest. It seems to me that they are not just an objection to this Local Plan but a radical statement of a different political economy and approach to planning. In any event I cannot complain that they do not form part of a coherent view of the borough's needs (c f the preceding paragraph).
17. At the outset NWT say that they are not surprised at the Local Plan's approach to employment in view of the Structure Plan. However, the Structure Plan is adopted and provides the context for the Local Plan. NWT will therefore not be surprised that I place some weight on it. In short, I do not see it as my role to instigate or undertake a review of the Structure Plan.
18. Having said that, I note and accept that the figures for land to be provided in the Structure Plan are guidelines and not precise requirements, which gives some scope for variation. However, I do not think there is as much scope for variation as NWT wants. Certainly I do not accept that the needs of employment can be met entirely within the boundaries of existing settlements, on existing employment land or in existing buildings. The largest inward investor in recent years may have used an existing building but this cannot be relied on in future. In my view there is a need, in order to comply with the Structure Plan, for a substantial allocation of land. As with housing this is on a scale that will necessitate using land outside the existing urban areas and in addition to land already identified or previously used for these purposes.

19. In identifying employment land I do not accept that the Council has been over-concerned with market demand and developers' preferences. I say this partly because the decision not to allocate Top Wighay Farm and to allocate Teal Close instead seems counter to the market view. Nor, in my view, is it correct to say that too much attention has been paid to providing a choice and range of sites. Indeed, I consider it is surprising how **few** sites (allocated sites or even objection sites) there are and how limited the choice is (for me or for future developers). There are only eight allocations listed in policy E1. Six of these are 5 ha or less. These smaller sites are spread around the borough to a degree, but this seems to me to reflect either the accident of where land can be found or a wish to have some employment land in most of the settlements rather than a wish to provide developers with a choice. There is only one large site and only one possible alternative to it.
20. As far as sustainability is concerned, I would agree that peripheral sites may not be as sustainable as sites in the urban area, but GBC have clearly attempted to find the best sites that are available.
21. On this basis, whilst I note the call for a review of the chapter and its approach, I consider a pragmatic approach is more practical. What it comes down to is this:
- are any of the allocated sites unacceptable for environmental or other reasons? (*answer: I think so*)
 - are there any other reasonable and practical alternatives on the table? (*answer: with one exception, I don't think so*)
 - is a large site needed? (*answer: I think so but NWT don't*)
 - if so, which of the two that are on offer? (*answer: Top Wighay Farm*)
22. The bigger questions about changes in society and work patterns do not upset this chain of reasoning. In saying this I do not just rely on the Structure Plan (although I could). Even if such changes as the growth in the service sector, flexible hours, home working and IT will reduce the need for employment land (and there is little or no evidence to demonstrate this); it is unlikely to happen within the lifetime of this Local Plan (2011). To rely on such changes reducing the need for employment land could lead to a lack of employment in the area if the changes did not occur as expected.
23. I agree in principle that the real focus of concern in planning for employment is jobs and not land. However, the Local Plan is a land-use document and its role is to indicate what the development and other uses of land will be. There is no mechanism for allocating or influencing the distribution of jobs other than through the allocation of land. This may not be a perfect tool but it is necessarily the focus of attention in local plans.
24. As far as the density of employment development is concerned, there is no guidance from government on this matter (as there is with housing). Densities vary greatly and, at least in part, this is because different activities and technologies have different space requirements. I have no evidence that Gedling is especially suitable for some types of employment or that certain types of employment could or should be diverted elsewhere. I therefore have no reason to disregard the Structure Plan by making distinctive assumptions (or policies) in Gedling regarding employment densities.

25. It is true that past rates of employment development have been less than is assumed in this Local Plan. It is not clear why this is the case but a shortage of suitable sites may have contributed. In any event most people would view slow rates of development in the past as a matter of regret rather than a sound basis for future plans. Be that as it may, if the outcome here is half a dozen small sites and one large one, I consider that the risks of over allocation will have been avoided.
26. For these reasons I conclude that I cannot adopt or recommend the alternative approach to planning employment land advocated by NWT.

Businesses Outside Employment Areas and in the Green Belt (Objector 1664)

27. This objector complains that there is no policy for small businesses outside the allocated areas and that there is no allowance for the expansion of existing employment in the Green Belt. However, policy E4 deals with employment development on unallocated sites and policy E5 with the expansion of existing employment uses other than in the Green Belt. I note that this objector has not objected to these policies even though they have objected to other policies in the Employment chapter of the Local Plan. Business uses in areas not intended for them (such as residential areas) can cause planning problems and policy E4 sets out criteria for assessing the acceptability of proposals as they arise. I can see no basis for this part of the objection to policy E1.
28. As far as the Green Belt is concerned, there is policy E9. The Green Belt is a national policy applied locally and this severely restricts the scope for departing from national guidelines. Nevertheless policy E9 goes as far as it reasonably can.
29. I conclude that no modification to policy E1 arises from this objection.

Wording of Paragraph 4.7 (Objector 1951)

30. This objector complains that paragraph 4.7 refers to land “previously” in the Green Belt. However, when this Local Plan is adopted the Green Belt notation will have been removed from all allocated sites. The Local Plan is therefore internally consistent. As far as the reasons for reviewing Green Belt boundaries are concerned, these come from the Structure Plan in the first instance.
31. I see no reason to modify the Local Plan in response to this objection.

The Amount and Distribution of Employment Land (Objector 4858)

32. The Council does not accept there is enough land available for employment without using greenfield sites and neither do I, especially if the Structure Plan is to be complied with. There is ample scope left to provide for sport and recreation on the remaining open land, although some of the facilities referred to by the objector (swimming pools and skating rinks) would not be appropriate in the Green Belt.
33. I conclude that no modification to the Local Plan is justified by this objection.

The Amount and Distribution of Employment Land (Objector 1324)

34. In most respects Langridge Homes support policy E1. They have two site-specific objections (New Farm and Hillcrest Park) that are dealt with in what follows. Their main complaint is that sites allocated for employment should be reserved for that purpose and should not be used for other development (such as housing or shops). However, it is not clear exactly what changes they seek to policy E1 in this regard and I consider that no change is needed.
35. I conclude that policy E1 should not be modified in response to this objection.

Overall Conclusions

36. I conclude therefore that there would be benefits in recasting the policy in more general terms.
37. However, I find there is no reason to reduce the amount of employment land being allocated as a matter of principle or policy.
38. But neither am I insistent that the Structure Plan guideline has to be met in full and in every respect.
39. In any event, the text in this part of the Local Plan will need revision in the light of my recommendations on individual sites.

RECOMMENDATIONS

40. I recommend that policy E1 should be worded: “The following sites on the Proposals Map are allocated for employment generating uses and development (other than retailing and other uses appropriately sited in shopping and local centres).”
41. I recommend that any restriction on the types of use to be allowed on any of the allocated sites should be added in parenthesis or in the text accompanying the policy – for example “Hillcrest Park Calverton (not suitable for general industry or uses likely to be incompatible with housing)”.
42. I recommend that the text accompanying the policy is up-dated and revised to reflect these and other modifications to the Local Plan.
-

4.2 E1 ALLOCATION OF EMPLOYMENT LAND

OBJECTION SITE: TEAL CLOSE

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000134	200578	Gedling Wildlife Group
000702	201784	Burton Joyce Parish Council
000717	201446	Nottinghamshire County Council
001158	201963	Nottinghamshire County Council (Strategic Property)
001345	201511	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust
004527	200808	Netherfield Wildlife Group
000136	201779	Mr P Smith
000888	200462	Mr W H Moore
001570	003690	Mr M Glover
001570	201404	Mr M Glover
004372	200583	Mr A Boothroyd
004641	201472	Mr B Rainford

AND OVER 100 INDIVIDUAL OBJECTIONS

Summary of Objections

The allocation of this site in the Second Deposit for employment purposes is objected to for a variety of reasons. These include the loss of open land and Green Belt land and the adverse impact the development would have on the landscape and on wildlife (especially birds attracted to the nearby lagoons). Objector 717 (and others) is concerned about the need to define a clear Green Belt boundary in this area.

There are objections to the suitability of the site arising from concerns about flooding and odour. The site is also said to be poorly located in relation to major roads serving the conurbation. The proposed development would generate heavy traffic to the detriment of the local environment and congestion.

The need for so much employment land to be allocated in the Local Plan is questioned by some. Others advocate alternative land to replace this allocation, notably at Top Wighay Farm.

(Objection 1158 201963 was not included in the list of objections to Teal Close by the Council although in my view it should have been. The objector pursued the objection to Teal Close in detail at the Public Inquiry and the Council did not challenge this.)

The County Council (Highways and Transport) considers that the lack of detailed access proposals, a full Transport Assessment and public transport proposals are of such importance as to threaten the general conformity of the Local Plan with the Structure Plan.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
005009	201845	Lady Bay Community Association
005010	201846	Trent Park Developments Ltd

Summary of Objection

The proposed employment development could prevent the implementation of a new road to an additional crossing of the River Trent in the longer term.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000722	201984	Severn Trent Water Limited

Summary of Objection

The employment allocation is supported but different/additional text is suggested.

ALSO CONSIDERED HERE ARE OBJECTIONS TO THE DESIGNATION OF THIS AREA AS WHITE LAND UNDER POLICY H4 IN THE FIRST DEPOSIT.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001158	002445	Nottinghamshire County Council (Strategic Property)
001324	002771	Langridge Homes Ltd

Summary of Objection

The policy is supported in principle but specific sites are disputed, including land at Teal Close.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000134	000170	Gedling Wildlife Group
000180	000262	RSPB

000609	002046	Ashley Travis Garage
000888	002103	Mr W Moore
001331	003008	Netherfield Wildlife Group
001331	003009	Netherfield Wildlife Group
001331	003010	Netherfield Wildlife Group
001331	003011	Netherfield Wildlife Group
001932	004512	Nottinghamshire Birdwatchers
003835	010553	R.A.G.E.

AND OVER 300 INDIVIDUAL OBJECTIONS

Summary of Objection

The designation of land at Teal Close as White Land is opposed, mainly because of the adverse impact any development would have on wildlife (principally migrating birds) at and near the site. Other reasons for opposing any development on this land include flood risk, poor access, traffic congestion, loss of open land, loss of Green Belt and alleged contamination of the site.

A small proportion of the objectors supported the early development of the land in preference to allocations elsewhere.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

Introduction

1. This is the largest and most important employment allocation and whether it remains in the Local Plan has ramifications throughout and beyond the Employment Policies.
2. The landowners (Severn Trent Water) have prepared an Outline Planning Brief for the development of the land. The Council submitted this as a Core Document (CD A24) in support of the allocation. This sets out a broad disposition of uses within the site and includes an Ecological Enhancement Brief. To reflect this, the Council put forward an informal proposed modification to the Local Plan incorporating a description of the proposed development derived from the planning brief.
3. I have already dealt with the issue of how much land in total should be allocated for employment uses in the plan. Suffice it to say here that the amount of land involved in this allocation cannot, in my view, be ruled out in principle. I return to the issue of whether so much of the land that is needed should be allocated in a single site below.

Flooding

4. The general issue of flooding and this site took up a considerable amount of time at the Local Plan Inquiry. Some members of the public (for example objectors 000888 and 004372) approached this instinctively on the basis that large scale built development in the floodplain is always unwise. In contrast objector 001158 presented a detailed, complex and highly technical case.
5. I do not want to get involved in the technical arguments more than is necessary. In my view the decisive issues are:
 - whether this site is within a floodplain or area at risk of flooding;
 - what mitigation measures are proposed;
 - what does PPG25 say;
 - what is the best independent advice available;
 - what conclusions can be drawn.

Floodplain and Risk

6. Most of the site is within the indicative floodplain as it will be shown on the (revised) Proposals Map. However, I note this is also true of most of the extensive employment land that has already been developed to the southwest. In any event the floodplain designation is indicative rather than definitive.
7. Be that as it may, it is not contested that the site is in an area with a high risk (above 1 in 100 years) of flooding by virtue of the risk arising from Ouse Dyke if not from the Trent. The Council describes the nature of the risk as arising only in the rare circumstances of a long duration flood in the Trent combined with a critical storm in the Ouse Dyke catchment. But if these circumstances are likely to occur more often than every hundred years, then the risk of flooding has to be regarded as high.
8. The Council also says that the severity of any flood is not likely to be great because any inundation is not likely to be very deep. But even a shallow flood may have considerable economic consequences without causing loss of life.
9. So, I take the view that the floodplain location and the site's status as an area with a high risk of flooding cannot be set aside and should be the starting point in the assessment of the site and the issue of flooding.

Proposed Mitigation

10. In very general terms the landowners and the Council envisage large-scale earth moving to raise the level of the land upon which buildings and sports pitches would be provided. This would be coupled with the creation of compensating lagoons elsewhere on the site so that the ability of the area to absorb floodwater would not be materially reduced. This has been worked up in some detail and has been the subject of detailed flood impact analysis undertaken on behalf of the landowner. It also forms the basis of the Outline Planning Brief.
11. I have observed that at least some of the developed land to the southwest (for example the car mart area) has been similarly raised.

PPG25

12. In these circumstances, what guidance can be derived from PPG25? First, I consider it is useful to record the general tenor and approach of the guidance as may be derived from the introductory preface. For example:
 - the Environment Agency (EA) has the lead role in providing advice on flood issues, at a strategic level and in relation to planning applications;
 - policies in development plans should outline the consideration which will be given to flood issues, recognising the uncertainties that are inherent in the prediction of flooding and that flood risk is expected to increase as a result of climate change
 - (in) planning decisions authorities should apply the precautionary principle to the issue of flood risk, using a risk-based search sequence to avoid such risk where possible and managing it elsewhere;
 - (in) planning decisions authorities should recognise the importance of functional floodplains, where water flows or is held at times of flood, and avoid inappropriate development on undeveloped and undefended floodplains.

13. In greater detail later in the document (Table 1) high risk areas are deemed generally unsuitable for commercial and industrial development unless a particular location is essential, eg for navigation and water-based recreation uses, agriculture and essential transport and utilities infrastructure, and an alternative lower-risk location is not available. All risks relate to the time at which a land allocation is made. (I take this to mean that future mitigation works are not to be accorded much weight.) Flood zones should be identified from EA flood data ignoring the presence of flood defences. (At the Inquiry the expert witnesses disputed the meaning of this part of the guidance – with the possible interpretations suggesting different outcomes for the objection site.)
14. What is at issue is not only whether the land itself would be at risk but also whether its development would increase the risk of flooding elsewhere.
15. Objector 1158 took a very straightforward view of the guidance, which may be summarised as: don't use a site that is at risk of flooding when one that isn't can be used instead. Top Wighay Farm is available and is free from flood risk so choose that. They also said that at the time of allocating land for development in a Local Plan the force of this argument is stronger than might be the case in considering a particular planning application in isolation.
16. Even without adopting this simple view of the issues, I have to say that I find the import of the guidance cautionary. The Council may be right that the guidance allows for exceptions and the issue of flooding has to be weighed in the balance with other considerations. However, I would want to be satisfied that I had very clear positive advice and guidance before committing this allocation.

Independent Advice

17. PPG25 indicates that the EA are the best source of advice. I invited them to attend the Inquiry both to help with technicalities (such as what "ignoring the presence of flood defences" means in practice) and more generally to advise on their view of this site. I would have found this particularly helpful as I understand they have been overseeing the modelling of flood risk being undertaken by the landowners on which the Council appears to have relied in reaching their decision to allocate the land. The EA could not attend the Inquiry but sent a letter dealing with some of the issues on which I was seeking guidance.
18. First, it has to be said that the EA is not an objector to this allocation and the Council placed some reliance on this
19. As far as the EA letter is concerned, I quote: "The EA has been in consultations with Severn Trent Water Ltd (the landowner) and their consultants for the above scheme for a number of years now, and it was understood by ourselves that an agreement in principle for the consolidation of the floodplain may well be workable. The work done by Mr Cooper and his colleagues is a significant change in what had been previously discussed, and for clarification, the report on his work was only submitted to EA in April 2003. The report is a major piece of work which requires very careful analysis of the methods and conclusions, and EA have therefore, passed the work to specialist consultants who are working on our behalf to carry out the Strategic Study of the fluvial River Trent, to carry out the necessary checks. Unfortunately, due to the very late

submission of the document, in relation to the Local Plan Inquiry timings, we have not been able to complete this assessment to meet the Inquiry programme.”

20. I am bound to say that this falls a long way short of the very clear endorsement that I feel is needed from the EA before committing this allocation. It also makes me wary of drawing my own, non-expert, conclusions on the technical evidence that was presented to me at the inquiry. Be that as it may, I am clear in my own mind that “an agreement in principle for the consolidation of the floodplain ***may well be workable***” (my emphasis) is not a robust enough basis for concluding that this site satisfies the stringent terms of PPG25.
21. After this letter the landowner's agent, via the Council, sent me a letter offering to clarify the EA position as it appears after the letter quoted above. They sought to demonstrate that there is agreement between themselves and the EA to an extent that would warrant supporting this allocation. The EA wrote again to disassociate itself from the letter from the landowner's agent in no uncertain terms.

Conclusions on Flooding

22. I therefore conclude that this is a site where flooding is a real and acknowledged issue. PPG25 is clear in favouring a precautionary approach to the allocation of such sites for development and in considering them generally unsuitable for commercial and industrial uses. The proposed allocation cannot be said to fall within any of the exceptions specifically allowed for in PPG25. The EA is unable to give unequivocal support to the allocation. Having considered all the evidence before me, I conclude that I am unable to recommend the allocation of this site for employment purposes because of unresolved flood risks.

Location

23. The location of the land as an employment site was also criticised. It was said that the east of Nottingham is not well served by good roads and that a site (for example Top Wighay Farm) closer to the M1 is much more likely to prove attractive to investors and employers. Although the attractions of a site nearer the M1 may be real, it can also be argued that sites to the east of the City are needed (partly to cater for relocations from nearby parts of the City undergoing renewal). It may also be the case that a site close to the east of Nottingham relates better to the wider needs of the whole urban area than a site that is further from the centre of the conurbation. This site would also be well related to a large labour force in Gedling borough. For these reasons the Council see this as a very sustainable location. Whilst this may justify the release of some land for employment here, it does not suggest that the whole of this site is needed or that the great majority of borough's allocated employment land should be here.
24. Without denying the possible attractions of the alternative site, especially to inward investment, on balance I conclude that poor accessibility from the M1 is not a decisive reason for not allocating this objection site. On the other hand neither am I convinced by the evidence that this is such a uniquely sustainable location that the bulk of the Local Plan's employment land has to be here.

Suitability of the Site

25. The allocation is adjacent to a major sewage works and close to a meat rendering plant, both of which have given rise to some complaints about odours over the years.

Again I heard conflicting technical evidence on this matter. Again, whether a precautionary approach should be adopted was at issue. Also at issue was whether sewage works should, as a matter of policy, have a separating cordon around them to distance them from other uses for their mutual benefit.

26. I consider that, whatever views one takes on these matters of principle, land close to a sewage works is not likely to prove an attractive location for many investors and employers, although a few may be more tolerant because of the nature of their own activities. This leads me to the view that, either way, at least part of this site is not a good location for what is in effect the key employment allocation in the Local Plan.
27. Relying on the record of the two potential sources of odour was contested, as were the future prospects for a trouble-free future. However, even if I accept that these existing facilities will be well managed and are not likely to create real problems very frequently, it is as much a matter of perception as the reality that may be decisive in deterring many potential neighbours.
28. I conclude that this consideration does count against the allocation of (at least some of) this land, especially as (part of) the only large employment site in the Local Plan.

Nature Conservation

29. There were many objections concerned about the impact of the proposed development on wildlife, especially birds, in the valley. The nearby lagoons are a major site for migrating water birds.
30. However, the Outline Planning Brief includes proposals for new lagoons and for the improved management of, and access to, the existing lagoons. On this basis some of the bodies representing ornithologists said they are now content with the proposals as a package. It was claimed that these interests now support the proposals. Other objectors have not expressed a view and their objections remain unresolved.
31. Nevertheless, on balance, I conclude that this is no longer a reason not to allocate the site for development.

Alternative Sites

32. Many objectors made general comments to the effect that it would be better either to find sites in the urban area or make better use of vacant or underused sites in the vicinity. Objector 888 went further and supplied details of several sites. The Council responded on each site: some were not in the borough, some had planning permission for other uses, one is occupied by a listed building, some had a planning history that made their use for employment purposes (as defined in the Local Plan) unlikely. It is not, of course, for the Local Plan or me to consider sites outside the borough. Apart from this, even if some of these sites do have potential for more intensive use, it does not seem to me that these sites could come close to providing as much land for employment development as is required. In short, even taken together, existing and underused urban sites in the area are not an adequate alternative to this site.
33. Not enough land in new small sites has been suggested to make good the shortfall if this site is not allocated.

34. The only large new site offered as a substitute for this site is Top Wighay Farm and the Council did not contest that this was indeed the only viable alternative if a large area of employment land is to be found. Indeed, the site at Top Wighay Farm was allocated for employment uses in the First Deposit and the Council advanced no objection in principle to it. I shall consider Top Wighay Farm in more detail below but for now it is enough to conclude that an alternative to Teal Close is available.

