

**RPS**



---

**Representations on the Gedling Local Planning Document Part 2  
Local Plan – Publication Version October 2016**

---

**Hearing Position Statement - Examination In Public 2017**

---

**On behalf of Persimmon Homes & Charles Church**

---

**Jonathan Smith MRTPI – RPS Planning & Development**

---

# Representations on the Gedling Local Planning Document Part 2 Local Plan – Publication Version October 2016

On behalf of Persimmon Homes & Charles Church – 16<sup>th</sup> January 2017

## Introduction

This representation has been submitted to influence the submitted Gedling Local Plan – (GLP) proposed by Gedling Borough Council (GBC), published for public consultation in the period 23<sup>rd</sup> May 2016 to 4<sup>th</sup> July 2016 and submitted for Publication on 14<sup>th</sup> October 2016. Our comments relate to our land interests at Calverton, known as the Park Road (H16) site. The site is well known to GBC and has been the subject of a previous Masterplanning exercise as part of the emerging Neighbourhood Plan for the village.

These representations refer to specific proposed policies and/or supporting text contained within the document. Where appropriate the referencing will follow that in the GLP and should be read in conjunction with previous representations made to earlier iterations of the Plan.

## Specific Representations

### Matter 4 – Green Belt: Issue 4c, Safeguarded Land

**Question 8** asks whether the allocation of Safeguarded Land at Calverton is appropriate [**Policy LPD16**].

Whilst removal of site H16 from the Green Belt and its specific allocation for housing is welcomed, it is considered that the proposed Safeguarded Land area at Oxtan Road/Flatts Lane [Policy LPD 16] is inappropriate in respect of its reasoning.

The need for the Local Plan to clearly differentiate between the proposed allocation (which will provide development during the Plan period) and the proposed safeguarded land (which has the potential to provide developable land post plan period/ following a Local Plan Review) is appreciated. However, we are concerned that the designation of safeguarded land on landscape grounds is firstly premised on poor landscape evidence and secondly could inadvertently prejudice

future plans for development.

The NPPF is clear in that where necessary, safeguarded land should be identified in Local Plans “...in order to meet longer-term development needs stretching well beyond the plan period”. If the Local Plan states the land is being safeguarded/ excluded from the proposed allocation on landscape grounds, it could be argued by third parties that it is not developable in the longer-term (as a result of this constraint) and, as such, it should not be removed from the green belt and safeguarded. We are mindful that if the landscape designation/justification were to become enshrined in the Local Plan, which by nature is a sensitive issue, it may prove very prejudicial towards potential future phases of development or even the provision of a satisfactory access for the allocation site.

Our expert Landscape and Visual Impact assessors (FPCR) consider there would be no increased harm to the character of the local landscape area resulting in expanding the allocation site up to Oxton Rd. This is partly due to the existing detracting urban influences that the Oxton Road corridor and industrial setting create. FPCR considers that Oxton Road creates the logical northern extent, with the site providing ‘infill’ development to the existing settlement pattern. This is also supported in visual terms, with no visual benefit from retaining the land to the north of the H16 site as open, as it wouldn’t provide a visual break from either elevated position in the north or the south. Intervening landscape features already create this break. Roof tops of the proposed development would be viewed within the context of the existing settlement from both directions and therefore wouldn’t create a mass of new housing which is out of proportion to the existing scale of the village. Also, users of Oxton Road would have no increased views towards the site beyond the retained mature hedgerow which currently provides a well vegetated corridor.

We consider it would be preferable for the Local Plan to state that the proposed allocation/ area of land to be safeguarded is based on the GBC’s anticipated housing requirement during the Plan period as opposed to reasons of landscape sensitivity. For example: *“The Local Plan evidence base indicates the proposed allocation will provide sufficient housing land in this location during the Plan period. However, an additional parcel of land adjacent to the proposed allocation has been safeguarded to provide a potential future development option/ logical expansion to the site,*

*subject to Local Plan Review/ future housing requirements.”*

**It is requested that a modification to the Plan is made in line with the comments above.**

Such a minor change provides for greater flexibility that could bring forward sites outside of the allocation boundary without affecting the overall environmental impact of the site setting. Additionally, the potential residential yield of adjacent sites coming forward could negate the need for other, less appropriate site allocations within Calverton. It is entirely possible that an expanded development at Park Road would be a more logical and comprehensive position that would provide wider benefits to existing residents as well as future residents.

Further representation will be made in respect of Matter 8 – Housing Allocations In Key Settlements For Growth, Issue 8f: Park Road (H16) [Policy LPD66] which interrelate with this Matter and in support of initial representations made on the site allocation and other allocations within Calverton (***GBC ref. lpd\_pub\_b/8***).