Access and Timing

35. The Highway Authority does not oppose this allocation in principle, although it has an unresolved objection concerning the lack of detailed proposals on access and public transport. Everyone accepts that access to this site would be dependent on the completion of the A612 new road alignment. I have not recommended that the Integrated Transport Scheme should be deleted from the Local Plan and it is being pursued vigorously by the Highway Authority. Even so, this means the allocated site is not immediately available. I consider that any lack of detail relating to transportation could be rectified at a later stage if the development were proceeding but, because this is not what I am recommending, I see no need to explore this matter further now.

Part Allocation

36. The issue of whether only part of the objection site could or should be allocated in this review of the Local Plan was not explored at the Inquiry. However, what form a smaller allocation would take, whether it would be viable and whether playing fields and ecological enhancements would be included are all unknown. Above all else, the issue of flooding has not been explored for a smaller allocation. The nature of the issues involved leads me to conclude that the site stands or falls as a whole and there is no scope, in practice, for allocating only part of the site in this review of the Local Plan.

Green Belt

37. If the site is not to be allocated for development, there remains the issue of whether the land should be removed from the Green Belt. I discuss elsewhere (policy H4) the general principle of whether there should be designations of Safeguarded Land in the plan and conclude that there should be. Because some or all of this land may have potential for development in the longer term if the flooding and other issues can be resolved, it is a candidate for designation as Safeguarded Land. Indeed, that is how the land was designated in the First Deposit, although this gave rise to a large number of objections (curiously, more at that stage than at the Second Deposit).
38. When considering this matter, I note that there are objections to the removal of the land from the Green Belt and that the Structure Plan Authority has concerns about the definition of a clear and defensible boundary for the Green Belt in this area.
39. The wider Trent valley is a distinctive and special landscape. At first sight it may not be attractive because it lacks dramatic features but its open character (and thus its value as Green Belt) is beyond dispute. It is the very qualities of the landscape that make it difficult to identify clear boundaries within it. Nevertheless the boundary as shown on the First Deposit Proposals Map follows roads and tracks for the most part so there are clear and defensible features on the ground. Taking into account the sewage works to the north and the industrial area to the south, this land does not protrude beyond the developed area into the wider valley.

40. On balance I conclude the area shown as excluded from the Green Belt in the First Deposit Proposals Map should be designated as Safeguarded Land in the Local Plan.

A New Trent Crossing

41. As to the two objectors who are concerned about this allocation blocking a potential road line to a new bridge across the Trent, I consider it unnecessary to consider this matter in any detail if no allocation is to be made. However, although they are to be commended on their far-sightedness, in general terms the future prospects for such a crossing are far from clear (or were at the time of the Local Plan Inquiry). Government guidance is firmly against protecting uncertain or long term transport proposals because they cause blight.

Detailed Wording and the Council's Revised Policy

42. I have already referred to the Council's informal proposed modification relating to this allocation (and the support it received from some objectors). However, as I am not recommending that the allocation should proceed, I do not consider it necessary to consider it further. The same applies to Severn Trent Water's proposed wording changes.

Overall Conclusions

43. For all these reasons I conclude that the allocation of land at Teal Close for employment purposes should be deleted from this review of the Local Plan. The decisive consideration in reaching this conclusion is the unresolved issue of flood risk. However, there are two other considerations that bolster this conclusion. First, for the reasons indicated above, there must be concern about the suitability of this location for the plan's only large scale employment allocation. Second, even if all these difficulties were overcome, there is a need to find some land that is free from constraints in the short term, which this land is not.
44. I also conclude that the land should be excluded from the Green Belt and designated as Safeguarded Land in the Local Plan.

RECOMMENDATIONS

45. I recommend that the employment allocation at Teal Close is deleted from the Local Plan.
46. I recommend that the land should be excluded from the Green Belt and designated as Safeguarded Land.
-

4.3 E1 ALLOCATION OF EMPLOYMENT LAND OBJECTION SITE: FORMER GEDLING COLLIERY

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000413	201612	East Midlands Development Agency

Summary of Objection

There may be scope to increase employment area at Gedling Colliery beyond 3 ha. EMDA is exploring this.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000706	001020	Mr G Smith

Summary of Objection

There is no need for more employment land. Keep as Green Belt.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000717	001518	Nottinghamshire County Council

Summary of Objection

A full Transport Impact Assessment is needed.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001345	003311	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust

Summary of Objection

Site has potential as protected wildlife area; leave wholly or partly undeveloped.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001258	004353	Mr C Brocklehurst
001558	003652	Mr J Finn

Summary of Objection

The site is not suitable because of HGVs on unsuitable roads.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001552	003615	Mrs P Weaver
001555	003627	Mr B Lakin

Summary of Objection

Employment land is not needed, there is enough elsewhere.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

1. For convenience and to avoid unnecessary repetition these objections are dealt with in the part of this report on policy H3 (Land at Former Gedling Colliery and Chase Farm)

RECOMMENDATION

2. For my recommendations see policy H3.

4.4 E1 ALLOCATION OF EMPLOYMENT LAND OBJECTION SITE: (LAND TO THE REAR OF) METALLIFACTURE, ARNOLD

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000012	000012	Mr M Hufton
000472	000664	Mr J Broadley
000667	000971	Mr G Blackburn
002948	007493	Mrs C Hufton
000541	000772	Mr D Moore
002645	010513	B Steeples
002656	010520	Ms J Widdowson
002830	010498	Mr J Sharp
003835	010544	R.A.G.E.

Summary of Objections

This land should be kept in the Green Belt. This is an inappropriate location for an employment allocation – loss of high quality arable land, incompatible with adjacent uses, increased development pressure, land unstable and prone to flooding. Ideally the existing factory would be relocated rather than employment uses expanded. The existing factory already causes traffic problems – a vastly improved access/egress would be required. This is a dangerous location on a busy road.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

1. Even allowing for the shortage of employment land in the Arnold area, the attractions of this site as an employment allocation are not obvious. The land is in the Green Belt at the moment. It is sloping land, and development would be an intrusion into the countryside. The site would be very difficult to access. Development of the site could involve considerable earth moving to create a level or terraced site and this could lead to the adjoining residential properties being dominated. In all the circumstances a very strong case would be needed to justify the removal of this land from the Green Belt and its allocation for development.
2. As explained at the Local Plan Inquiry, the Council's intention to allocate the site for employment purposes goes back several years to a request from the owners of the adjacent factory who wished to expand their business onto this land. However, since then the ownership and management of the factory has apparently changed at least twice. The Council admits that it does not know whether the current owners have any need or wish to expand. In my view the current state of knowledge about the intentions of the adjoining company is too uncertain to constitute an adequate reason for removing the site from the Green Belt.
3. As far as the access is concerned, if the capacity of the employment site were to be expanded the existing access would need to be greatly improved. The Highway Authority was consulted when the idea was first mooted and has specified its requirements. Whilst these would have the benefit of improving the access to the existing factory, they would be very expensive indeed and would disrupt the existing business. Thus, whilst the improved access could be seen as a benefit, the cost may be prohibitive – undermining the viability of the whole project. Again, the current views and intentions of the existing business are not known.
4. It may be that there is a need for employment land in Arnold but, because the release of this land is intended to be for the benefit of the adjoining firm, this allocation cannot

be regarded as meeting the wider needs of the area. The site is too small to have a significant impact on the amount of employment land that has to be found in the borough as a whole.

5. The objectors raised other concerns, such as doubts about the adequacy of drainage from the site and the stability of the land. I have no doubt that any practical difficulties such as these could be dealt with by engineering solutions, although the cost may be higher than would normally be expected for this sort of development. Again this may cast doubt on the viability of the proposal.

Summary and Conclusion

6. In summary therefore, I accept the Council's stance that this allocation should be seen as a special case to meet the needs of the existing adjoining firm. However, on this basis I would have expected evidence of a far stronger (and more recent) interest from the firm concerned. In all the circumstances I consider that a case has not been made to justify this allocation, especially as there are reasons to doubt the economic viability of the proposed development.

RECOMMENDATION

7. **I recommend that the employment allocation at (the rear of) Metallifactory is deleted from the Local Plan and that the land is retained in the Green Belt.**
 8. **For the avoidance of doubt I record that this does not affect the status in the Local Plan of the existing factory and its site.**
-

4.5 E1 ALLOCATION OF EMPLOYMENT LAND OBJECTION SITE: NETHERFIELD EMPLOYMENT ALLOCATIONS

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
004842	201917	Mr T Clayton & Miss L Inwin

Summary of Objection

Proposals to allocate land for employment development as an extension to the Victoria Business Park are opposed. There are concerns about increased traffic on the Loop Road (congestion/noise/pollution) and the requirement for a new Loop Road junction. The area would be severed from where people live by the new road. The residential area to the north would also be cut off from the countryside in the floodplain. There would be an adverse impact on the local environment and the floodplain. There is no objection to the allocations proposed in First Stage Deposit Plan.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

1. It is not entirely clear from the objection form to which area this objection relates. However, the fact that the objection was made to the Second Deposit and states that the objectors support the allocations in the First Deposit indicates to me that the objection relates to the proposed Teal Close employment allocation. I have already dealt with this (see above).

RECOMMENDATION

2. For my recommendation on this objection see under E1 Teal Close Employment Allocation.
-

4.6 E1 ALLOCATION OF EMPLOYMENT LAND OBJECTION SITE: LAND AT VICTORIA PARK

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001345	003313	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust

Summary of Objection

More employment land is not needed. We understand that this site is a potential SINC and is therefore not suitable for development.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001948	004571	Aldergate Properties Ltd

Summary of Objection

Land at Victoria Park should be included in the employment land figures. It has planning permission for other uses but could be developed for employment purposes. Replace the word “Colwick” with “Netherfield”.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

Potential SINC (Objector 1345 – Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust)

1. The situation is a little confusing (for me at least) but I am interpreting this objection as relating to the approximately oblong employment allocation with a northeastern boundary running along Ouse Dyke. It has a central grid reference of 633407. This is to be distinguished from the triangular employment allocation South of Victoria Park (central grid reference 634401) with which I shall deal next. It is also to be distinguished from the larger Teal Close allocation in the Second Deposit, on which I have already reported. The written evidence on NWT’s objections (from both sides) is not entirely clear which sites are referred to, so the best I can do is set down my understanding of the situation and proceed accordingly.
2. I am also proceeding on the basis that this objection site is still only a “potential” SINC and that it has not been confirmed as a SINC or identified as a candidate for such designation.
3. Although I understand (but do not share) NWT’s view about whether more employment land has to be found, the location of this site means that it is not easy to regard it as unacceptable in principle. It appears to me to be a “common sense” and sustainable extension to the existing employment area. In general locational terms, therefore, this is a suitable site for employment uses.
4. Without wishing to appear flippanant, it seems to me that virtually any land neglected for long enough could become a potential SINC. I therefore attach little weight to this claim for this site. I have not been able to get into the site, although I understand it is valued as grassland and there may be orchids present. However, I have no evidence that this site itself is an important or scarce habitat beyond this very general description.
5. The site is next to the lagoons but – without in any way playing down the importance of these – this does not preclude development in my view. Any development on this objection site can be designed to shield the adjacent lagoons from disturbance. There is a considerable area of open land to the east that remains in the Green Belt and will remain open land. In short, I do not have any evidence that would lead me to conclude that development of this site would prejudice nature conservation in the wider area.
6. The Council says that Victoria Park has a long history of employment development and that this objection site is already outside the Green Belt. It was in fact allocated for

employment in the adopted Local Plan. GBC says that the significant area for nature conservation is to the east of this site. In the absence of compelling evidence about the importance of this site as a habitat, I see no reason why this site should not continue to be allocated for employment development.

7. I conclude that no modification to the Local Plan is justified in respect of this objection and site.

Objector 1948 (Aldergate)

8. As far as Aldergate are concerned, the area of their objection site is too small to have a decisive impact on the overall need for employment land, given my rather relaxed attitude to the Structure Plan guideline. In any event it is agreed that there is a planning permission for another use.
9. The suggested change in the description of this site appears to have been made in the Second Deposit.
10. I conclude that no further change to the Local Plan is needed.

RECOMMENDATION

11. I recommend no modification to the Local Plan in response to these objections.
-

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

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001345	003312	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust
001345	201511	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust

Summary of Objection

(First Deposit) More employment land is not needed. We understand that this site is a potential SINC and is therefore not suitable for development.

(Second Deposit) The site has been designated as a SINC even though it is not listed in the Local Plan as such. This makes it inherently unsuitable for development. The site should only be developed if there is an overriding need to do so, which has not been demonstrated in this case. The SINC designation should be recorded in the Local Plan so that the nature conservation value of the site can be weighed explicitly against the case for development. If that were done the employment allocation would be deleted.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

1. As recorded above, the situation is somewhat confusing (for me at least) but I am interpreting this objection as relating the triangular employment allocation South of Victoria Park (central grid reference 634401). This is to be distinguished from the approximately oblong employment allocation with a northeastern boundary running along Ouse Dyke (see above). It is also to be distinguished from the larger Teal Close allocation in the Second Deposit, on which I have also already reported. The written evidence on NWT's objections is not entirely clear on which sites are referred to, so the best I can do is set down my understanding of the situation and proceed accordingly.
2. The Council's evidence refers to SINC 5/210 (Netherfield Disused Railway Line) having been designated late in 2001 and notified to them in 2002. It is the title given to the SINC that indicates to me that it is this objection site that is referred to. It also confirms what NWT says about the site having been designated as a SINC.
3. So, on the evidence before me, I come to the view that this site has now been designated as a SINC. Two issues arise:
 - should the site be listed as a SINC in the Local Plan and treated accordingly?
 - should the employment allocation be removed from the site for this or any other reason?

Listing in the Local Plan

4. In view of the above agreement on the status of the site, I can see no reason why it should not be listed in the Local Plan. There is a clear procedure for identifying SINC's that this site has apparently passed through. Like the Ashfield Local Plan Inspector I recognise the enhanced credibility of SINC's because of the rigour and independence of the designation process.
5. Although the Council says the Local Plan should not be modified, they give no reason for this view. They say that SINC designation and allocation for development are not incompatible but such matters can be left to the planning application stage. However, it seems to me that being listed in the Local Plan would enhance the status of the SINC as a material consideration during the processing of any planning application.
6. I conclude that this SINC should be listed in the Local Plan with all the other SINC's.

The Employment Allocation

7. As to whether the employment allocation should be deleted, this is a more finely balanced matter in my view. I have noted the reason for the designation as a SINC and the comparative rarity of such old railway sidings as well as the presence of swamp on the site. The interest and importance of the site are not disputed and are recognised by the SINC designation. I have also noted (but do not share) NWT's view that there is no need to find more employment land. For the reasons set out above I consider there is a need to identify more employment land, especially in this part of the borough.
8. Although this site is not so much of a "common sense" and sustainable extension to the existing industrial area as the previous site, the fact that it would be an extension to the Victoria Park employment area means that there is some logic to the allocation. The site is also previously developed land, which (in most circumstances) would lead to it being favoured for development.
9. On the other hand the present ground conditions on the site (which no doubt contribute to its SINC status) are such that development cannot be viewed as an easy or imminent possibility. I have not been told that there is any scheme or plan for the reclamation of this site. Furthermore, without any such scheme, the amount of land that could be made suitable for redevelopment is extremely uncertain – especially if the SINC designation is to be respected. As the Council says (and the objector accepts) the SINC designation is not necessarily incompatible with all development. However, in this case extensive development could well change the landform and drainage of the area and this could harm the evolving habitat. The site is next to the lagoons but because of the lie of the land it may be possible to develop without causing too much disruption in that direction.
10. In locational and other terms, therefore, the site has advantages and disadvantages as an employment allocation. Overall I consider that the location is acceptable in principle, although it is in my view extremely unlikely to deliver a worthwhile amount of developable land within the life of this Local Plan.
11. The Council also says the identification of the site as a potential employment allocation pre-dates the SINC designation, although NWT emphasises that the site was White Land in the adopted Local Plan.
12. On balance I conclude that the employment allocation should be deleted. This is only due in part to the SINC designation but also takes into account the shape, size and condition of the site. In my view, with or without the SINC, the site is most unlikely to deliver a worthwhile amount of developable land within the lifetime of this Local Plan. The SINC is an added but important complication. In these circumstances it seems to me that designation as employment land is, at best, premature or, at worst, little more than a hollow gesture in the direction of finding more land.

RECOMMENDATION

13. **I conclude that SINC 5/210 (Netherfield Disused Railway Line) should be listed in Appendix 2 of the Local Plan and that the employment allocation South of Victoria Park should be deleted from the Local Plan.**

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

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001158	201963	Nottinghamshire County Council (Strategic Property)
001158	201965	Nottinghamshire County Council (Strategic Property)
004900	201515	Mr J Broomhead

Summary of Objection

(Second Deposit) The substitution of the employment allocation at Teal Close for the land at Top Wighay Farm between the First and Second Deposits is objected to. The change is not properly justified in the plan. The site at Top Wighay Farm is in a sustainable location and would be (more) attractive to investors and employers.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001158	002425	Nottinghamshire County Council (Strategic Property)

Summary of Objection

(First Deposit) Whilst the allocation in the First Deposit of employment land at Top Wighay Farm was welcomed, the area of the site was not agreed. In any event more land was needed.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001021	002201	Hallam Land Management Ltd

Summary of Objection

The site is not in a sustainable location. Land south of Newstead is preferable in this and other respects.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001325	002797	Papplewick Parish Council
001325	002798	Papplewick Parish Council

Summary of Objection

There is no evidence of demand for employment land in this location. The land should remain in the Green Belt. The land is remote from areas of unemployment in the borough and not easily reached by public transport from them. The site is not in a public transport corridor, and is not sustainable without a housing allocation. There would be an over-concentration of employment in this rural area.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001330	002953	CPRE

Summary of Objection

This allocation would lead to an over-concentration of employment development in a remote, rural part of the borough. The allocation is not in accord with the environmental objectives of the plan. Too much employment land is being provided. This is not in a public transport corridor.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001345	003314	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust

Summary of Objection

This allocation would lead to an over-concentration of employment development in an area remote from where it is needed. There would be a loss of historic rural landscape with hedges and trees. This is an unnecessary loss of greenfield land.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001620	003838	Gedling Liberal Democrats
001633	003872	Mr C Taylor

Summary of Objection

The site is remote from the areas of unemployment and need in Gedling borough.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001955	004676	Gedling Labour Group

Summary of Objection

The site is remote from housing and not sustainable.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
003827	010501	Nottingham City Council

Summary of Objection

A full Transport Impact Assessment is needed for this site. The transport proposals at Top Wighay Farm should stand alone and not be linked to this allocation. The provision of a high quality bus link to Hucknall should be considered as an interim measure.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

1. There were objections to the allocation of employment land at Top Wighay Farm in the First Deposit. Some of these were withdrawn after the allocation was deleted in the Second Deposit but others were not and are listed above. In as far as the allocation was deleted in the Second Deposit, all these objections have been met. I therefore regard them as supporting the plan as it now stands and take them into account here.
2. In addition several objectors to other allocations say that land at Top Wighay Farm would be preferable, although GBC has not always recorded these as objections to the lack of an allocation here. I take these objections and arguments into account here.
3. The question of whether the land needed for an employment allocation at Top Wighay Farm should be taken out of the Green Belt is also dealt with here.
4. Related objections concerning a housing allocation and a park and ride facility at Top Wighay Farm are dealt with elsewhere, as is the general issue of Safeguarded Land. (See the relevant parts of this report for my recommendations on these matters).

Introduction

5. Leaving aside the exact amount of land, I have already concluded that a substantial allocation of new employment land is needed in the borough. Having looked at the alternatives to this site advocated by the Council in the Second Deposit, most of the land has fallen by the wayside for the reasons I have identified as I have considered each objection site. (In reality this means that I have not accepted that land at Teal Close should be allocated – where most of the allocated land was – largely because of unresolved flood risks.) The land at Top Wighay Farm is the only viable alternative that is left to me and the Council accepted as much at the Local Plan Inquiry.
6. If this sounds like a grudging acceptance, to some extent it is. For, as many of the objectors to the First Deposit point out, Top Wighay Farm is relatively remote from the main urban area in the borough and the areas most in need of new jobs. No doubt a greater variety of readily available sites with a concentration in the southeast of the borough would have had advantages. But such choices are not in front of me and there is no evidence such sites can be found. All the evidence is to the contrary because that is where the Council tried (and failed) to find viable sites in the Second Deposit.
7. In these circumstances some objectors would prefer not to allocate as much land as I think is necessary. I do not think this would stimulate the earlier identification of sites elsewhere. Neither do I consider that releasing land at Top Wighay Farm for development will, in practice, hold back the identification of sites in the southeast of the borough if there are in fact any sites with potential in the longer term. I therefore take the view that wilfully deciding to under-provide would threaten the orderly planning of the area (by failing to comply with the Structure Plan) and would not best serve the wider public interest.
8. Moreover, the fact that I also consider that more readily available housing land has to be found means that there is an opportunity to provide for a more balanced mix of uses at Top Wighay Farm than would otherwise be the case. This will make for a more sustainable outcome.

The Site Assessed

9. The site is greenfield land and in the Green Belt. The release of such land would not be favoured unless it was necessary. I am satisfied that it is necessary and is sanctioned by the Structure Plan. In any event the same considerations apply at Teal Close.
10. In addition this site is said to be relatively “contained” visually. The total area proposed for development is large and set in a wide and open landscape. It is visible from the A611 and would alter the landscape considerably, as would any development of this scale on virtually any greenfield site. The evidence I have about the impact that the development would have on the landscape is that the harm will not be unduly severe if adequate landscaping measures are incorporated. I am satisfied that the development would be no more harmful here than in any other possible greenfield location. Moreover, the site is in a wide enough Green Belt tract for the coalescence of settlements to be avoided.
11. Taking into account the urban area in Ashfield district, the site is an urban extension – albeit a rather irregular one. Hucknall is not in Gedling borough and may not be part of the main urban area in the Nottingham conurbation but it is a sizeable urban area so that the general priority in government guidance will be satisfied by this allocation. Moreover I note that in determining the housing allocation for Gedling, the Structure Plan EIP Panel envisaged that there is scope for development in this general area.
12. A transport assessment of the site has been undertaken and is largely agreed by the Highway Authority and the Planning Authority. It is agreed (by the Councils anyway) that the site is in a public transport corridor and there is the expectation and scope for an improved rail connection into the Top Wighay Farm site.
13. Generally the site is not a special wildlife habitat and its noteworthy features in this respect can be protected as part of any development.
14. There is no suggestion of a flood risk at this site.
15. My understanding is that the site is immediately available for development.
16. For all these reasons I conclude that the site identified for employment development in the First Deposit is suitable for allocation in the Local Plan.

Controlling the Development

17. The main objector concerned with this land has prepared an Illustrative Concept Master Plan for the site. At the Local Plan Inquiry I asked for, and was supplied with, a draft policy that could be incorporated in the Local Plan in the event of my recommending the allocation of this site. On this basis the Council did not take issue with it. The draft policy reflected the Outline Master Plan.
18. Whilst I also have no specific reservations about the draft policy, I consider that its final form should be determined by the Council (no doubt in consultation with the landowners) at the time the Council makes modifications to the Local Plan. This will allow consideration to be given to my recommendations on housing land and the situation that exists at the time. I am conscious that some time will have elapsed

between my hearing evidence at the Local Plan Inquiry and the modifications. I am hopeful that a fully integrated and balanced mixed-use development will result.

Overall Conclusion

19. I therefore conclude that the land allocated in the First Deposit for employment development at Top Wighay Farm should be reinstated in the Local Plan.
20. For the avoidance of doubt I also conclude that the allocated land should be excluded from the Green Belt.
21. I conclude that the Local Plan should include a policy to guide and control the development and disposition of the various land uses at Top Wighay Farm to achieve an integrated mixed-use development.

RECOMMENDATION

22. I recommend that the land allocated in the First Deposit for employment development at Top Wighay Farm should be reinstated in the Local Plan.
 23. I recommend that the allocated land should be excluded from the Green Belt.
 24. I further recommend that the Local Plan should include a policy to guide and control the development and disposition of the various land uses at Top Wighay Farm to achieve an integrated mixed-use development.
-

4.9 E1 ALLOCATION OF EMPLOYMENT LAND ADDITIONAL SITE: LAND SOUTH OF NEWSTEAD

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001021	002202	Hallam Land Management Ltd
001949	004603	c/o J H Walter Rural Consultants
001949	004609	c/o J H Walter Rural Consultants

Summary of Objection

Land South of Newstead should be allocated for a mix of uses, including employment. It is a sustainable location in the Hucknall Transport Corridor.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

1. For convenience and to avoid unnecessary repetition these objections are dealt with in the section of my report dealing with policy H2 (Additional Site South of Newstead).

RECOMMENDATION

2. For my recommendation see under policy H2.
-

4.10 E1 ALLOCATION OF EMPLOYMENT LAND ADDITIONAL SITE: EAST OF NEWSTEAD (ANNESLEY COLLIERY)

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001933	004515	Midlands Mining Ltd

Summary of Objection

Land at Annesley colliery should be allocated for employment. The site is split between two districts and part of it is allocated in the Ashfield Plan. This will allow overall reclamation of the Colliery site.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

1. For convenience and to avoid unnecessary repetition this objection is dealt with in the section of my report dealing with policy H2 (Additional Site East of Newstead).

RECOMMENDATION

2. For my recommendation see under policy H2.
-

4.11 E1 ALLOCATION OF EMPLOYMENT LAND ADDITIONAL SITE: NEW FARM REDHILL

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001324	002773	Langridge Homes Ltd

Summary of Objection

There was insufficient land allocated for employment use in the First Deposit. Land should be allocated at Teal Close to make up the deficiency and in substitution for the allocation of employment land at Top Wighay Farm. In addition there should be a site at New Farm in association with proposed housing allocation there.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

1. The respective merits of Top Wighay Farm and Teal Close are dealt with fully in other parts of this report, where this objection is taken into account. Likewise the Langridge Homes objection relating to the proposed mixed use development of land at Flatts Lane Calverton.
2. As far as proposed employment land at New Farm is concerned, this would be in association with the large proposed housing allocation there. However, no site is shown for the employment uses on the Illustrative Master Plan prepared by the objector and I have little or no evidence about it. I therefore regard it as entirely subsidiary to the housing proposal.
3. In the Housing chapter of this report I conclude that none of the land at New Farm should be allocated for residential development in this review of the Local Plan, although the land should be taken out of the Green Belt and protected as Safeguarded Land. In these circumstances it follows that there should not be an employment allocation here at this time.
4. I conclude that this aspect of this objection should fail.

RECOMMENDATION

5. I recommend no modification to the Local Plan in response to this objection.
-

4.12 POLICY E1 SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND OVERVIEW

1. As a result of all the above I am recommending that policy E1 should read as follows:

The following sites on the Proposals Map are allocated for employment generating uses and development (other than retailing and other uses appropriately sited in shopping and local centres):

	Gross area Ha	Acres
Top Wighay Farm	25	61
Victoria Park, Netherfield	3.5	9
Former Gedling Colliery	3	7
North of Hazleford Way, Newstead	2	5
Hillcrest Park, Calverton (not suitable for general industry or uses likely to be incompatible with housing)	3	7
Former Calverton Colliery	9	22
TOTAL	45.5	111

Comment

2. I realise that this is less employment land than the Structure Plan says should be found and less than I have agreed could be allocated. But my reasons for reaching these conclusions are not only determined by strategic considerations. They also arise from the site by site assessment of what has been put before me. On the other hand, in overall terms I am also aware of the slow take of land in the 1990s and I am not convinced that a shortfall of this scale will harm the actual flow of land into employment use.
3. Nevertheless, it is true that the result of my recommendations is that the supply of land in the east of the borough (where it is most needed) is severely reduced. This points to an urgent need to review this aspect of the Local Plan, a matter that will become even more urgent if the take-up of employment land does improve.

4.13 E2 PROPOSED MIXED USE AT HILLCREST PARK (FLATTS LANE) CALVERTON

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001324	002774	Langridge Homes Ltd
001324	201321	Langridge Homes Ltd

Summary of Objection

(First Deposit) This site should be retained for employment uses. It will be difficult to develop for a mixture of uses. There are better potential housing sites closer to the centre of the village.

(Second Deposit) All the developable land at Flatts Lane should be allocated for employment.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001330	002954	CPRE
001330	201813	CPRE

Summary of Objection

(First Deposit) The employment land should be included in the figures for policy E1 and count towards the total.

(Second Deposit) The figures still do not add up. From a 8 ha site 3 ha are allocated for housing and 3 ha for employment. The balance should be allocated for employment.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001344	003129	Slack; Kirkham; Goldby; Grococks (Joint)

Summary of Objection

The unimplemented allocation should be re-allocated elsewhere and the unused land here should revert to the Green Belt.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

1. I have considered the proposed mixed use of this site in the Housing chapter of this report. In that context I said that mixed-use development is strongly recommended in government guidance and I can see no reason why such an approach would be inappropriate or unachievable in Calverton. I concluded the mixed-use development allocation at Flatts Lane Calverton should be retained in the Local Plan with a residential capacity of 90 dwellings.
2. I have little additional evidence to go on here. Two objectors denigrate this site’s suitability for housing because they are advancing alternative sites in Calverton. One I am recommending favourably, the other not. Either way, I have no evidence that all this land is needed for employment purposes or that it is suitable for Green Belt designation. All in all there is no compelling evidence to overturn the proposed mixed-use allocation as it appears in the Local Plan.
3. As far as the numbers are concerned, the Council says that the adopted Local Plan allocated 8 ha of land for development here. Of this, some land has been developed and this review of the Local Plan is dealing with the remaining 6 ha. This seems plausible and I have no evidence to the contrary.
4. I conclude that no modification is called for in relation to this site or policy.

RECOMMENDATION

5. I recommend no modification to the Local Plan in response to these objections.

4.14 E3 RETENTION OF EMPLOYMENT

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000309	000438	House Builders Federation

Summary of Objection

The HBF is concerned with how this policy relates to the Urban Capacity Study of housing sites.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001158	002428	Nottinghamshire County Council (Strategic Property)

Summary of Objection

The policy concerns two separate issues and should therefore be two policies (dealing with: 1. employment retention, 2. the expansion, conversion and redevelopment of sites). The tests in the policy cannot be applied by reference to the policy and lower case text alone so the form of the policy is inappropriate in a Local Plan.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001342	003111	British Telecommunications PLC

Summary of Objection

The policy resists redevelopment of employment sites for non-employment purposes. This conflicts with other policies (H5, H9, H10 and S1) affecting housing and town centres. An extra criterion should be added referring to these policies..

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001343	003116	Post Office

Summary of Objection

The policy does not encompass employment-generating uses (such as Post Office sorting offices and other public service providers) that are comparable to (and compatible with) B1, B2 and B8 uses.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
003863	010600	Mr D Clark

Summary of Objection

Line 13 of paragraph 4.13 should refer to E3 rather than E2, as E2 is for residential in employment use.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
004880	201973	Mrs J I North

Summary of Objection

There needs to be an assurance that the industrial area (Teal Close is referred to) will be retained in its designated area and not mixed with housing. *(Inspector’s note: this objection relates to the Teal Close employment allocation, which I have recommended should be deleted. I therefore consider it is unnecessary for me to consider this objection further.)*

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001345	003303	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust

Summary of Objection

Clause (a) of the policy is objected to because it includes allocation to which this objector has also objected. Clause (b) is supported in principle but only if the site is a sustainable location, otherwise redevelopment should be resisted.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001158	201964	Nottinghamshire County Council (Strategic Property)

Summary of Objection

Top Wighay Farm should be reinstated

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001325	002800	Papplewick Parish Council

Summary of Objection

Top Wighay Farm should not be allocated and should be removed from the list.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

The Need for New Employment Sites

1. Some objectors seek to bolster their objections to new employment allocations in the Local Plan by also objecting to this policy. These have not always been recorded as objections to policy E3. For example, Papplewick Parish Council and the Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust say, in effect, that new allocations to which they object would not be necessary if this policy were sufficiently strong or if it were applied to

more existing employment sites. In my view neither the amounts of land involved nor the way that existing and new land is treated (for example in the Structure Plan) are comparable enough to make a simple substitution in this way. I consider that broadly the same amount of land will need to be found for new employment development however policy E3 is framed. The demand for new employment sites cannot be entirely met or satisfied on existing sites.

2. I conclude that no modification to the Local Plan is justified.

Employment Sites and Housing Land

3. Langridge Homes made a similar point in relation to housing land, saying that policy E3 should be strengthened and that a consequence of this would be that more housing land would need to be found. However, I am not aware that any residential allocations were previously employment sites (although the former EMEB site was an example of this in the First Deposit). So what is at issue are the assumptions that can be made about the rate at which housing windfalls will come forward. The question of housing windfalls is dealt with elsewhere but suffice it to say here that policy E3 would have to be very comprehensive to make a calculable difference. And it seems to me that the general direction of government policy is away from the blanket protection of all existing employment land. The Council certainly says that some existing employment sites are inappropriately sited and that a change to residential use will often result in an improvement in residential amenity in nearby dwellings.
4. The HBF are also concerned about the flow of sites from employment uses to housing but their principal concern is that the Council may have been too optimistic in the assumptions they have made in the respect. I have discussed this matter under policy H1 and have removed any ambiguity in the situation by recommending that the land the Council described as “contingency sites” should be regarded as “housing windfalls”.
5. I conclude that no modification to the Local Plan is justified.

The Form of the Policy (Objector 1158)

6. I can see what objector 1158 means about this policy being concerned with two separate matters as set out in parts (a) and (b) of the policy. However, both parts of the policy relate to the same sites and to that extent there is merit in dealing with both matters in the one policy that only needs to be shown once on the Proposals Map. In my view presentational matters like this are largely for the Council to decide.
7. As to the policy relying on criteria that need to be applied and interpreted in each particular case that arises, I see no harm in this either.
8. I conclude that no modification to the Local Plan is justified.

Conflict with Other Policies (Objector 1342)

9. My understanding of the policy and what it is intended to achieve is the retention of employment uses in certain specified areas. To assess how this would interact with other policies it is necessary to look at each of the policies mentioned by the objector in turn:

Policy H5: is a general policy applying in all built up areas. It therefore overlaps the areas protected by policy E3. But clause (c) of policy H5 says

that proposals are to comply with other policies in the plan (such as policy E3). I take this to mean that in the defined areas where it applies policy E3 would take precedence over policy H5 and I feel sure that this is the intention. So, if there is conflict between the policies it is clear how it should be resolved. Perhaps the Local Plan could make this clearer and in my view the place to do this would be in the text accompanying policy H5.

Policy H9: all the same planning issues appear to arise in relation to policy H9 as for H5, except that it is not clearly stated that policy E3 should prevail. Perhaps it should be.

Policy H10: in theory the same considerations arise here but in my view the matter is less clear cut. It is clear that converting vacant and unused spaces above shops and offices is to be encouraged. But it is less clear whether, within the areas where policy E3 applies, the same is true of conversions from an employment use to a residential one.

Policy S1: is a policy that applies to defined district and local centres. As far as I can see these do not overlap at all with the areas defined under policy E3. If this is true, there is no scope for any conflict.

10. On this basis I consider that there is no need for any action as far as policy S1 is concerned. The same could be said of H5 but in my view the clarity of the Local Plan would be helped if the text accompanying policy H5 drew attention to the need to comply with policy E3. As far as H9 and H10 are concerned, I consider that the text accompanying these policies should draw attention to policy E3 and say that in the areas covered by this policy proposals will be expected to comply with it.
11. As to the objector's suggestion that a clause should be added to policy E3 to allow for exceptions if proposals comply with these other policies, I see no merit in this. In my view this would negate the intent and effectiveness of the policy.
12. I conclude that some modifications to the text of the Local Plan are required in relation to policies H5, H9 and H10, as indicated above.

Appropriate Uses on Employment Land Allocations (Objector 1343)

13. To cut a long story short, this is to a large extent a re-run of the Post Office's objection to policy E1 and in general terms my conclusions are much the same. However, in this case the areas listed in the policy (some of which are the same as those listed in policy E1, although I have recommended some are deleted) are more likely to have the caveat that B2 Uses are excluded. On the other hand this policy contains the proviso that any development should not cause traffic, amenity or conservation problems (which is lacking in policy E1).
14. Again, my preference would be for a more inclusive and simpler policy. Something on the lines of – "Within the following sites, as defined on the Proposals Map, the expansion, conversion and redevelopment of land and premises for employment uses (other than retailing and other uses appropriately sited in shopping and local centres) will be permitted provided the development would not cause traffic, amenity or conservation problems". The policy would then list the sites that are affected. The text

accompanying the policy could draw attention to the sites where residential amenity (or any other known consideration) is likely to be a sufficiently strong constraint to limit the type of activity likely to be approved.

15. I conclude that the policy and text should be modified accordingly.

Objector 3863

16. This objector thinks there is an error in the accompanying text where it refers to policy E2 as a means of achieving employment. Policy E2 concerns the mixed-use proposal at Calverton, which will include employment. It is therefore appropriate for the text to refer to it and I conclude that no modification is needed.

Sustainability (Objector 1345)

17. NWT opposes redevelopment under clause (b) of this policy if the site is not in a sustainable location and I agree with this in principle. However, the objector is not specific about any of the sites causing concern in this respect and it does not seem to me that any of them are so remote as to be completely ruled out at the outset.

18. I conclude that no modification is needed.

Tidying Up (Objectors 1158, 1325 and 1345)

19. Clause (a) of policy E3 includes the sites allocated in policy E1 and there is no objection to this in principle – indeed it seems sensible that it should do so. These objectors have followed through their objections to policy E1 by seeking amendments to this policy. Again this is also understandable but I have already considered their primary objections in relation to policy E1.

20. I conclude that the list of sites in clause (a) of policy E3 should be modified to reflect my recommendations on individual sites in policy E1.

RECOMMENDATION

21. I recommend that policy E3 should be modified to read as follows:

Within the following sites, as defined on the Proposals Map, the expansion, conversion and redevelopment of land and premises for employment uses (other than retailing and other uses appropriately sited in shopping and local centres) will be permitted provided the development would not cause traffic, amenity or conservation problems.

22. I also recommend that the text accompanying policies H5, H9 and H10 should be expanded to draw attention to policy E3 and explain its relationship with these policies.

23. I recommend that the list of sites in this policy should be revised to reflect the contents of policy E1 as far as employment allocations are concerned.

4.15 E3 RETENTION OF EMPLOYMENT – DAYBROOK

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000382	000534	North Eastern Co-Operative Society Ltd

Summary of Objection

The site on the corner of Mansfield Road and Oxclose Lane is a car showroom and is incorrectly included within this designation. E3 unreasonably restricts the prospects of the existing business and any future redevelopment. The future of this small site is immaterial to future employment and overall land supply in the borough. Considering the current lawful use, this site should be taken out of the E3 area.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001948	004570	Aldergate Properties Ltd

Summary of Objection

133 Mansfield Road is (was) a newsagent with a public house adjacent to it on the corner of Sherbrook Road. North of Sherbrook Road the frontage is a mixture of shops and dwellings. This frontage (Mansfield Road west side south of Byron Street) should not be included in the E3 area. It is not in employment use now and should not be included.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

1. Neither objector questions the principle that there should be an E3 area of employment protection at Daybrook and neither do I. What is at issue the area's definition, especially with reference to its extent to the north and south on the west side of Mansfield Road.

Objector 382

2. As stated in the objection, the site on the corner of Oxclose Lane is a car showroom. As the Council points out this site was previously included in an area designated under a broadly similar policy in the adopted Local Plan. I see no reason to suppose that the present designation would pose any difficulties for as long as the existing lawful use continues and the objector does not say there have been any problems.
3. The way the objector presents their case, there are two possibilities to consider:
 - if the existing user (or similar) wishes to expand or redevelop the site for the same use (or similar);
 - if the site is to be redeveloped for another use (and the site is large enough and self-contained enough for this to be a realistic option).
4. As far as the first possibility is concerned, as the Council points out, the existing lawful use on the site would be an important material consideration if the present user (or similar) wanted to expand their business or redevelop the site for the same use. I do not consider that the E3 designation would cause any difficulties in this eventuality. I therefore take the view that this is not a reason to modify the Local Plan.
5. As far as the situation that would arise if complete redevelopment for another use were proposed, several possibilities might arise. As far as shopping and other town centre uses are concerned, any proposal would be assessed in the light of town centre policies in the Local Plan and PPG6. The E3 designation would have little impact one way or the other. If an employment use were proposed the E3 designation might prove helpful. The major limiting effect of the E3 designation would be, at least in the first instance, to introduce a presumption against residential development. Given the circumstances of the site and its surroundings (the employment area to the south and the busy road junction to the north, it does not seem to me that the site is entirely

suitable for residential development. To this extent, and in as far as the Local Plan is intended to provide guidance on the future use and development of land, the E3 designation seems to me to be appropriate.

6. I conclude that the Local Plan should not be modified in response to this objection.

Objector 1948

7. In my view the situation is somewhat different at the other objection site to the south. This has a mixture of uses, is split into a large number of properties and has little depth. Even so, the impact of the E3 designation may not be very different, although the question of comprehensive redevelopment is less likely to arise in my view.
8. The Council says that this section of Mansfield Road has been subject to pressures for retail and other uses more appropriate to town centre locations. There is a mix of business, office and retail as well as residential uses in this location. The area is the subject of policy E17 in the 1990 adopted Local Plan, which sought to encourage office development. The demand for small-scale offices has not resulted in the investment necessary to see renovation or even redevelopment in this area. Therefore a wider approach has been proposed to encourage more employment uses in the area. The recent investment in the former Fine Wires factory shows that there is demand for residential in this location and the development at the corner of Edwin Street illustrates the demand for employment uses.
9. This reads a little as if the Council perceives there is a problem here but is not sure what to do about it. I'm not sure I can be much help either. The existing policy for the area has failed to stimulate investment and it is not clear whether policy E3 (or removing it) would have beneficial results. Be that as it may, it is worth looking at the possible consequences of the policy (or removing it).
10. In my view shopping uses on anything but the most local scale would fall foul of town centre policies in the Local Plan and PPG6. So this consideration is neutral in its effect. Office (and other employment) uses would be made easier if E3 is retained but, at least in the first instance, the opposite would be true of residential uses. It's difficult to know where the balance of advantage lies.
11. However, on balance I conclude that the E3 policy should be retained for several reasons. Residential is not the predominant use in the area now and the local environment is not well suited to residential use. It therefore seems reasonable to me that this should not be the first choice of use for the area. Some of the buildings in the area, probably the majority in terms of site and floor area, are best suited to employment uses. The whole frontage has a commercial character and appearance. In any event, if employment uses cannot be found, then the policy says that a residential use can be considered.
12. Accordingly I conclude that the E3 designation should be retained.

RECOMMENDATION

13. I recommend no modification to the Local Plan in response to these objections.

4.16 E3 RETENTION OF EMPLOYMENT - PARK ROAD BESTWOOD

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000721	001252	St Modwen Developments Ltd

Summary of Objection

The site at Park Road Bestwood should be deleted from policy E3. The site and its buildings are no longer suited to current employment needs and demand. Not more than 1 ha will be needed for employment uses when the site is redeveloped.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

1. The objector owns land that was part of the Bestwood colliery, now closed. About half of the land is allocated for housing development in the Local Plan and about half is identified in policy E3 as a site where employment uses are to be retained. The objector’s intention is to allow for the eventual redevelopment of all the land for housing, although there are no immediate plans to redevelop the E3 land.
2. The retention of employment on the objection site helps to make Bestwood a rounded and sustainable settlement. A considerable residential allocation has already been made in the village and to double the potential for new housing would not, in my view, be proportionate to the scale and character of the village. In broad terms, therefore, I consider that the approach in the Local Plan is reasonable.
3. The objector says there is little demand for the premises on the objection site, which are poorly located and not ideal for modern businesses. Yet as I saw on site, a high proportion of the buildings on the western part of the objector’s land were occupied and the buildings appeared to offer a range of accommodation in a reasonable state of repair. Since the time of my visit the objector says that the largest occupier has given notice that they are to quit and there does seem to be a turnover of occupiers on the site. However, to what extent this is due to inherent weaknesses in the site and premises and to what extent it is due to the letting policies of the owners is not clear.
4. GBC do not claim that this site or its buildings provide prime commercial accommodation but that they contribute to a range and choice both in this settlement and in the wider area. This seems to me to be a convincing reason to retain and protect the employment potential of the site at least for the duration of this Local Plan. In any event I am not convinced that the site cannot and does not make a useful contribution to the economic base of the area.
5. I conclude that to ease the way for the redevelopment of this site for (more) housing could result in a disproportionate amount of residential development in Bestwood, to the detriment of the village’s character and sustainability. I also conclude that the site can and should make a valuable contribution to the local economy and that it should continue to be designated as a protected employment site by policy E3.

RECOMMENDATION

6. I recommend no modification to the Local Plan in response to this objection.

4.17 POLICY E3 SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND OVERVIEW

1. As a result of all the above I am recommending that policy E3 should read as follows:

(a) Within the following sites, as defined on the Proposals Map, the expansion, conversion and redevelopment of land and premises for employment uses (other than retailing and other uses appropriately sited in shopping and local centres) will be permitted provided the development would not cause traffic, amenity or conservation problems.

Top Wighay Farm

Victoria Business Park

Former Gedling Colliery

North of Hazleford Way, Newstead

Hillcrest Park, Calverton

(not suitable for general industry or uses likely to be incompatible with housing)

Former Calverton Colliery

Colwick Industrial Estate

Great Northern Way, Colwick

Park Road, Bestwood Village

Portland Street, Daybrook

Brookfield Road / Rolleston Drive, Arnold

(not suitable for general industry or uses likely to be incompatible with housing)

Mansfield Road, Arnold

(not suitable for general industry or uses likely to be incompatible with housing)

Salop Street, Arnold

(not suitable for general industry or uses likely to be incompatible with housing)

Catton Road, Arnold

(not suitable for general industry or uses likely to be incompatible with housing)

Sherbrook Road, Daybrook

(not suitable for general industry or uses likely to be incompatible with housing)

Station Road, Carlton

(not suitable for general industry or uses likely to be incompatible with housing)

Bewcastle Road, Bestwood Park

(not suitable for general industry or uses likely to be incompatible with housing)

South of Hazelford Way, Newstead

(not suitable for general industry or uses likely to be incompatible with housing)

Former Home Brewery, Daybrook

(not suitable for general industry or uses likely to be incompatible with housing)

(b) as in the Second Deposit.

4.18 E4 EMPLOYMENT DEVELOPMENT ON UNALLOCATED SITES

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001948	004569	Aldergate Properties Ltd

Summary of Objection

Policy E4 should be modified to allow for the mixed development of Cornwater Fields Ravenshead.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

1. This is one of a series of objections seeking the allocation of land south of Ravenshead for a mixed development of residential and offices. I have considered this concept under policy H2 and have recommended against it. Although the objector sees the proposal as akin to creating a new Saltaire at Ravenshead, I consider it is not in accord with current planning policies or guidance. I certainly take the view that the general policies in the Local Plan (such as E4) should not be altered to accommodate it.

RECOMMENDATION

2. I recommend no modification to the Local Plan in response to this objection.
-

4.19 E5 EXPANSION OF EXISTING EMPLOYMENT USES NOT IN THE GREEN BELT

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001158	002429	Nottinghamshire County Council (Strategic Property)
001158	002430	Nottinghamshire County Council (Strategic Property)
001345	003305	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust
001345	003306	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust
001664	003931	W Hardy & Sons

Summary of Objection

NCC: This policy is objected to because it overlaps with policy E3(a) to some extent and implies that there is more concern about the impact of small employment areas than large ones.

Paragraph 4.14 is misleading about the cause of (and remedy for) the lack of employment development in Gedling. Lack of access to the M1 is seen as the main cause.

NWT: Expansions should be allowed unless they would prejudice development, which would be more beneficial to the local economy and more sustainable. A clause to this effect should be added to the policy.

Paragraph 4.14 says that Gedling can avoid becoming a dormitory suburb if extensions to existing firms take place. This means that less land needs to be allocated for employment uses.

W Hardy & Sons object to the policy but give no reasons

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions***Objector 1158***

1. In my view policies E3 and E5 deal with different parts of the borough. I do not consider that they overlap and certainly not to an extent that invalidates either or makes either redundant.
2. However, I accept that the first part of paragraph 4.14 rather overstates the contribution that expansions of small non-conforming uses can make. But I see no harm in it and there is no necessity to delete it.

Objector 1345

3. The issue of prejudicing comprehensive development is dealt with in policy ENV1(e). I see no need to repeat it here.
4. I have already said that in my view paragraph 4.14 overstates what can be achieved by expanding small non-conforming uses. I do not accept that it could reduce the need for new employment land by anything like the amount this objector hopes.

An Editing Matter

5. In my view the last word in the policy should be “surroundings” not “surrounds”.

Objector 1664

6. I do not know what modification to this policy the objector seeks.

RECOMMENDATION

7. I recommend that the last word in policy E5 should be changed to “surroundings” from “surrounds”.
8. I recommend no modification to the Local Plan in response to these objections.

4.20 E6 BUSINESS/WORKING FROM HOME IN RESIDENTIAL AREAS

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000024	000024	Mr A Carr

Summary of Objection

A more positive attitude (and public financial support) to assist businesses in rural areas is needed.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000406	000584	Orange Personal Communications Services

Summary of Objection

There is a need for a policy that encourages home based / teleworking.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001664	003930	W Hardy & Sons
001664	003931	W Hardy & Sons

Summary of Objection

The rural locations identified in the Local Plan for development are too limited to enhance the rural economy. Objection 3931 appears to relate to policy E5 (see above).

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

Objector 024

1. In my view the question of public funding goes beyond the remit of the Local Plan, although I believe that in the rural areas most in need of assistance there are public funds available. I also believe that there are schemes and incentives that apply equally in urban and rural areas. The Local Plan already contains policies aimed at rural diversification, although these have to recognise that nearly all of Gedling's rural areas are in the Green Belt.

2. I conclude that no modification to the Local Plan is needed.

Objector 406

3. The objector calls for a policy to encourage home based working and the fuller exploitation of telecommunications. E6 is such a policy. Home based working does not always require planning permission but, where it does, it is not clear what more this policy could or should say. The objector has no specific changes for me to consider.

4. I conclude that no modification to the Local Plan is needed.

Objector 1664

5. I am not sure that this objection has been correctly ascribed to this policy. Be that as it may, the Local Plan goes some way in supporting rural diversification and enterprise and contains some policies to this effect. However, the extent of what is possible is (and has to be) constrained by Green Belt policy and government guidance on rural planning. For all this objector's several objections complaining about the lack of rural development opportunities, I do not have a clear idea of what they actually want. This is because their objections lack any specific proposals. In the circumstances there is little I can do to help them even if I was persuaded that I should.

6. I conclude that no modification to the Local Plan is needed.

RECOMMENDATION

9. I recommend no modification to the Local Plan in response to these objections.

4.21 E7 EMPLOYMENT DEVELOPMENT IN RURAL SETTLEMENTS EXCLUDED FROM THE GREEN BELT

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000777	001221	Mr D Lawson

Summary of Objection

Policy E7 is slightly inconsistent with policies E6 and E11.

001664	003928	W Hardy & Sons
--------	--------	----------------

Summary of Objection

Does this policy include “washed over” villages? Why are such villages excluded?

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

Objector 777

1. The objector is right that policies E6, E7 and E11 are not exactly the same. But they are intended to be applied in different circumstances. Policy E6 is intended to relate to residential areas in the main built up area. Policy E7 applies in “inset villages”, such as Burton Joyce. And policy E11 applies to offices whereas the other two policies relate to a broader range of proposals.
2. Although they might all be thought to apply to a single hypothetical case (a proposal for an office in Burton Joyce) they would not necessarily all apply in every case. So a proposal in a residential part of Burton Joyce might be treated differently from a proposal in another part of the village. A proposal that relates to an existing building might be treated differently to one that does not. All in all I see no difficulty in the policies not being identical. They will be used when proposals arise as is appropriate.
3. I conclude there is no need to modify this policy.

Objector 1664

4. To answer the objector's first question; this policy applies to inset villages, not washed over villages. In washed over villages only infilling is allowed because this is the scale of development considered appropriate for such settlements. Infilling is generally defined as the addition of one or two dwellings in a gap in a built up frontage. In my experience the landowners of such sites usually prefer to develop them for housing because this generates more value than an employment use in the same location.
5. I do not know whether this objector owns such a site in a washed over village or whether this is an entirely academic point. But if an employment proposal did come forward to infill **a gap inside the infill boundary of a washed over village**, it would have to be considered on its merits and in the light of policy E9. I do not rule out entirely the possibility that such a proposal would be unacceptable but much would depend on the particular circumstances of the site. However, I see no need to modify the policy to accommodate such an unlikely eventuality.
6. I conclude there is no need to modify the policy.

RECOMMENDATION

7. I recommend no modification to the Local Plan in response to these objections.

4.22 E8 REDEVELOPMENT OF CALVERTON COLLIERY

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001345	003308	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust

Summary of Objection

This site should be included with the overall employment land figures. The types of use proposed should not create additional journeys.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
003863	010601	Mr D Clark

Summary of Objection

The Local Plan says that Calverton has not proved an attractive location for employment, so there is no real need for this allocation. Other parts of the colliery site have a better access.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

Objector 1345

1. I note this objector’s general support for this policy. Their suggestion that the land should be included in the E1 figures has been met in the Second Deposit.
2. This only leaves their suggestion that “the type of development granted on this site should be carefully controlled so that it will not create unnecessary additional journeys”. It is not clear what sort of controls they have in mind. Nor is it clear how they would differentiate between necessary journeys and unnecessary ones. And are additional journeys those over and above the present situation or over and above the situation when the colliery was working? I am inclined to the view that it is the latter that will have to be taken into account, in which case there may be considerable scope for traffic generation. All in all, much as I concur with the (albeit rather imprecise) sentiments, I cannot see how the Local Plan can be modified to take them into account.
3. I conclude that no modification to the Local Plan is justified.

Objector 3863

4. My understanding is that this policy is as much a recognition that the abandoned site needs clearing up as anything else. This has to be done within the constraints of Green Belt policy. The other part of the colliery site referred to is being restored to an open state.
5. On this basis I conclude there is no need to modify the policy.

RECOMMENDATION

6. I recommend no modification to the Local Plan in response to these objections.

4.23 E10 INAPPROPRIATE EMPLOYMENT SITES

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001158	002432	Nottinghamshire County Council (Strategic Property)

Summary of Objection

The policy is objected to because there is no certainty that these two sites will become available. The sites cannot be relied on as housing sites and the loss of employment land should be made good.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001345	003310	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust

Summary of Objection

Even if these sites are not appropriately sited, as existing businesses the occupiers should be supported to secure their continued viability. Alternatively the businesses affected should be relocated, but not to sites in the Green Belt.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

1. I note that neither of these objectors apparently has any interest in the land or businesses affected by this policy. Rather, as I understand them, the objectors are concerned about the indirect effects of this policy on the supply of employment and/or housing land and the economy. In my view these sites are marginal in these contexts.
2. I also note what the Local Plan (paragraph 4.19) says about this policy being a continuation of policies in the adopted Local Plan, which in turn traces the approach to these sites back to 1978.
3. The only evidence I have from the Council is that the stated desire for residential redevelopment is in order to establish clarity about the preferred alternative use for these sites. Neither site is included in the H2 housing land figures because of the uncertainty surrounding them. The Council also says the allocations of employment land are intended to provide sites for any businesses displaced from these sites, although the employment land requirements are not so precise that this is clear. The Council will work with the affected businesses to attempt to relocate them and will also support any developers interested in residential development.
4. Taking all this into account I am nevertheless uneasy. If the policy, in effect, dates back to 1978 it is a very long time in coming to fruition! Nor have I been given any concrete proposals that would lead me to suppose that things will be resolved in the lifetime of this Local Plan. I accept that the sites are not included as housing land in policy H2, so the impact on housing land supply has not got wider implications but this only underlines the Council’s acceptance that the policy is unlikely to be implemented in any urgent or meaningful way.
5. However, the site at Podder Lane is far from attractive in its present condition and appears to me to accommodate predominantly open uses with a low employment density and a harmful impact on the immediate environment. The access is unarguably substandard in a number of respects and the only hope of improving access to the land would be in connection with residential development and not by an intensification of the existing uses or redevelopment for employment purposes. Residential development of this land would solve several problems that cannot be tackled in any other way. In these circumstances I conclude that the Local Plan E10 designation is justified at Podder Lane.

6. The situation at the Meadow Road site is, in my view, less clear cut, especially because the area has several buildings with a considerable combined employment capacity. The site is also in a part of the borough where employment land is in short supply – a situation that my recommendations make even worse. So the prospects of successful relocation seem at best remote and at worse impractical. Thus the policy appears to penalise some established businesses without any prospect of a remedy.
7. If this land were not designated as a problem site, it would be dealt with under policy E4. This is quite a restrictive policy in my view that puts a strong emphasis on the protection of the environment in the areas surrounding non-conforming uses. In the absence of any clear and achievable relocation proposals, I feel that this is as far as the Local Plan should go in dealing with the land at Meadow Road. I am concerned that businesses here are, in effect, being blighted without any positive way forward in prospect. In the absence of any firm and realistic relocation proposals, I conclude that the site at Meadow Lane should be deleted from this policy. Nor is it clear that all of the land at Meadow Road would be ideally suited to residential development (which is in contrast to the situation at Podder Lane.
8. I therefore conclude that the designation at Meadow Road should be deleted from policy E10.

RECOMMENDATION

9. I recommend that policy E10 is retained in the Local Plan but that the land at Meadow Road, Netherfield should be deleted from it.

4.28 E11 OFFICE DEVELOPMENT OUTSIDE SHOPPING CENTRES

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001345	003309	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust

Summary of Objection

The policy is too prescriptive. Small-scale office conversions should be encouraged if a building has no current use. But the loss of residential opportunities must be guarded against. Reword the policy to say “Planning permission will be granted provided that . . .” instead of “Planning permission will not be granted unless . . .”.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001948	004568	Aldergate Properties Ltd
001948	201948	Aldergate Properties Ltd

Summary of Objection

(First Deposit) Policy E11 should be modified to allow for the mixed development of Cornwater Fields Ravenshead. Any reference to B1(a) uses should be deleted to achieve this.

(Second Deposit) The text added to paragraph 4.20 is based on a misinterpretation of PPG6. There is no scope for large offices in Arnold so it is unrealistic to attempt to locate major B1(a) use exclusively within or adjacent to town centres. Large offices should be allowed away from centres and A2 uses may also be appropriate where there is a local need.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

Objector 1345

1. It seems to me that the text added to paragraph 4.20 in the Second Deposit goes some way to meeting the substantive point made by this objector, in that it accepts that small offices may be located away from town centres. I do not think the Local Plan should go further in this direction. As to the suggested wording change to make the policy more “positive”, I consider this to be largely cosmetic and of little merit.
2. I conclude that no (further) modification is needed.

Objector 1948

3. I seem to have considered Aldergate’s land south of Ravenshead several times already and each time the answer is the same. It is worth re-stating that I am recommending that the site remains in the Green Belt. Therefore, whatever the outcome on policy E11, the objector’s proposal near Ravenshead would be inappropriate development. Be that as it may, I shall consider the points made on policy E11.
4. It does not seem to me that the difference between the objector and the Council is so much about the interpretation of PPG6 as it is about whether the decentralisation of offices is justified because Arnold town centre has no available sites. Although I looked at the availability of town centre sites in detail as part of a concurrent shopping appeal, I am not convinced that there are no such sites in or adjacent to Arnold town centre for office development. I do not have evidence on this,
5. But even if there are not any sites for offices available in or close to Arnold, I note that Local Plan paragraph 4.20 puts this policy in a wider context by referring to Nottingham City centre. I agree that it is necessary to take this wider perspective. Thus, if one were following a sequential approach, it would be a very long time (and a long way through the list) before one reached a site in the Green Belt near Ravenshead!
6. The objector has not said exactly what modification to this policy they are seeking but I sense that the only change they would find palatable would be a statement to the effect that their proposal near Ravenshead is acceptable. I am unwilling to recommend such a change, partly because I do not believe that their proposal has any merit and partly because I do not believe the Local Plan should be redrafted solely to accommodate a particular proposal.
7. I conclude that the Local Plan should not be modified.

RECOMMENDATION

8. **I recommend no modification to the Local Plan in response to these objections.**
-

5.1 TRANSPORT - GENERAL OBJECTIONS

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001328	002909	Government Office for the East Midlands
001328	201948	Government Office for the East Midlands

Summary of Objection

Policy omission - the intention to promote commuter plans, now usually called travel plans, is not apparent in any of the transport policies.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001946	004558	Railtrack PLC

Summary of Objection

There should be a policy to encourage the movement of freight other than by road. Without such a policy the Local Plan lacks a basis for promoting and accommodating the predicted growth in rail freight. The omission is inconsistent with government advice and fails to reflect the Structure Plan. A policy is suggested.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

Objector 1328

1. In response to this objection the following was added to policy T1 in the Second Deposit, “In addition such developments where necessary will be expected to secure green transport plans or commuter plans for the development to reduce car use.”
2. I see no need for a separate policy on this matter. I conclude that this objection has been met and that no (further) modification is necessary, except to bring the terminology up to date (see below, under policy T1).

Objector 1946

3. On rail freight the Council says that this is not a land-use issue and that the suggested policy is an aspiration that would have no tangible effect on planning decisions in Gedling. There is a small employment allocation next to the rail line into the former Gedling colliery but otherwise there is little scope for the Local Plan to influence the mode of freight transport. A major change of mode would depend on extraneous influences, probably at national level. If such a change occurred there is nothing in the Local Plan that would prejudice a greater use of rail for freight transport.
4. I find this response to be plausible and have no evidence to the contrary.
5. I conclude that there is no reason to modify the Local Plan in this respect.

RECOMMENDATION

6. I recommend no modification to the Local Plan in response to these objections.

5.2 T1 NEW DEVELOPMENTS - DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000309	000439	House Builders Federation

Summary of Objection

The HBF recognise the need for developer contributions to transport infrastructure. But they need to be necessary, relevant to planning, directly related to the proposed development, and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to it (Circular 1/97). The policy and text need modifying to reflect this.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001158	002436	Nottinghamshire County Council (Strategic Property)
001158	002440	Nottinghamshire County Council (Strategic Property)

Summary of Objection

The policy needs redrafting to make it more specific. The policy should refer to Transport Assessments to form the basis for negotiations in accordance with Circular 1/97. The policy or text should also refer to threshold site sizes to establish from which developers contributions will be sought.

Paragraph 5.16 refers to a sequential approach to new development in the Structure Plan. This is inaccurate and the reference to the Structure Plan in this paragraph should be deleted.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001324	002767	Langridge Homes Ltd

Summary of Objection

The policy is too vague. It should be expanded to be specific on the levels of contributions to be negotiated, reflecting the content of the Interim Transport Planning Statement.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001338	003084	Birch Homes Ltd

Summary of Objection

The policy is contrary to Circular 1/97 because developer contributions should be directly related to the development proposed. Amend the policy to reflect this.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001948	004567	Aldergate Properties Ltd

Summary of Objection

The policy needs to be more specific as to when contributions will be sought and how big they will be. A scale needs to be provided linked to allocated sites.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001952	004612	Sainsburys Supermarkets Ltd

Summary of Objection

Paragraph 5.16 - greater clarity is needed to show that this policy will be applied in a way that is consistent with Circular 1/97. Clarification is also needed as to how contributions will be used across local authority boundaries.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

1. At the time of my writing, the government is consulting on possible changes to the rules relating to developer contributions. However, in the meantime changes have not been introduced and the current relevant advice is found (primarily) in Circular 1/97 and it is to this that I give most weight.

Objector 309

2. The HBF base their criticisms of the policy and text on the Circular. They say that it is not the creation of additional demand for travel per se that should trigger contributions but whether that increase requires improvements to the transport system that can be related directly to the proposed development. This is a fine distinction that would (only) be significant if the increased demand for travel arising from a particular development could be accommodated by spare capacity in the existing transport infrastructure. They also say that paragraph 5.16 needs altering to reflect these considerations.

3. In response the Council says that the Local Plan policy is based on the adopted Structure Plan (policy 5/4) and that matters that have arisen since the Structure Plan was adopted are dealt with in Supplementary Planning Guidance (entitled the Interim Transport Planning Statement).
4. I note that the policy closely follows the Structure Plan, although it extends the coverage to include cycling and walking (which is in accord with government policy). For my part I consider that this policy is already tortuous enough in its wording. I fear that the addition of more clauses and caveats would cause its meaning to collapse under the weight of additional words. I also note that in the Second Deposit the words “an additional” were added in relation to demand and that the policy already referred to “measures arising from the development”. I therefore think the points made by the HBF are already adequately incorporated in the policy.
5. As far as paragraph 5.16 is concerned I consider that the words “to reflect the likely integrated transport costs required to serve the development” offer adequate protection.
6. However, I consider that much confusion could be avoided if the text explicitly stated that the policy will be applied in accordance with current government guidance on developer contributions and I conclude that this should be done.

Objector 1158

7. Transport Assessments are a means not an end. I therefore see no need for them to be mentioned in the policy. However, the Council acknowledges that they are needed for all large sites, with a threshold defined in the Interim Transport Planning Statement (already referred to above). I consider that these matters could usefully be referred to in the text accompanying the policy.
8. As to the sequential approach to site selection in the Structure Plan (or not), I understand the point made by the objector and the reasons for it. However, it does not seem to me to be an important issue in the context of paragraph 1.56. Nevertheless I agree that the word sequential could be deleted without any harm being done.
9. I conclude that the text accompanying policy T1 should be modified by:
 - adding a reference to Transport Assessments, the threshold that triggers them and how they are used;
 - deleting “sequential” in line eight of paragraph 5.16.
10. The opportunity should also be taken to revise and update the text as necessary.

Objector 1324

11. I note this objector's call for more detail based on the Interim Transport Planning Statement, with which they have been involved. However, to include such detail would have the effect of making the Local Plan unnecessarily long and inflexible.
12. I conclude that the Local Plan should not be modified in the way suggested.

Objector 1338

13. This objection repeats one of the issues raised by the HBF (objector 309 – see above). In my view the words in the policy “measures arising from the development” provide sufficient protection in this regard. The text reinforces the point.
14. I conclude that no modification is needed in response to this objection.

Objector 1948

15. I consider that this objection covers similar ground to that raised by objector 1324. The danger in a precise statement of contributions for every allocation is that the plan would become too long and inflexible. There would also be little scope for negotiation.
16. I conclude that no modification is needed in response to this objection.

Objector 1952

17. I believe I have already dealt with the general point of conformity with government guidance. I have concluded that this requirement should be explicitly stated in the text.
18. As far as cross-boundary issues are concerned, I have no response from the Council on this. Without a specific justification for the last sentence in paragraph 5.16, I consider it should be deleted.
19. I conclude that the last sentence in paragraph 5.16 should be deleted.

Highway Safety

20. As currently worded, I am a little concerned that – although the policy refers to public transport, cycling and walking – it does not appear to encompass highway safety. Paragraph 2.23 talks in terms of developer contributions being sought to address the effect of development on the surrounding highway network by the promotion of integrated transport measures. I am not sure that the policy is cast in wide enough terms to encompass this.
21. I particularly have in mind the sort of relatively minor “off-site” junction improvements or carriageway realignments that might improve highway safety sufficiently to cater for an increase in traffic caused by a proposed development. These may relate to pedestrians and cyclists (eg the addition of a pavement or cycle lane) but will not always do so. Traffic calming measures on existing roads might be another case in point in some cases.
22. I conclude that the words “highway safety measures” should be added to the policy after the first mention of “public transport” in the policy.
23. Because this adds to the complexity and length of the policy I would also redraft it to make it more easily understood.

RECOMMENDATIONS

24. I recommend that policy T1 is redrafted to read as follows:

Contributions will be negotiated from developers of retail, housing, employment and other significant developments to meet elements of the transport costs that arise from the additional demand for travel caused by their proposals. The contributions will be used to promote integrated transport measures that may include:

- public transport provision or enhancement;**
- measures to assist pedestrians;**
- highway safety measures;**
- measures to assist cyclists;**

Where appropriate the dedication of land within development sites will be negotiated to assist in providing public transport services.

In addition developers will be expected to prepare and implement travel plans for developments that are likely to generate a significant number of journeys. Such green transport plans will include measures to reduce the level of car use arising from the development.

25. I recommend that the text accompanying policy T1 should be modified to:

- state explicitly that policy T1 will be implemented in accordance with current government guidance on developer contributions;**
- add a reference to Transport Assessments, the threshold that triggers them and how they will be used;**
- delete “sequential” in line eight of paragraph 5.16;**
- delete the last sentence in paragraph 5.16.**

26. I also recommend that the text is revised and updated as necessary.

27. I recommend that a cross-reference to this policy is added to the text accompanying policy C2.

5.3 T2 NEW DEVELOPMENTS - SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001948	004566	Aldergate Properties Ltd

Summary of Objection

The policy needs to be more specific as to when contributions will be sought and how big they will be. A scale needs to be provided linked to allocated sites.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

1. This objection is an exact repeat of objection 4467 to policy T1 and to that extent I have already considered it.
2. The objection to policy T2 refers to the need for more clarity and precision on the matter of developer contributions. However my reading of policy T2 is that it is concerned with layouts and the physical infrastructure that needs to be provided on development sites. Neither the policy nor the text mentions developer contributions, which are dealt with in policy T1. (I also note that no other objector has raised the matter of contributions in the context of policy T2.)
3. For both these reasons I consider that no modification to policy T2 is justified.

RECOMMENDATION

4. I recommend no modification to the Local Plan in response to this objection.
-

5.4 T3 PROPOSED TRANSPORT SCHEMES – A612 GEDLING, MAJOR INTEGRATED TRANSPORT SCHEME

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000702	201168	Burton Joyce Parish Council
000715	201289	Sport England
000888	200469	Mr W H Moore
001330	201253	Council for the Protect of Rural England
003918	201814	Mr & Mrs Blakeman
004032	201235	Mr T Wagg
004033	201234	Mrs C Crix
004845	201240	South Nottinghamshire Bat Group
004849	201256	Carlton Town FC (Mr I Spencer)
005015	201923	Grantchester Retail Park

AND OVER 100 INDIVIDUAL OBJECTIONS

Summary of the Objections

The proposed new road is unnecessary – the existing road should be improved (especially by widening the railway bridge and removing the bottleneck). The proposed road is not justifiable in terms of sustainable development or current government transport policy. It would lead to an increase in traffic overall and through Burton Joyce and on Stoke Lane in particular. It would have adverse environmental impacts. The proposed road would have an adverse impact on wildlife, including woodland, bats and birds.

The proposed road would dissect and destroy valued and important open space and football pitches. The pitches are important for the football club but are also of wider sporting and social importance for the area.

The proposed road is too close to houses (in Stoke Lane, Linden Grove and elsewhere). The scheme will increase noise, pollution, fumes and traffic accidents. The alignment should be further to the south to avoid the existing urban area.

The bus priority measures will impose extra mileage and great inconvenience on local residents, especially those living in the Linden Grove area travelling to and from Burton Joyce by car.

Although traffic will be reduced in front of Carlton-le-Willows school the safety and convenience of pupils coming from Burton Joyce will be prejudiced.

The proposed road would prejudice development of Grantchester Retail Park and interfere with access to it. The revised road line may have archaeological implications.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

1. This scheme is listed twice in policy T3; once as bus a priority scheme and once as a new road link. However, I understand it is a single integrated proposal that includes a new road and bus priority and traffic management measures on the existing roads. Both aspects of the scheme have given rise to objections and I deal with them all here.
2. However, I am bound to say at the outset that in my view many of the objections fall outside my remit as a Local Plan Inspector. For example, I do not consider that the Local Plan is the right and proper forum for determining either the detailed design of a road proposal or the details of traffic management and bus priority proposals.

The Local Transport Plan

3. In any event the scheme is included in the current Nottinghamshire Local Transport Plan and its funding has been approved. It is apparent from the Highway and Transport Authority's contributions to the Local Plan Inquiry that NCC is pursuing the scheme energetically. A public exhibition was circulating in the area while the Local Plan Inquiry was taking place with a view to the early submission of a planning application followed by early implementation.

4. Furthermore, GBC says that the line of the proposed road was included in the adopted Local Plan and has been protected for 20 years. I recognise however, that the rationale for the current proposal may be somewhat different to the reasoning behind the long protected road scheme even if the two alignments are the same.
5. PPG12 indicates that the transport policies and proposals to be included in the Local Plan should reflect the contents of the Local Transport Plan. Usually it will be the Structure Plan rather than the Local Plan that is the appropriate part of the Development Plan for transport proposals. Be that as it may, plans are to include new roads, major public transport schemes and “packages” (as is the case in this instance). Traffic management measures, for example bus priority, are to be included.
6. In view of this guidance and because this package of measures (the new road and the bus priority measures) are included in – and arise from – the current Local Transport Plan, I am strongly pre-disposed not to recommend that they are deleted from the Local Plan. I am also mindful that the road line is not a new one and that new planning blight is not being created by the proposals. In addition, those who object to particular aspects of the proposals will have the opportunity to pursue their objections in other contexts (and quite possibly before my report is published). With all this in mind, I have the following comments on the principal reasons for objection.

Reasons for Objections in Principle

7. It seems to me that those who say that the proposed new road is unnecessary and that the existing road should be improved are viewing the proposal purely as a highway scheme. Similarly it is difficult to argue that the proposed road is not justifiable in terms of sustainable development or current government transport policy when it has just received funding via the Local Transport Plan approval. The scheme needs to be assessed as a package of highway, traffic management and bus priority measures.
8. I have no evidence that the proposals would lead to an increase in traffic overall or through Burton Joyce or on Stoke Lane in particular. At first sight it would be surprising if more trips were made as a result of this package of measures and the scheme will have failed if there is no diversion of trips from cars to buses.
9. It is true the proposed road would have some adverse environmental impacts, although there will be compensatory improvements due to a reduction in traffic on the existing road. I do not have enough information to conduct a full appraisal of the environmental gains and losses, although such an exercise will be needed before implementation. Similarly, the impact on wildlife and woodlands will need to be assessed and mitigation measures explored before implementation. The information I have at this stage (for example on bats, which are only said to “possibly” roost in the area) is not such as would warrant either stopping the project or seeking a major realignment of the road. But I accept that the wildlife impact will need to be considered in much more detail.

Carlton Football Club

10. The largest single cause of objection is the impact the proposed road would have on Carlton Football Club's ground. As well as many individual objections for this reason, the Football Club presented evidence at the Local Plan Inquiry. In addition Sport England have objected saying they would oppose any planning application unless and until adequate replacement pitches are provided.

11. The new road would dissect the club's ground and destroy the best pitch on which there has been considerable investment. Only a small practice pitch would be left and no full sized pitch could be provided on what would be left of the ground. The club is clearly a widely valued part of the community and the pitch has an importance beyond the club itself (being used for important matches by other teams). However, the football club is concerned not only to achieve equivalent replacement pitches but also to secure these in time to avoid a disruption to their fixtures. They fear a break in continuity could lead to the closure of the club.
12. I have to say that from the cases put to me at the Public Inquiry, I did not get the impression that either the County Council or the Borough Council were yet devoting enough time, effort and focussed attention to the issues involved, which will not be easy to resolve. GBC were hopeful that replacement pitches could be found on Severn Trent land but this is bound up with the Employment Proposals for this land (which I am recommending should be deleted from the Local Plan).
13. Be all this as it may the club's grounds are designated as Protected Open Space under policy R1 of the Local Plan. This says that planning permission will not be granted unless alternative facilities are provided. It seems to me that this and the stance of Sport England are likely to be decisive considerations.
14. In evidence (717(i)) the County Council said: "In respect of safeguarding land for the new road, it should be noted that there is a conflict with policy R1 – Protection of Open Space. The First Deposit incorrectly identified the playing fields north of Stoke Lane as protected Open Space, because this did not take into account the safeguarded land for the proposed Gedling Bypass. The Second Deposit Draft now correctly safeguards the land for the A612 Southern Link Road through policy T3. Clearly conflicting policies such as T3 and R1 cannot simultaneously apply to the same area of land and, therefore, this needs to be clarified and a reduced area for the playing fields shown in the Local Plan."
15. I have to say that I find this a rather narrow, legalistic and unhelpful approach. It seems to me that the County Council would be deluding itself if it thought that having secured a road line in the Local Plan disposed of this matter. Whilst two competing notations cannot sensibly apply to the same piece of land, the land bisected by the road should in my view retain its R1 notation so that adequate replacement is a requirement. Since I accept the football club's reasons for saying that what remains would be unusable as an effective playing field, it seems to me that this will place the onus on the promoters of the scheme to do something about it.
16. On the other hand it also seems to me that the football club and its supporters may be attaching more importance to the Local Plan process than it has in relation to the proposed road. I am supportive of the club in the difficulties they now face. However, I can think of no recommendation to alter the Local Plan that I could make that would assist them. All I feel I can usefully do is highlight the need for a replacement and equivalent playing field in the hope that this issue will receive more urgent attention than it appeared to be getting when it was discussed at the Local Plan Inquiry.

Impact on Residential Amenity

17. That the proposed road is close to some houses (in Stoke Lane, Linden Grove and elsewhere) currently remote from a main road is undeniably true. However, traffic will be reduced in the vicinity of many more houses. It is not clear to me that the balance of advantage is against the proposal in this respect.
18. I have no evidence the scheme will increase traffic, noise, pollution, fumes and accidents overall. It is likely that a new and better-designed road would be beneficial in all these respects.
19. As to whether the alignment should be much further to the south to avoid the existing urban area, I have no detailed evidence exploring this proposition. If such an alignment is feasible I would expect it to be explored as part of the Environmental Assessment and CPO procedures.

Bus Priority and Traffic Management

20. The second largest cause for objection is that the bus priority measures will impose extra mileage and great inconvenience on local residents. Those living in the Linden Grove area travelling to and from Burton Joyce by car (as many say they do for such facilities as the doctors) expect to be most affected. The County Council confirmed that their current intention is to make the old road bus only at the point where the new road would start. This would mean that car traffic from within the area enclosed by the new road (for example Linden Grove) would have to detour around the new road, adding considerably to journey lengths and times. To this extent the objectors have a point (although they appear to ignore the benefits of better bus services and safer cycling and walking that they would enjoy).
21. It is clear to me that the whole basis for the package is to secure bus priority on Burton Road. The present scheme is advanced only on this basis. There is thus a need for measures to secure the intended bus priority. Whether this can only be achieved by preventing the free movement of **all** cars along the old road I cannot say and do not have the information upon which to make a judgement. However, I consider that the detailed design and assessment of a particular traffic management scheme is too detailed a matter for the Local Plan and me. Those who object for this reason will have other opportunities to pursue their objections.
22. I see no reason to suppose that the safety and convenience of pupils who attend the Carlton-le-Willows school from Burton Joyce will be prejudiced. The exception could be if they are brought to school by car, in which case the same considerations arise as for residents who live near the school (see immediately above).

Other Matters

23. I have no reason to suppose that the detailed design of the proposed road cannot accommodate the current access needs and likely development of the Grantchester Retail Park.
24. I have no evidence on the archaeological implications of the proposal but would expect this matter to be pursued at a later stage in the implementation process.

Conclusions

25. Having considered these and all the other matters raised in the objections to this package of proposals, I conclude that the scheme should be retained in the Local Plan. This is largely because the scheme is already an approved element of the Local Transport Plan. It is also in the knowledge that those who are adversely affected by the proposals will be able to pursue their objections by other means if they wish to.

RECOMMENDATION

26. I recommend no modification to the Local Plan in respect of policy T3 and the A612 Gedling Major Integrated Transport Scheme.
27. However, for the avoidance of doubt I also recommend that the R1 notation be retained on the Carlton Football Club ground (except for where the road line crosses it).
-

5.5 T3 PROPOSED TRANSPORT SCHEMES: GEDLING ACCESS / RELIEF ROAD AND PASSENGER RAIL LINE

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000130	000162	Mr M Eaton
000130	000165	Mrs G Eaton

Summary of Objection

The proposed road is only an access to the development and will not act as a bypass. A full bypass is needed with traffic calming and restrictions on existing roads.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000160	000210	Carlton Le Willows School

Summary of Objection

Pupils from Burton Joyce would have to cross the new road and this would be unsafe. The road will increase traffic on the A612.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000179	000236	Mr J Hand
000559	000799	Dr P Martin

Summary of Objection

The proposed road is only an access to the development and will not act as a bypass. A full bypass is needed with traffic calming and restrictions on existing roads. There is particular concern about increased traffic on Lambley Lane.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000413	000594	EMDA

Summary of Objection

EMDA reserved its position on the First Deposit line of road in order to look at alternatives.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000717	001520	Nottinghamshire County Council

Summary of Objection

The proposed road is an access to development not a transport scheme. The line of the full bypass should be protected. (The County Council considers this a matter of such importance as to threaten the general conformity of the Local Plan with the Structure Plan.) (Also as advanced during the Inquiry, the Highway Authority says that no dwellings should be occupied on the Gedling Colliery / Chase Farm site until the access road is completed.)

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001158	002444	Nottinghamshire County Council (Strategic Property)

Summary of Objection

The function of the proposed Relief/Access/Bypass Road is confused. The road should precede the proposed housing and long term transport proposals should not be protected (PPG12). There should be a strong presumption against a new road unless other options are impractical. 1430 houses probably cannot support the Road. The proposal is premature until the Structure Plan bypass proposal is formally reviewed.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001324	002863	Langridge Homes Ltd
001324	201323	Langridge Homes Ltd

Summary of Objection

The relief road should not be seen as a long term project. Also the alignment should be further out from the built up area. An explanation of why the Gedling Relief Road is not in the plan should be added

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001326	002856	Mr F Rodrigues
001327	002874	Gedling Village Preservation Society
001862	004195	Mr D MacKnight

Summary of Objection

The proposed road is only an access and not the full bypass. A full bypass is necessary if congestion is to be avoided. The proposal is not in accord with the bypass proposal in the Structure Plan.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001330	003007	Council for the Protect of Rural England

Summary of Objection

A relief road is unnecessary and would increase the general level of traffic. It would harm the Green Belt and countryside.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001337	003080	Messrs J N C & T Cutts

Summary of Objection

The road should be realigned further from the built up area.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001345	003223	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust

Summary of Objection

The road would harm the landscape, the countryside and wildlife.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001620	003837	Gedling Liberal Democrats

Summary of Objection

An extension is needed from this road to the Colwick loop road.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
003972	010827	Metro Jennings Ltd

Summary of Objection

The alignment will harm Gedling village and does not respect the topography. The road should be further from the built up area. Funding is not certain.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
003981	010868	English Heritage

Summary of Objection

The road would harm the setting of Gedling House (Grade II listed) and the landscape.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
004217	200366	Mr G T Wood
004366	200566	Mr G T Wood

Summary of Objection

The realignment in the Second Deposit would have a very harmful impact on properties in Lambley Lane.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001158	003651	Mr J Finn

Summary of Objection

Concern about noise from trains on the rail line in nearby homes.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
4900	201514	Mr J Broomhead

Summary of Objection

With the reduced number of houses in the Second Deposit, the rail proposal is not viable. Bus and tram proposals in Nottingham emphasise the inappropriateness of a single (heavy) rail spur.

AND OVER 400 INDIVIDUAL OBJECTIONS

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

1. For convenience and to avoid unnecessary repetition these objections are dealt with in the part of this report on policy H3 (Land at Former Gedling Colliery and Chase Farm)

RECOMMENDATION

2. For my recommendations see policy H3.

5.6 T3 PROPOSED TRANSPORT SCHEMES – OTHER MATTERS

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000024	000025	Mr A Carr

Summary of Objection

The railway into Calverton should be retained and its potential for Park and Ride explored.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000514	000727	Mr J Bentley

Summary of Objection

Scheme 5 (Gedling Relief Road): The Local Plan fails to deal with the increase in traffic that will follow this development (at Gedling Colliery / Chase Farm). The particular area of concern is Gedling Road between Arno Vale Road and Mapperley Plains. Traffic calming measures should be introduced to divert traffic from this stretch of road.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000717	001551	Nottinghamshire County Council
000717	201486	Nottinghamshire County Council

Summary of Objection

All the schemes listed in this policy are likely to require land. However, only two of the schemes are shown on the Proposals Map. All the schemes should be shown on the Proposals Map, even if only with a symbol. Also the time estimates for implementing the schemes are not derived from the Local Transport Plan as stated in policy T3.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001021	004513	Hallam Land Management Ltd

Summary of Objection

The scheme at Top Wighay Farm (referred to at the end of paragraph 5.18) is redundant because of the existing multi-modal transport facility at Newstead.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001158	002444	Nottinghamshire County Council (Strategic Property)
001158	002448	Nottinghamshire County Council (Strategic Property)
001158	201967	Nottinghamshire County Council (Strategic Property)

Summary of Objection

(First Deposit) The policy is not appropriate for a Local Plan, it should restrict itself to protecting the land needed for schemes. Schemes unlikely to be implemented by 2011 should be deleted. Particular exception is taken to the Gedling Relief Road. The schemes should be ordered according to their anticipated timing.

(First Deposit) Paragraph 5.18 provides inadequate support for Policy T3. Each scheme and its objectives should be described. There is no reference to the Local Transport Plan.

(Second Deposit) Schemes (iv) and (xi) are unachievable in the short term. (iv) refers to T3 (xii) - typing error. Suggest replacement of (short term) with (medium term) in both cases.

Paragraph 5.18 – the deleted text should be restored.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001329	002911	Government Office for the East Midlands

Summary of Objection

(First Deposit) PPG13 says that there is a need for consistency between Local Transport Plans and Local Plans. Unrealistic long-term schemes should not be included in the Local Plan. The Gedling Relief Road is questioned for this reason. The same is true of the rail link to the Gedling Colliery site.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001344	003132	Slack; Kirkham; Goldby; Grococks (Joint)
001344	201424	Slack; Kirkham; Goldby; Grococks (Joint)

Summary of Objection

(First Deposit) The T3 proposals do not best serve the proposed housing allocations in the Local Plan or the objectors' proposed housing development in Calverton. Other yet to be determined transport schemes should be included.

(Second Deposit) The objection is reiterated.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001948	004565	Aldergate Properties Ltd

Summary of Objection

Bus Station and Interchange facilities in Arnold and Carlton Square and bus priority measures should only be implemented after consultation and evaluation. Any loss of car parking in these centres could have a harmful impact. There should be an additional scheme relating to the Forest Lane / Mansfield Road junction at Papplewick. This would become more important if development goes ahead in the area. .

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001345	003221	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust
001345	003239	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust

Summary of Objection

The objector supports bus schemes but is opposed to investment in new roads, which encourage the growth in traffic. Road schemes in the policy should be deleted.

The Council is supported when it seeks to reduce the need to travel but paragraph 5.18 is mistaken in assuming that the volume of journeys will continue to increase. There is a need to promote sustainable development and public transport. No priority should be given to highway schemes to assist or cater for cars.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions***Calverton Park and Ride***

1. The Council says about this objection that investigations into the possible uses of the rail line to Calverton have taken place. Although the County Council may have intentions to create a cycle path, no scheme is far enough advanced for inclusion in the Local Plan.
2. Government guidance is that only transport schemes that are far enough advanced to be included in the Local Transport Plan should be included in the Local Plan. But PPG12 also places some emphasis on protecting disused rail lines to ensure their continued availability for transport proposals and to protect them from development that would prejudice their long-term use.
3. I conclude that this matter should be reviewed at the time of the modifications to determine whether the Local Plan should protect the former rail line to Calverton from development that would threaten its integrity.

Gedling Road (Arno Vale Road to Mapperley Plains)

4. This objection was to the First Deposit, since when the Second Deposit has deleted Scheme 5 (Gedling Relief Road) from policy T3 in the Local Plan. However, the Second Deposit includes a realigned access road for Gedling Colliery / Chase Farm (GCCF). This comes as far as Mapperley Plains and it is agreed that it will have to include a new junction at that point (see my considerations and recommendation of this issue under policy H3), although I have not seen a detailed design for this. However, I would anticipate that the junction design would include any traffic management measures considered desirable in the approach roads to the junction.
5. There are no transport proposals in the Local Plan northwest of Mapperley Plains that would affect Gedling Road. The section of what was the Gedling Relief Road between Mapperley Plains and Arno Vale is not protected in the Local Plan (First Deposit or Second Deposit). The Highway Authority has objected to this omission of a scheme that is in the Structure Plan. However, I am not recommending a modification as a result (see under policy R1), because this new section of road is not included in the Local Transport Plan and there is little hope or expectation that it could be implemented within the lifetime of this Local Plan (2011).
6. All this alters the context in which this objection has to be considered to some extent.
7. I think it is still fair to say that the GCCF development will bring more traffic to the Arnold Lane / Gedling Road / Mapperley Plains junction. The new design of that junction may have a very marginal influence on how much of that extra traffic turns left

or right or carries on ahead into Gedling Road. The design of the junction will also affect the amount of congestion at the junction and in the roads leading to it. But I consider the objector is correct to anticipate an increase in the volume of traffic on Gedling Road.

8. Since the section of the Gedling Relief Road northwest of Mapperley Plains is not included in the Local Plan, I see little prospect for diverting traffic away from Gedling Road as this objector wishes. In any event merely including the Relief Road scheme in the Local Plan would not advance its implementation if it were not also included in the Local Transport Plan (which, as I have said, it is not). Therefore traffic management measures in Gedling Road would have to be directed towards regulating the flow and speed of the traffic and not with the hope of diverting it.
9. However, although this may fall short of all that the objector wants, I conclude the design of the junction at Arnold Land / Mapperley Plains / Gedling Road should include any traffic management measures to be introduced in the approach roads to the junction. I have recommended accordingly below and under policy H3.

Proposals Map and the Local Transport Plan

10. As far as the County Council's comment on the Proposals Map is concerned, I can see no reason why all the schemes listed in this policy should not be shown in one way or another. I consider this would make it easier to understand the plan and conclude that they should be shown. GBC does not appear to object to this. However, the objector may have to supply more information for this to be done.
11. As to the County Council objection that the time estimates for implementing the listed schemes are not derived from the Local Transport Plan (LTP), the Borough Council accepts that this is the case. I conclude that any timings shown for the schemes in this policy should be derived from the Local Transport Plan.

Top Wighay Farm

12. In the First Deposit paragraph 5.18 ended with a reference to the extension of the Nottingham Express Transit Railway north of Hucknall. Objector 1021 took issue with this as it was in conflict with their own desire to have development located south of Newstead. In the Second Deposit the proposed development at Top Wighay Farm was deleted and so was the reference in paragraph 5.18. This met the first objection. However, objector 1158 disputes the change. In view of my recommendations on development at Top Wighay Farm I consider that the text should be restored. The existence of a railway station at Newstead does not alter my view on this.
13. I conclude that paragraph 5.18 should be restored to how it was in the First Deposit.

Objector 1158

14. Whilst the emphasis in a Local Plan may be on protecting the land needed for schemes, in my view it need not be restricted to this. Indeed this objector seeks a fuller specification of the purpose of each scheme. In any event, the order in which the policy is presented is, in my view, largely a matter for the Council.
15. I agree that schemes unlikely to be implemented by 2011 should in general be deleted from the policy. However, now that the Gedling Relief Road has been deleted (in the

Second Deposit) it seems to me that most of this objector's specific concerns have been met. It does not seem to me that there is any particular merit in (or need to) list the schemes according to their anticipated timing.

16. As far as paragraph 5.18 is concerned, I agree that it would be useful for this to give more details of each scheme – a short description and an indication of what each scheme is intended to achieve. A cross-reference to the Local Transport Plan would also be desirable. However, the attempt to ascribe likely implementation dates to the schemes has proved unreliable and generally more trouble than it is worth. But as long as any timings are consistent with the Local Transport Plan no harm is caused. I have already concluded that this should be the case.
17. As to the Second Deposit, schemes (iv) and (xi) are described by the objector as unachievable in short term, although this is not the understanding I reached at the Local Plan Inquiry. Be that as it may, these proposals are in the Local Transport Plan. I (and the Council) agree there is an editing error in the policy because in scheme T3 (iv) the cross-reference should be to scheme T3 (xi).
18. I conclude that the policy and text should be modified accordingly.

Objector 1329

19. The Government Regional Office questions the inclusion of the Gedling Relief Road in the programme. This was removed in the Second Deposit, so this part of the objection has been met. (I realise that it has been replaced by the GCCF access road but different considerations arise now the road is part of a development proposal.)
20. As far as the rail link to the Gedling Colliery is concerned, the Council says in its written response on this objection that details of the scheme should be included in the text accompanying the policy, although this did not happen in the Second Deposit. However, I have already concluded that this should be the case for all the schemes (see above under objector 1158).
21. Whilst I note that this scheme is not included in the Local Transport Plan, it seems to me that this is rather a special case because it involves the re-use of an existing rail line. PPG12 indicates that the protection of rail lines from development that would prevent their re-use is something of a special case. Because the inclusion of the scheme in the Local Plan ensures the continued protection and integrity of the route, I consider it to be justified.
22. Similarly the schemes related to buses may not be entirely dependent upon inclusion in the Local Transport Plan.
23. However, for the avoidance of doubt, I consider that the list of Road schemes needs to be reconciled with the latest Local Transport Plan and any schemes that are not included in the LTP should be deleted from the Local Plan.
24. I conclude that the list of Road schemes in the Local Plan should reflect the latest Local Transport Plan and that any road schemes not in the LTP should be removed from policy T3 in the Local Plan.

Objector 1344

25. I note that this objector does not think that the schemes in policy T3 are well related to the development areas proposed in the Local Plan. However, they give no indication of what schemes, if any, they think should be included. In any event the schemes in this policy are not necessarily aimed at new development in the area but may be to address existing problems in the area.
26. As far as the objectors' site in Calverton is concerned, it is my understanding that this is proposed on the basis that it is already in a sustainable location with adequate transport connections. More importantly, I am not recommending it is included in the Local Plan anyway.
27. I conclude that no modification to the Local Plan arises from this objection.

Objector 1948

28. I note this objector's concerns about proposals in Arnold and Carlton Square but the Local Plan is not primarily concerned with consultation arrangements. (However, the Council agrees that full consultation will take place as part of preparing a Town Centre Action Plan. The Council said it intended to explain this in the text accompanying the policy but this did not happen in the Second Deposit. I have already recommended that more details of each scheme should be included, so perhaps this will now be done.) As to whether either scheme would or should involve a reduction in parking spaces should be determined nearer the time. My only comment on this issue is that the existing free parking in these centres does not suggest or ensure that the best and fullest use of existing parking is taking place. However, I leave this matter to be explored and resolved as and when detailed schemes are prepared. The objector does not appear to oppose the schemes listed in the policy in principle.
29. As far as a proposed scheme at the Forest Lane / A60 junction is concerned, GBC says only that this is a matter for the Highway Authority and that no such scheme is included in the Local Transport Plan. As far as the Local Plan is concerned that is the end of the matter in my view. However, I feel I must comment that I also find this junction extremely hazardous.
30. I recommend no (further) modification to the Local Plan in response to this objection.

Objector 1345

31. By now the primacy of the Local Transport Plan should be apparent and I have already concluded that this should be the source for the list of road schemes to be included in policy T3. This objector makes no comments on any particular schemes and their general views on road proposals do not alter my views.
32. As to the issue of whether the volume of all journeys (public and private), including those on foot and by cycle will continue to rise, I have no evidence. Much will no doubt depend on how a "trip" is defined. The Council says that even if the intention is to reverse the trend of increasing trip numbers, it will take time to accomplish. I have no reason to modify the Local Plan.
33. I recommend no (further) modification to the Local Plan in response to this objection.

RECOMMENDATIONS

34. I recommend that the situation regarding the disused railway line to Calverton should be reviewed at the time of the modifications to determine whether the Local Plan should protect the line from development that would threaten its integrity.
 35. I recommend that the design of the junction at Arnold Land / Mapperley Plains / Gedling Road should include any traffic management measures to be introduced in the approach roads leading to the junction (see also under policy H3).
 36. I recommend that all the schemes listed in this policy should be shown on the Proposals Map.
 37. I recommend that the list of Road schemes in the Local Plan should reflect the latest Local Transport Plan and that any road schemes not in the LTP should be removed from policy T3 in the Local Plan.
 38. I recommend that any inaccuracy in Local Plan policy T3 in the way that it refers to the Local Transport Plan and the timing of schemes should be corrected.
 39. I recommend that paragraph 5.18 should be restored to how it was in the First Deposit.
 40. I recommend that paragraph 5.18 is expanded to give details of each scheme, including a short description and what the scheme is intended to achieve. A cross-reference to the Local Transport Plan should also be added.
 41. I recommend that in scheme T3 (iv) the cross-reference should be to scheme T3 (xi).
 42. Otherwise I recommend no modifications in respect of policy T3.
-

5.7 T4 PARK AND RIDE – GENERAL OBJECTIONS

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001271	003687	Mrs K Smedley

Summary of Objection

Park and Ride will attract too many vehicles; it should only be for local residents.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001345	003226	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust

Summary of Objection

Park and ride schemes are likely to be counter productive. The reduction in city-centre congestion may only encourage others to drive through the centre. Park and Ride promotes rural and edge of centre car journeys, increasing overall miles and undermining general public transport services. Park and Ride discourages developing urban /rural public transport links and require a lot of space that would better be left as open land. All support for Park and Ride should be removed from paragraph 5.12 and the Local Plan generally.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
003887	010640	Mrs J Carter

Summary of Objection

Objection – no reasons given.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

1. The Council recorded more objections as being to the general principle of Park and Ride but my reading of the objections concerned is that they relate to one or more of the proposed schemes. I have moved them to the relevant sections that follow. This leaves three objections to consider here.
2. As far as **Mrs Smedley** is concerned it is intended that the size of the Gedling Colliery Park and Ride should be small in order to limit its attraction to local users. Otherwise no such restrictions are mentioned. Indeed, one is tempted to say the more the merrier because any cars left at a Park and Ride at the edge of the urban area will reduce traffic on busy roads closer to the city. I do not, therefore, support her objection.
3. **NWT** mounts a comprehensive critique of Park and Ride. However, they provide no evidence in support of their views and such schemes have been in operation locally and nationally for some years without the adverse effects that they fear becoming apparent. Be that as it may, Park and Ride is an important element of government transport guidance and has been embraced by NCC. I therefore conclude that this objection should not succeed.
4. I cannot sensibly comment on **Mrs Carter**’s objection.
5. I conclude that the Local Plan should not be modified in response to these objections. However, please note there is a recommendation relating to Park and Ride arising from an objection to policy ENV26 (Green Belt).

RECOMMENDATION

6. I recommend no modifications in response to these objections.
7. I have recommended elsewhere that the text accompanying policy T4 should include a cross-reference to PPG13 Annex E.

5.8 T4 PARK AND RIDE – GEDLING COLLIERY

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000179	000233	Mr J Hand
000432	000614	Lambley Parish Council
001158	002453	Nottinghamshire County Council (Strategic Property)
001193	010870	Mr M Hudson-Scott
001193	201831	Mr M Hudson-Scott
001324	002768	Langridge Homes
001326	002866	Mr F Rodrigues
001327	002869	Gedling Village Preservation Society

AND ABOUT 150 INDIVIDUAL OBJECTIONS

Summary of Objections

The scheme will draw traffic to an already congested area with unsuitable roads. It will cause harm to road safety, amenity and the environment. It is also said that the reduction in the number of houses (in the Second Deposit) will exacerbate this problem.

Particular fears are expressed about traffic in Lambley with vehicles accessing the facility from east of Nottingham. This is a rat-run already, using country lanes.

Some objectors raise the possibility of increased crime.

One objector supports the proposal if the railway line is made secure (concern for children playing).

It is also said that the site is not within a transport corridor and there is a lack of demand here.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

1. For convenience and to avoid unnecessary repetition these objections are dealt with in the part of this report on policy H3 (Land at Former Gedling Colliery and Chase Farm)

RECOMMENDATION

2. For my recommendations see policy H3.
-

5.9 T4 PARK AND RIDE – LEAPOOL ISLAND

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001324	002768	Langridge Homes Ltd

Summary of Objection

Park and Ride at Leapool is supported but there is a need to define the boundaries of the site.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001329	002910	Government Office for the East Midlands

Summary of Objection

Paragraph 5.19 says there is uncertainty about the proposals for Park and Ride at Leapool and Top Wighay Farm. These proposals should be reviewed in the light of the Greater Nottingham Local Transport Plan (LTP) in order to conform to PPG13.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001948	004564	Aldergate Properties Ltd

Summary of Objection

More details of the proposal and likely timing should be given for the Leapool proposal.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
002830	010495	Mr J Sharp

Summary of Objection

The proposal will not materially reduce traffic or cars in the area generally but will greatly increase traffic and queuing at this busy road junction. This will harm the traffic flow and traffic safety at the roundabout and will cause pollution. The proposal would harm the amenity of local residents and would be visually obtrusive. There will be a loss of open farmland in the Green Belt. There are fears that the site would later be used for built development.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
003835	010542	R.A.G.E.

Summary of Objection

There are doubts about the feasibility and timing of the proposal. Also, because it is further out than any other Park and Ride facility, about viability. The site is in the Green Belt but the general concept of Park and Ride is agreed. There may be particular problems concerning land drainage at this site.

AND ABOUT 15 INDIVIDUAL OBJECTIONS

Summary of Individual Objections

There is concern about the scale of this proposal next to an already congested road junction. There would need to be effective landscaping because local tourist initiatives depend on the rural character of the area.

About a dozen objectors make the same objections as Mr Sharp, as summarised above (002830-010495).

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

1. This proposal is shown diagrammatically on the Proposals Map. It is also referred to in the Local Transport Plan, which says that a feasibility study is being undertaken. I was told that the study was still underway at the time of the Local Plan Inquiry.

Objections in Principle

2. There are several objections in principle to the proposal, mainly from local residents. Some of these seem to me to question the basic rationale of Park and Ride. For example, there are doubts as to whether traffic and general congestion in the wider area would be reduced and whether such a peripheral location can be effective. Such matters are likely to form part of the feasibility study of this proposal, which is underway. On the face of it, I can see no reason why a Park and Ride this far from the city would not prove effective **provided** enough bus priority can be secured on the route into the centre (but there must be some reservations on this account in this case). Be that as it may, if the feasibility study cannot demonstrate that a proposal on this site would be effective, why would it be pursued?

3. Such basic doubts about the effectiveness of Park and Ride are out of step with current government guidance, which generally favours including Park and Ride proposals in integrated transport plans. Practical experience elsewhere also indicates that Park and Ride can be effective. I therefore consider it sensible to await the outcome of the feasibility study to resolve these matters. Certainly enough information was not available at the time of the Local Plan Inquiry to allow me to make a full and detailed assessment. In these circumstances I do not rule out the proposal at this stage but neither can I give the scheme wholehearted support.

Congestion and Safety on the Roundabout

4. Another aspect of the proposal that concerns the objectors is the effect that the addition of a new access would have on traffic flows and safety on the roundabout. I have not seen a design for a new access but neither would I expect to explore such detail in the context of the Local Plan Inquiry.
5. However, I accept that the existing roundabout may have to be redesigned to accommodate the access to a Park and Ride site. But roundabouts with four accesses are the norm and I see no reason why one would not be workable here. If the congestion is as severe as reported to me, it may also be necessary to install traffic signals on the roundabout, which could also have benefits for pedestrians and achieving bus priority. Again this is not an uncommon feature on roads today. However, whatever the final design adopted I have no particular reason to doubt that a safe access can be provided. But if there are insurmountable access problems at this site, I have no doubt that the Highway Authority would not support the proposal.
6. The net effect may not be to ease the congestion that arises at peak times at this roundabout but I do not see this as the prime objective of such a scheme.
7. For these reasons I consider that concerns about the flow and safety of traffic at the Leapool roundabout are not a reason to remove the Park and Ride from the Local Plan.

Green Belt and Visual Intrusion

8. The proposed siting of the Park and Ride is in the Green Belt and in not unpleasant open countryside.
9. PPG13 Annex E sets out the circumstances in which Park and Ride facilities may be sited in the Green Belt. It recognises that suitable sites for Park and Ride on the edge of cities will often be in the Green Belt. I consider that there is every prospect that the conditions set out there could be met in this location. In any event there is no objection in principle to siting a Park and Ride in the Green Belt.
10. The landform here is a shallow bowl. There is thus scope for siting a Park and Ride in a position where it would not be prominent. There would also be scope (as some objectors recognise) for extensive and effective landscaping.
11. I conclude that these considerations do not preclude the possibility of a Park and Ride facility at Leapool.

Residential Amenity

12. There are relatively few homes in the immediate vicinity of the indicative Park and Ride site shown on the Proposals Map. Until the exact extent of the proposal and any mitigation measures are known, I would not rule out the possibility that undue harm to residential amenity can be avoided. In all the circumstances I would not delete the Park and Ride from the Local Plan for this reason at this stage.

Other Matters

13. I have considered all the other matters raised by objectors, such as land drainage, but do not consider that these mean that the proposal should be ruled out at this stage. I see no reason to suppose that creating a Park and Ride here would pave the way for other development. The site and its surroundings would still be in the Green Belt.

Uncertainty

14. As far as the uncertainty surrounding this proposal is concerned, this was still unresolved at the time of the Local Plan Inquiry because I was told that the feasibility study was still underway. The preliminary stage of the proposal is also evident in my assessment so far. It is clear that, if the Highway and Transport Authority do not confirm a major transport proposal in its Local Transport Plan, then it should not form part of a Local Plan.
15. However, I am reluctant to remove this proposal from the Local Plan while investigative work is still active. But if the scheme is not confirmed by the time of the modifications then, in my view, it should be deleted. In practice this may not prove fatal to the eventual implementation of the scheme because the land is in the Green Belt and I am not aware of any competing development pressures for this land.
16. It follows from all I have said that at this stage the objection from Langridge Homes seeking defined site boundaries cannot be met either. But since they are in general support of the proposal I imagine they would accept this for the time being. Nor can Aldergate's plea for more information be satisfied.
17. In these circumstances I am inclined to give – at most – only qualified support for this scheme in the present state of knowledge.

Conclusion

18. I conclude that whether or not this scheme is retained in the Local Plan should be reviewed at the time of the Local Plan modifications. If by then the feasibility study has justified a Park and Ride in this location and the proposal is on the way to being included in the Local Transport Plan, then it should be retained. If there are no such signs of progress, then I conclude that the proposal should be removed from the Local Plan.

RECOMMENDATION

19. I recommend that the inclusion of the Park and Ride at Leapool in the Local Plan should be reviewed at the time of the modifications in the light of my comments above and any progress on the feasibility study and Local Transport Plan.

5.10 T4 PARK AND RIDE – TOP WIGHAY FARM

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001021	002203	Hallam Land Management Ltd

Summary of Objection

Top Wighay Farm should not be developed, land South of Newstead is preferable. Therefore Park and Ride at Top Wighay Farm is unnecessary.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001158	002455	Nottinghamshire County Council (Strategic Property)
001158	201968	Nottinghamshire County Council (Strategic Property)

Summary of Objection

Paragraph 5.19 is objected to because it refers to Park and Ride at Gedling Colliery but not to the possibility of extending a rail connection into Top Wighay Farm. The NET proposal should be referred to.

Objection to deletion of Park and Ride at Top Wighay Farm.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001324	002768	Langridge Homes

Summary of Objection

The Park and Ride at Top Wighay Farm is uncertain and at best long term. Delete from the Local Plan.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001325	002824	Papplewick Parish Council

Summary of Objection

Delete the Park and Ride proposal and keep the land in the Green Belt. It would have little impact on congestion in the urban area and would attract traffic into a congested rural area with unsuitable roads. In any event the proposal is too large. Buses from the site would have to travel round Hucknall.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001329	002910	Government Office for the East Midlands

Summary of Objection

Paragraph 5.19 says there is uncertainty about the proposals for Park and Ride at Leapool and Top Wighay Farm. These proposals should be reviewed in the light of the Greater Nottingham Local Transport Plan (LTP) in order to conform to PPG13.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001948	004564	Aldergate Properties Ltd

Summary of Objection

More details and a fuller policy description are needed.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

1. The Park and Ride proposal and the line of a rail spur to it (the NET extension) are shown diagrammatically on the Proposals Map and were referred to in the First Deposit T4 policy and the associated text. In the Second Deposit both aspects of the proposal were deleted and it was explained that this was because the development area at Top Wighay Farm had been removed from the plan.
2. I consider, therefore, that the objections seeking the deletion of these proposals from the Local Plan have been met. However, I take them into account here as supporting the plan as it now stands. This means that the principal objector to the plan as it now stands is objector 1158, who seeks reinstatement of the Park and Ride and rail link.
3. The Park and Ride was discussed at the Local Plan Inquiry in the context of objector 1158's proposals for a large development for employment and housing at Top Wighay Farm. I was told that the Park and Ride and NET extension had been discussed with the operators of the rail facility who have expressed an interest in principle. I was asked to recommend that the proposals are safeguarded in the Local Plan as part of the larger Top Wighay Farm development.

The Principle

4. My recommendations concerning policies H2 and E1 are that there should be a sizeable area of employment and housing development at Top Wighay Farm. I accept the case that the Park and Ride can form a useful part of this mixed-use development, as did GBC when they included the proposals in the First Deposit.
5. I also accept that the rail link and Park and Ride could perform a useful role, allowing commuting and other journeys **to and from** the new developments. However, I note that the proposed development is not dependent on the rail link and Park and Ride because it is felt that adequate bus links to the city exist or can be provided. Nevertheless, I consider it is the case that a rail connection would be preferable. It would be faster and less liable to road congestion, thus providing a more attractive alternative to road transport.
6. Although the details of what is proposed are at a very preliminary stage, I accept that this is inevitable while the very principle of the wider development is still being debated. I have been asked to include the rail extension and Park and Ride proposals in the Local Plan to safeguard the land for their future implementation. In my view this is both desirable and reasonable. Until the future of the wider development proposals at Top Wighay Farm is settled one could not expect more.
7. To delete the Park and Ride proposal at this stage because of uncertainty, lack of details or because it is not included in the Local Transport Plan could mean that the opportunity for a valuable integrated land-use / transport proposal could be lost for little more than procedural reasons.
8. However, I accept that the Park and Ride could attract people from beyond the new development area and that the original objections from the Parish Council need to be considered.
9. In part the Parish Council questions the basic rationale of Park and Ride. For example, they doubt whether traffic and general congestion in the wider area would be reduced. However, a facility of this type could transfer traffic from road to rail, thus reducing road traffic. In any event, such basic doubts about the effectiveness of Park and Ride are somewhat out of step with current government guidance, which generally favours including Park and Ride proposals in integrated transport plans. Practical experience elsewhere indicates that Park and Ride can be effective. Failing to safeguard the land for these facilities at this relatively early stage in the project would not advance integrated planning.
10. I accept that the pattern of journeys in the surrounding area would be changed but I am not convinced that the net effect for the area or its residents would be harmful.

Green Belt

11. The proposed siting of the Park and Ride is currently in the Green Belt. However, to facilitate the development proposals, Top Wighay Farm would have to be taken out of the Green Belt. In any event PPG13 Annex E indicates that there are circumstances in which Park and Ride facilities may be sited in the Green Belt. It recognises that suitable sites for Park and Ride on the edge of cities will often be in the Green Belt.

Conclusion

12. I conclude that the proposed rail link and the Park and Ride should be reinstated in the Local Plan as part of the comprehensive development proposals at Top Wighay Farm. This will enable land to be safeguarded for these purposes while the details of the overall development scheme are progressed.

RECOMMENDATION

13. I recommend that the proposed rail link and the Park and Ride should be reinstated in the Local Plan as parts of the comprehensive development proposals at Top Wighay Farm.
-

5.11 T5 TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001343	003114	Post Office

Summary of Objection

Schemes for town centres should seek to maintain and if possible enhance accessibility for the delivery of goods. Early consultation should take place to secure this

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001621	003840	Netherfield Action 2000

Summary of Objection

Pedestrian priority is supported but there are traffic problems in Netherfield that need attention already. Too much traffic is using the centre as a short cut.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001948	201949	Aldergate Properties Ltd

Summary of Objection

The (Second Deposit) reference in paragraph 5.20 to the consultation process should be moved into the policy to ensure that the results of consultation are not pre-empted. Schemes should only be introduced where there are clear benefits.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

Objector 1343

1. Although not exactly the form of words sought by the Post Office, additional text was added to paragraph 5.20 in the Second Deposit. The objector sought a commitment to maintaining or improving the arrangements for deliveries whilst the new text talks only in terms of giving consideration to the matter. Whether this difference is significant needs to be worked through as schemes are prepared. I am inclined to the view that this objection has been met, or at least reasonably incorporated into the Local Plan.
2. I conclude that no (further) modification to the Local Plan is necessary.

Objector 1621

3. Netherfield Action 2000 support pedestrian priority measures but believe that traffic management needs to be improved in Netherfield in any event. They say that too much of the traffic in the centre is using it as a short cut and has no need to be there.
4. In response the Council says that the Highway Authority is progressing an improvement scheme for Netherfield and that consultations will take place. Traffic management and shopping centre improvements are closely related but the Local Plan is not the right place to resolve the details. Further improvements in the longer term may result from the A612 scheme.
5. I presume that the scheme that was under consideration at the time of the First Deposit was designed and implemented. I do not know if this met this group's aspirations.
6. Be that as it may, I agree with the Council that the Local Plan cannot and should not go into detail on such matters. Also it seems to me that the A612 scheme may lead to a change in traffic movements in this area and it is best to consider these matters either at the design stage of that scheme or after it has been implemented. In my view the Local Plan correctly focuses only on the principles.
7. For these reasons I conclude that the Local Plan should not be modified as a result of this objection.

Objector 1948

8. Aldergate want the text added to paragraph 5.20 (to meet the Post office’s objection to the First Deposit) moved into the policy to give the consultation process more weight. But the Local Plan is not primarily concerned with the consultation process and procedures. In any event the text is part of the Local Plan and carries weight accordingly.
9. I conclude that no (further) modification is needed.
10. The objection also refers to matters that were not changed in the Second Deposit. The Council says that this is not a duly made objection, so it is not a matter for me.

RECOMMENDATION

11. **I recommend no (further) modifications to the Local Plan as a result of these objections.**
-

5.12 T6 PEDESTRIAN IMPROVEMENTS

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001845	004154	Mr T Lock

Summary of Objection

There is a lack of emphasis on public transport provisions in the Local Plan. There is too much emphasis on TRAM. There are no plans for traffic calming or to use the Gedling Relief Road to reduce traffic on Shearing Hill. The Gedling rail line should be used immediately and the old station should be brought into use.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

1. The Local Plan protects the former mineral line to Gedling Colliery from development that would prevent its re-use. But a scheme to achieve this is not in the Local Transport Plan. In these circumstances the Local Plan cannot go any further than it does.
2. As to traffic calming and reduction measures on Shearing Hill it is my understanding of the evidence I heard at the Local Plan Inquiry that these are intended after the Gedling Colliery / Chase Farm Access Road is built. But in the meantime this is the main route through the area and there is no scope for either calming or diversion. I am persuaded by this evidence.
3. I conclude that the Local Plan should not be modified as a result of this objection.

RECOMMENDATION

4. **I recommend no modification to the Local Plan.**
-

5.13 T7 PEDESTRIAN MOVEMENT

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001621	003841	Netherfield Action 2000

Summary of Objection

There are traffic and pedestrian conflicts in Netherfield partly because so many cars use Netherfield as a short cut. The siting of the market on Victoria St, Chandos and Ashwell Street is also objected to because of the conflict with traffic.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

1. In part this objection covers the same ground as this group’s objection to policy T5. In that objection Netherfield Action 2000 supported pedestrian priority measures but said that traffic management needs to be improved in any event. They said that too much of the traffic in the centre is using it as a short cut and has no need to be there.
2. In response the Council said the Highway Authority was progressing an improvement scheme for Netherfield and that consultations were to take place. Traffic management and shopping centre improvements are closely related but the Local Plan is not the right place to resolve the details. Further improvements in the longer term may result from the A612 scheme.
3. I presume that the scheme that was under consideration at the time of the First Deposit was designed and implemented. I do not know if this met this group’s aspirations.
4. Be that as it may, I agree with the Council that the Local Plan cannot and should not go into detail on such matters. Also it seems to me that the A612 scheme may lead to a change in traffic patterns in this area and it is best to consider these matters either at the design stage of that scheme or after it has been implemented. In my view the Local Plan correctly focuses only on the principles.
5. As far as the market is concerned, I consider that the siting of this is also a detailed matter to be resolved in the light of the traffic management scheme for the centre. I consider it is not a matter that I can or should try to resolve in the Local Plan.
6. For these reasons I conclude that the Local Plan should not be modified.

RECOMMENDATION

7. I recommend no modification to the Local Plan as a result of this objection.
-

5.14 T8 CYCLE FACILITIES

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000128	000160	Mr & Mrs R Creates

Summary of Objection

The objectors comment on the frequency of different bus services. A cycle path is needed on the Colwick Loop Road. The Trentside Path and cycle track are supported.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001220	003648	Mrs P Ward

Summary of Objection

Cycling should be encouraged. Cycling facilities are not adequate. Priority should be given to cyclists where paths meet or cross roads. Cyclists should not have to dismount at junctions.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions***Objector 128***

1. The question of bus frequencies on various routes is too detailed a matter to sort out in the Local Plan.
2. As far as a cycle path on the Colwick Loop Road is concerned, the Council says that an alternative (more direct and safer) route is included in the Local Plan. With conditions as they are, I see and accept the merits of this alternative.
3. When conditions are changed after the implementation of the A612 scheme the balance of advantages may also change.
4. In the meantime I conclude that the Local Plan should not be modified.
5. I note the support for the Trentside Path and will take it into account when I consider policy T11.

Objector 1220

6. As far as Mrs Ward is concerned, the importance she attaches to cycling as an environmentally acceptable alternative to the car is exactly in line with government policy and guidance. The Council also supports what she says and refers to their Cycle Strategy. I note her comments on the detailed design of cycling facilities but do not consider that I can get into such detail in the context of the Local Plan.
7. I conclude there is no need to modify the Local Plan.

RECOMMENDATION

8. I recommend no modification to the Local Plan in response to these objections.

5.15 T9 CYCLE ROUTES – GENERAL OBJECTIONS

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000281	000385	Mr W Potter

Summary of Objection

Priority should be given to providing safe cycling conditions on roads rather than to segregated cycle paths. The dual use of footpaths and bridleways is not safe or pleasant. Surfaced cycle paths in rural areas will look unsightly. Attention should be directed to densely populated areas with more potential for cycle use.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001059	002255	Mrs J Kirby
001637	003878	Mr J Kirby

Summary of Objections

It is dangerous to mix cyclists and horses.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001664	003927	W Hardy & Sons

Summary of Objection

There has been insufficient examination of the proposed routes. There has been no consultation with landowners and the examination of the practicality of routes has been inadequate.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
004533	200839	Ramblers' Association, Nottinghamshire Area

Summary of Objection

Objection to conversion of footpaths to dual use. Dual use is neither safe nor pleasant. Recreational cycle routes should use unclassified rural roads or bridleways.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001719	003999	Mr C Peck

Summary of Objection

The footpaths proposed as cycle routes are unsuitable because of stiles and narrow bridges. Upgrading footpaths for cyclists would be inappropriate in rural areas. It is suggested that cycle routes should be along new routes so that obstacles can be removed by proper planning.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

1. Although some of these objectors are primarily concerned with a particular route, all are concerned with the principles involved in the identification and design of the proposed cycle routes in the Local Plan. The detailed criticisms of the routes proposed in the Local Plan all relate to the Three Villages Circuit and I deal with this separately below. I deal first with the matters of general principle and policy here.
2. My understanding is that this policy and the routes identified in connection with it are primarily intended for recreational use. As such they are likely to be appropriately located in rural areas. Also, although some use may be made of (minor) roads, it seems to me to be right for safety reasons to provide facilities that, as far as possible, separate cyclists from motor traffic. So, although more urban routes and more protection for cyclists on busy roads may both be justified, in my view this does not undermine the principle of providing a few recreational routes in rural areas.
3. The main cause of objection relates to the difficulties that may arise if such facilities for cyclists are to be shared with walkers and horse riders. I acknowledge that such difficulties can arise and I understand why walkers and riders feel protective about the facilities they already enjoy. However, in my experience, provided a wide enough facility is made available – with segregation at any busy pinch points – detailed design and goodwill can overcome the difficulties involved. I am not, therefore, inclined to recommend against the inclusion of this policy in the Local Plan or against shared routes as matters of principle. Although new alignments and segregated tracks may be

desirable, I would not regard the use of shared and converted routes (using improved and widened footpaths or bridleways) as being unacceptable in principle.

4. Of the three routes included in the plan only one is specifically identified by objections as contentious (see below) and I have no evidence to indicate that the other two cannot be designed successfully for multiple use and enjoyment. Whilst such facilities may not be appropriate in every landscape and setting, I do not share the view that they are necessarily harmful to the landscape or out of place in the countryside.
5. Bearing in mind the public consultation that has gone into the preparation of this Local Plan and the further consultations that will be necessary at the detailed design stage, I do not accept that all the T9 proposals should be removed from the plan because of inadequate consultation and examination.
6. For all these reasons, I conclude that no modification should be made to policy T9 as a matter of general policy and principle.

RECOMMENDATION

7. I recommend no modification to policy T9 in response to these objections.
-

5.16 T9 CYCLE ROUTES – CALVERTON TO WOODBOROUGH

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001059	002255	Mrs J Kirby
001637	003878	Mr J Kirby
000568	000813	Mr M Mayfield
001638	003879	F V Smith & Sons
000338	000479	Mrs S Godfrey
000319	000535	Mr D Sellors
003863	010603	Mr D Clark
000466	000657	William Jones
000578	000825	Mr R Robson
001639	003880	Mr G Davies

Summary of Objections

The proposed path from Calverton to Woodborough is too steep and does not go near shops or employment sites. Converting these footpaths to cycle paths would cause practical problems for farmers. It would be dangerous to mix cyclists, walkers, farm animals and horses as proposed. Bank Hill Woodborough is dangerous. The route crosses the site of a Monument. There are concerns about abuse by motor vehicles/cycles. Some detailed amendments to the route near Woodborough are suggested.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

1. I have already accepted that the Local Plan should include some rural recreational cycle routes. I have also accepted that, in principle, these can use routes shared with walkers and horse riders. Whether for transportation or leisure reasons, government guidance is strongly in favour of fostering cycling.

2. As noted above, all the detailed objections to this policy relate to the Three Villages Circuit. The Council says the other two routes identified by policy T9 are more advanced in their planning and implementation.
3. The particular part of the contentious route that has attracted objections is in the area around Calverton and Woodborough. It is also acknowledged that the terrain of the route is not ideal for cycling, being especially steep near Calverton and Woodborough.
4. The Council's evidence at the Local Plan Inquiry indicates that the Three Villages proposal is at a preliminary stage and is unlikely to be implemented in the foreseeable future. Moreover, this route (and the section between Calverton and Woodborough in particular) relies heavily on the conversion of existing footpaths. I have walked this route and, in my view, some of the existing paths – especially between Fox Wood and Woodborough – would be difficult to redesign to cater for cyclists in a satisfactory way.
5. The Council argues that all it wishes to do in the Local Plan is establish the line of the route in order to protect it from prejudicial development pending more detailed investigation. Changes to the alignment will be explored later in the implementation process. But in the meantime any adverse consequences for the affected landowners and residents would be fixed and specific. This sounds a bit like "its fixed if you don't like it but we can still change it if we want to", which I consider is rather inconsistent.
6. Nevertheless, during the Inquiry the detailed alignment of the proposed route at Bank Hill / Bank Farm / Bank Hill House was discussed. It emerged that there is agreement between the Council and the two objectors concerned (one of whom is the landowner/farmer) that it would be better if the path were realigned from where it is shown on the Proposal Map to follow the track to the southwest. I also accept that this would be a better route for all those likely to be concerned, including cyclists, for whom it would be both shorter and safer. Although this would satisfy one objector (Mr Mayfield), the landowner would prefer not to have a cycle route on his land at all.
7. In other localities the possibility of exploring alternative alignments to remove specific objections and conflicts did not arise during the Local Plan Inquiry and, in any event, easy alternatives may not exist.
8. Taking all the above matters into account my conclusion is that the merits and timing of this particular proposal and its route are not sufficiently established or advanced to warrant its inclusion in this review of the Local Plan.

RECOMMENDATION

9. **I recommend that the Three Villages Recreational Cycle Route should be deleted from the Local Plan and Proposals Map.**
10. **If this recommendation is not accepted I recommend that the alignment of the route at Bank Hill / Bank Farm / Bank Hill House should be moved to follow the line put forward at the Inquiry by objector 000568 (Mr M Mayfield).**

5.17 T9 CYCLE ROUTES – FUNDING

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000309	000440	House Builders Federation

Summary of Objection

No objection to the principle of the policy but developers should only be asked to contribute where a facility is “directly related to the development proposed” (Circular 1/97).

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

1. The Second Deposit added a sentence to this effect to paragraph 5.25. I therefore consider that this objection has been met and conclude that no (further) modification is required.

RECOMMENDATION

2. I recommend no modification to the Local Plan in response to this objection.
-

5.18 T9 CYCLE ROUTES – NEW ROUTE

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001220	003646	Mrs P Ward
001221	003640	Mr E Ward

Summary of Objection

Cycle commuting would be encouraged if there were a new route linked to a new pedestrian and cycle bridge over the Trent (at Colwick). Routes intended for commuters should be designed for speed, with good surfaces and priority at junctions.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

1. There is no proposal in the Local Transport Plan for a new vehicle-free bridge over the Trent so I cannot recommend one should be included in the Local Plan.
2. As to the comments on the design of cycle paths, I cannot but agree. However, the Local Plan is not the place to resolve matters of detailed design.
3. I conclude that the Local Plan should not be modified.

RECOMMENDATION

4. I recommend no modification to the Local Plan.
-

5.19 T10 HIGHWAY DESIGN AND PARKING GUIDELINES

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000309	000441	House Builders Federation

Summary of Objection

The text should include a statement on a flexible approach to highway design and layout. It should say that a flexible approach would also be adopted when roads are adopted.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001341	003110	McCarthy & Stone (Developments) Ltd

Summary of Objection

The flexibility referred to in Local Plan paragraph 5.27 is not reflected in Appendix 3, which does not say the standards are maxima. Lower standards are appropriate in housing for the elderly. The objector’s research and experience as well as government guidance support this. In housing for the elderly provision should be within a range of 1 space for 2 apartments and 1 space for 4 apartments, depending on location. On occasions provision outside this range will be appropriate. In some case only visitor parking will be needed.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001345	003247	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust

Summary of Objection

The policy needs revision with the intention of reducing dependence on the private car. Parking standards should be interpreted to minimise parking provision in line with promoting sustainability and public transport.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001948	004563	Aldergate Properties Ltd

Summary of Objection

The current County Highways Design Guide and Parking Standards should be seen only as guidelines, leaving room for individual sites to be treated on their merits. It is therefore not acceptable for Appendix 3 to say, “where developers propose a level of parking provision which is significantly different to that recommended in this document specific negotiations with the Borough council will be required”. The County Council’s standards have varied over time but should be regarded as maxima.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

1. Current government guidance on parking standards amounts to a major departure from past practice. In particular current guidance includes the following:
 - developers should not be required to provide more spaces than they themselves wish (PPG13 paragraph 51, PPG3 paragraph 60);
 - policies should set maximum levels of parking for broad classes of development (PPG13 paragraph 52). Residential standards should not be expressed as minimum standards (PPG3 paragraph 60);
 - off-street residential parking provision need not be so high in urban areas where public transport is available. Housing for single and elderly people may provide less parking (PPG3 paragraph 61);
 - car parking standards that result, on average, in residential development with more than 1.5 off-street car parking spaces per dwelling are unlikely to reflect the government’s emphasis on securing sustainable residential environments (PPG3 paragraph 62);
 - other standards may vary from area to area but care should be taken not to prejudice the attractiveness of town centres (PPG13 paragraph 51);
 - parking charges should be used to encourage the use of alternative modes (PPG13 paragraph 57);
 - a balance has to be struck between encouraging investment in town centres and the risk of congestion because of too many cars (PPG13 paragraph 56);
 - special attention needs to be paid to the needs of disabled people who rely on the car (PPG13 paragraph 51).

2. Local Planning Authorities and developers should think imaginatively about designs and layouts (PPG3 paragraph 54). They should avoid inflexible planning standards and reduce road widths, traffic speeds and promote safer environments for pedestrians (PPG3 paragraph 56).
3. I shall be bearing in mind all the government guidance on parking and highway design standards as I consider the objections to this policy.

The HBF

4. At First Deposit the HBF sought an indication that highway design standards would be applied flexibly. At the Second Deposit text was added to paragraph 5.27 saying that a flexible approach would be applied to highway layouts and standards. In my view this largely meets the objection. Highway adoption is not – in my view – a matter for the Local Plan or for me. I conclude that no (further) modification to the Local Plan arises from this objection.

Elderly Person' Housing

5. I take the objector's point that the reference to the parking standards being maxima that should be used flexibly is not very prominently located in Local Plan paragraph 5.27. I also take the point that Appendix 3 does not say (prominently or not) that the standards are maxima. Indeed in places the text of the appendix implies that the opposite is true because, where flexibility is referred to, it is described in terms of reducing the requirement (whereas if the standards were maxima, flexibility would imply that the standard could be increased). I see scope for improvement and more clarity in both these respects.
6. As far as housing for the elderly is concerned, the standard for sheltered housing is for staff spaces plus one space per 2 units. Housing for the active elderly "will be treated as normal residential development for parking purposes", although "a relaxation may be acceptable for developments covered by an appropriate legal agreement in respect of occupancy". As I have already said, if these are maximum standards any such "relaxation" would be upwards! Be that as it may, the standards in the Local Plan are a long way from what objector 1341 is suggesting.
7. The guidance from government is clear that developers should not be required to provide more parking than they consider is necessary. This objector is an experienced developer in their own field and produces evidence that their approach has been accepted elsewhere. I am therefore minded to recommend that the policy is modified to recognise their objection. However, I consider that this would best be achieved by a general re-write of the policy rather than by tinkering with it to include the form of words suggested in the objections.

NWT

8. The general approach of this objector appears to me to be entirely consistent with government guidance and to that extent I find it acceptable. To achieve this the policy will need to be re-written, although the objector has not made any positive or detailed suggestions about this.

Aldergate

9. I note the call for the standards to be used as guidelines only and for there to be scope for individual sites and proposals to be considered on their merits. To an extent this is in line with government guidance, although if standards are to be regarded as maxima (or indeed minima) there has to be a limit on the amount of flexibility allowed for.
10. However, I agree that the current parking standards as incorporated in Appendix 3 are something of a mixed bag. It is not entirely clear in the appendix whether the standards are minima or maxima and the text in the appendix sometimes seems at odds with the flexibility that is claimed in the body of the plan. However, I do not intend to re-write Appendix 3. Rather I prefer to redraft the policy so that it is clearer how the appendix can be used and interpreted.

Conclusions

11. I therefore conclude that policy T10 needs a fundamental redrafting both to bring it more closely into line with government guidance and to meet these objections. My suggested wording is:

In considering proposals for new development, reference will be made to the Highway Authority's highway design and parking guidelines.

However, developers will not be required to provide more parking spaces than they consider necessary unless failure to provide enough off-street parking would harm road safety or prejudice the flow and management of traffic in nearby streets.

The levels of parking provision outlined in Appendix 3 indicate the expected maximum amounts of parking that may be provided in association with broad classes of development, although lower provision may be made, especially in locations with good access to public transport.

In residential developments car parking provision in excess of (on average) 1.5 off-street car parking spaces per dwelling is unlikely to be acceptable. Housing for single and elderly people, in particular, may provide substantially less parking.

Special attention will be paid to providing parking spaces reserved for disabled people in all non-residential development. In residential areas disabled parking spaces will be provided according to the need for them.

12. The text accompanying the policy will need to be revised to reflect this new policy.
13. Although the standards and text in Appendix 3 of the Local Plan also need revision, I am not recommending that progress towards adopting the Local Plan should wait for, or depend on, this. I note that the Council says this is in hand but I have framed my suggested policy in such a way that the Local Plan need not be held up on this account.

RECOMMENDATION

14. I recommend that policy T10 should be replaced by:

In considering proposals for new development, reference will be made to the Highway Authority's highway design and parking guidelines.

However, developers will not be required to provide more parking spaces than they consider necessary unless failure to provide enough off-street parking would harm road safety or prejudice the flow and management of traffic in nearby streets.

The levels of parking provision outlined in Appendix 3 indicate the expected maximum amounts of parking that may be provided in association with broad classes of development, although lower provision may be made, especially in locations with good access to public transport.

In residential developments car parking provision in excess of (on average) 1.5 off-street car parking spaces per dwelling is unlikely to be acceptable. Housing for single and elderly people, in particular, may provide substantially less parking.

Special attention will be paid to providing parking spaces reserved for disabled people in all non-residential development. In residential areas disabled parking spaces will be provided according to the need for them.

15. I recommend that the text accompanying the policy is revised to reflect this new policy.

5.20 T11 TRENTSIDE PATH

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001345	003249	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust

Summary of Objection

The proposed route needs to be considered for its implications for the river as a wildlife corridor. The proposal should be retained but a proviso added concerning wildlife protection.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

1. The Council says that it will work closely with the Environment Agency to implement this proposal in a way that respects local wildlife. It feels that this can be left to the detailed planning stage and to the protection given by policy ENV37.
2. However this is a legitimate concern. Since the Council does not dispute the importance of the issue I conclude that the following should be added to the text accompanying the policy:

In implementing this proposal particular regard will be paid to the local wildlife and the importance of the river as a wildlife corridor.

RECOMMENDATION

3. I recommend that the following is added to the text accompanying policy T11:

In implementing this proposal particular regard will be paid to the local wildlife and the importance of the river as a wildlife corridor.

5.21 T12 PUBLIC RIGHTS OF WAY

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001948	004562	Aldergate Properties Ltd

Summary of Objection

This policy is unnecessary. Planning permission does not cause the extinguishment of a public right of way and a developer will be responsible for moving the footpath or incorporating it into the design.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

1. The Council says this policy is needed to ensure that rights of way are protected wherever possible and to ensure that any planning issues are considered as well as highway issues. Because this policy makes it clear that footpaths are a consideration that may be material when assessing planning proposals I consider it is justified.
2. I conclude that no modification to the Local Plan is needed.

RECOMMENDATION

3. I recommend no modification in response to this objection.

6.1 C1 COMMUNITY SERVICES - GENERAL PRINCIPLES

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001621	003839	Netherfield Action 2000

Summary of Objection

Community services in Netherfield are over-stretched. There is a need for more facilities, especially for education. But new facilities would result in the loss of open space, which is already lacking. There is a possibility of moving a school to the Kappler site. With two schools on one site, open space could be retained and extra community provision could be located on the vacated site.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000068	000089	Mr F Waldram

Summary of Objection

The provision of cemeteries is not included in the Local Plan. Linby churchyard has limited space and Papplewick church has ceased burials because of flooding. Building has to be kept away from River Leen. This is also a Conservation Area. Provision for a burial ground should be made in Linby.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

Netherfield

1. GBC's response to this objection is that it raises matters for the Local Education Authority (NCC) and it appears to me that this is the case. The issue of moving a school from one site to another is a matter for the Education Authority in the first instance and without their support it is not a matter that I could recommend is included in the Local Plan.
2. As to whether community facilities are over-stretched in Netherfield (either absolutely or in comparison with other parts of the borough), I have no evidence. I conclude that no modification should be made to the Local Plan.

Burials in Linby and Papplewick

3. GBC says it is aware of this problem and is working with the agencies involved to ensure future provision is satisfactory. However, cemeteries are an appropriate use in the Green Belt, so there is no need to allocate a site in the Local Plan.
4. I presume that when the Council says there is no need to allocate a site they mean that, because there is plenty of land in the Green Belt that could be used, a decision can be left until a new cemetery is actually needed. In as far as Green Belt land is unlikely to be built on in the meantime, this argument has some force.
5. I also note that the Parish Councils and church authorities in this area do not appear to be objecting to the Local Plan for this reason. In these circumstances I have no evidence on the actual level of need. I consider that one objection from an individual without any evidence of need or representations from the relevant authorities is not a sufficient reason for me to make an allocation in the Local Plan. In any event I have no information on possible sites.
6. I conclude that no modification should be made to the Local Plan.

RECOMMENDATION

7. I recommend no modification to the Local Plan in response to these objections.

6.2 C2 COMMUNITY FACILITIES FOR MAJOR DEVELOPMENT SITES

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001025	004357	Mrs M Hunt
001030	002219	Mr S Hill
001210	004494	Mr F Kelsey

Summary of Objection

Enough school places should be provided in the development at Gedling Colliery / Chase Farm to avoid the need for trips by car to existing schools.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001158	002456	Nottinghamshire County Council (Strategic Property)
001345	003255	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust

Summary of Objection

This policy is opposed pursuant to objections to the Gedling Colliery / Chase Farm development as a whole.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001325	002790	Papplewick Parish Council

Summary of Objection

Development north of Papplewick Lane would put pressure on existing facilities.

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
000717	001525	Nottinghamshire County Council
000717	201431	Nottinghamshire County Council

Summary of Objection

Despite the title of this policy, C2 only refers to Gedling Colliery. Furthermore, the policy only requires that land should be safeguarded for education, health and community facilities. The policy should be broadened to apply to any allocation and should require appropriate developer contributions for the additional facilities needed to serve the development. Developer contributions towards enhanced educational provision will be needed at Gedling Colliery / Chase Farm, Newstead and Bestwood. At Hucknall, if the land north of Papplewick Lane is allocated, arrangements will need to be made jointly with the developer in Ashfield. (During the Local Plan Inquiry NCC (Education Authority) submitted evidence that contributions and/or land for the enhancement of school facilities would also be needed at: Ashwater Drive, Chartwell Grove, Linden Grove, Victoria Park, Teal Close, Stockings Farm and Burton Joyce. In the event, some of these sites are recommended for deletion. But there will be a requirement at Top Wighay Farm and there may also be requirements elsewhere, for example at Dark Lane Calverton, as a result of my positive recommendations.)

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001844	004153	Mr B Yeomans

Summary of Objection

Local Plan paragraph 6.10 says there have been discussions with the Local Education Authority on the need for new schools and the capacities of existing schools. But no details are given in the Housing chapter of the Local Plan as is claimed. The Local Plan should contain more detail on the numbers of school children that will arise from new residential development and where new schools are needed. Much more attention to the details of how development will impact on schools is needed in the Local Plan.

ISSUES RELATING TO THE STATE OF EXISTING SERVICES AND DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS ARISE IN CONNECTION WITH SEVERAL OTHER POLICES AND SITES IN THE LOCAL PLAN (NOTABLY H2 AND H3). WHAT FOLLOWS IS A GENERAL ASSESSMENT OF THE ISSUES, ALSO TAKING INTO ACCOUNT THE RELEVANT OBJECTIONS TO OTHER POLICIES.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

Specific Sites

1. As far as the objections relating specifically to Gedling Colliery / Chase Farm are concerned, for convenience and to avoid unnecessary repetition these objections are dealt with in the part of this report dealing with policy H3 (Land at Former Gedling Colliery and Chase Farm).

2. As to land north of Papplewick Lane, this is no longer allocated in the Local Plan and I am not recommending it is reinstated. I see no need to consider the objection from Papplewick Parish Council any further.
3. As it stands at the moment, Policy C2 appears to relate only to the proposed development at Gedling Colliery / Chase Farm, although the text accompanying the policy adopts a much wider perspective. I find this to be confusing and inadequate.

The General Situation

4. As to the objections from the County Council, I have already remarked on the difficulty I have had in finding general or site specific policies relating to developer contributions in the Local Plan. These difficulties have arisen when I have been considering housing allocations where objectors have raised the issue of the adequacy of existing services. I say this even though paragraph 2.23 (Second Deposit) deals briefly with this matter.
5. GBC take the view that consideration of developer contributions and obligations can be dealt with adequately in Development Briefs to be prepared for each large site. The Borough Council says it is aware of the County Council's education requirements and how they calculate them but feels that no change to the plan is needed to secure adequate contributions from developers.
6. My own view is that GBC may be right but it would be both safer and more open to public scrutiny for these matters to be dealt with explicitly in the Local Plan. This could be achieved in a variety of ways:
 - dealing with the largest and most complex allocations by including policies devoted to them (H3 is an example and land at Top Wighay Farm will need a comparable policy to cover the residential and employment elements of the proposals there). These policies should include an outline of what will be required of developers (as H3 already does to an extent). To aid public and developer understanding I favour as much information as possible being gathered together in one place for each site. In view of the request for a school site at Stockings Farm, I would treat that site as a large site in this context as well as Top Wighay Farm and GCCF;
 - contributions (or the need for new school sites or other land) at smaller allocations could be dealt with in the supporting text accompanying policy H2 and/or could be listed with an indication of the relevant requirements in policy C2. Either way, I consider this should be a more explicit and fuller statement than the current paragraph 2.23;
 - unforeseen sites and eventualities could be dealt with in policy C2 by setting out the general requirements for developer contributions / obligations where these are justified by the circumstances of a site.
7. There is scope for some variation within this general scheme and I do not wish to be dogmatic about how the matter is dealt with. However, I favour both a fuller statement of the requirements at each allocated site and consider there is merit in including a general statement in a policy both to cover unforeseen eventualities at allocated sites and to deal with windfall sites.

8. Development Briefs would not have the force of the Development Plan and may not always be produced in time. At appeals Inspectors also would find it useful (and stronger) if the Local Plan included an explicit statement about contributions (land and/or funds). Moreover including such material in greater detail gives developers the opportunity to object within the statutory planning framework. I consider that the Council is best placed to draft this material.
9. I would expect any material that is to be included in the Local Plan to comply with current government guidance on developer contributions, planning conditions and planning obligations and that the text in the Local Plan should make this clear. In my view the Local Plan should set out the full range of services and facilities that might give rise to developer contributions and such other requirements as might arise in association with individual developments.
10. I note that policy T1 already deals with transport matters, R3 with open space in residential development, H16 with affordable housing and policy ENV1 (c) requires adequate access to be provided for development. I have also already referred to paragraph 2.23 in the Second Deposit. Possible contributions towards works or facilities away from development sites may also be justified in some instances and this possibility should be allowed for. But the aim should be to provide as comprehensive and detailed a statement as possible.
11. I therefore conclude that the Local Plan should be modified by the addition of material to deal explicitly and generally with the issue of developer contributions and other requirements that may be expected of developers. This should be in the form of an expanded policy C2, specific housing policies for the three largest sites and an expansion of the text accompanying policy H2 if this latter is also thought desirable.
12. It would be more in keeping with current guidance if the form of words used was in terms of “seeking” and “negotiating” rather than “securing” and “requiring”, although I am not convinced that this would make a great deal of difference in practice.
13. I have recorded above in the summary of objections all the requirements the Local Education Authority has identified in its objections and evidence. (I note that in every case the LEA objections / evidence seek to secure adequate developer contributions toward local school provision rather than opposing any residential allocation in principle.) However, I consider it is unnecessary for me to make individual comments and recommendations on each site.
14. If GBC follows my recommendations on developer contributions towards education (and other) facilities, the Council will need to review and specify the need for such contributions in the light of the latest information at the modification stage. This procedure will also ensure there is an adequate opportunity for objection.
15. I conclude that policy C2 and other parts of the Local Plan would benefit from considerable modification.

School Places

16. I now turn to the objection from Mr Yeomans, who wants far more detail in the Local Plan about school places and the impact of new development.

17. As should be apparent, I have some empathy with his views. What I have said above should lead to a much clearer picture of how residential development impinges on existing schools and where new facilities would need to be provided. Reading between the lines I am not sure that the lack of information is entirely GBC's fault – if the late arrival of the Education Authority's detailed representations with me is any guide. Be that as it may, I agree that the Local Plan should identify those housing allocations where a contribution towards enhancing school provision is likely to be an issue.
18. However, where I part company with Mr Yeomans is over how much of the detailed background information needs to be included in the Local Plan. In my view whilst the results of the work should be included in the Local Plan, it is unnecessary for all the detailed calculations and assumptions to be there too. It would make for a very long and unwieldy planning document.
19. I therefore conclude that the views I have already reached are a sufficient response to this objection.

RECOMMENDATIONS

20. **I recommend that the Local Plan is modified by the addition of material to deal explicitly and comprehensively with the issue of developer contributions / obligations. This additional material should take the form of:**

- **an expanded policy C2 that states the principles that will govern developer contributions for allocated and windfall sites and all the matters that may give rise to such contributions / obligations;**
- **the revision of policy H3 so that it covers all the developer contributions / obligations that are envisaged at Gedling Colliery / Chase Farm;**
- **the creation of two new housing policies to perform the same function in relation to development at Top Wighay Farm and Stockings Farm;**
- **setting out any anticipated contributions for the smaller housing sites in the revised policy C2 and, if desired, in the text accompanying policy H2;**

I envisage that the new policy C2 and the three housing policies relating to GCCF, Top Wighay Farm and Stockings Farm will also draw together and cross-refer to any contributions / obligations that arise from other policies in the plan (such as policies T1 and R3).

21. **For my recommendations on the above objections relating specifically to Gedling Colliery / Chase Farm see policy H3.**
22. **I recommend no modification to policy C2 as far as land at Papplewick Lane is concerned.**

6.3 C3 NURSERY FACILITIES

Objector Number	Objection Number	Objector Name
001345	003265	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust

Summary of Objection

The objector agrees with the constraints on the location of such proposals and in general supports the provision of nursery and childcare facilities if suitably located. However, this should not be at the expense of a more sustainable use of the site, especially for housing or employment. Add clause (d) to the policy: that there are no alternative options for development which would better serve sustainable development.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

1. The Council acknowledges that balancing the competing demands for land is a planning matter. It has looked at potential housing sites in its Urban Capacity Study and feels that there are already sufficient policy constraints in the Local Plan to protect sites from inappropriate development if need be.
2. My concern about the objector's proposed addition to this policy is that it could, in effect, always make the provision of nursery and childcare facilities a third choice for any particular site. By this I mean that, if a site were suitable for housing or employment, then childcare facilities could be ruled out by the proposed new clause in the policy. This is because it says "there are no other alternative options for development which would better serve sustainable development".
3. It seems to me that, although childcare facilities have proliferated in recent years, each new facility (and indeed all such facilities cumulatively) makes only a small demand on the total stock of land and buildings.
4. In very general terms, what would amount to a sustainable location for a nursery would also be a sustainable location for housing or employment uses. Given the number of comings and goings that may arise at childcare facilities and the need for these to be conveniently located in relation to where people live and/or work, sustainable locations for these facilities are very important.
5. For these reasons I take the view that the addition to the policy that the objector seeks is unnecessary and may even be undesirable. I therefore conclude that no modification to the Local Plan is justified.

RECOMMENDATION

6. I recommend no modification to the Local Plan in response to this objection.
-