

***Allocations and Development Management DPD - Additional  
Sites Consultation Paper Comments***

***May 2012***

***Public Open Space off Lincoln Road/Cedar Avenue***

## ***Public Open Space off Lincoln Road/Cedar Avenue***

---

**Comment Reference:** ADM/AS/12

**Post Town:**

**Company/Organisation:** English Heritage

**Agent Post Town:**

**Agent Company/Organisation:**

**Additional Site Number:** Site 1

No comments

---

**Comment Reference:** ADM/AS/16

**Post Town:** Newark

**Company/Organisation:**

**Agent Post Town:**

**Agent Company/Organisation:**

**Additional Site Number:** Site 1

strongly support the continuation of these playing fields as public open space and one which should be improved and invested in. I do not consider the site as a reasonable alternative, as it is incompatible with the preferred strategy for the Bridge ward.

The council identifies the need for more open and recreational space in the Bridge ward and its recent policy has been not to release any playing field land, due to the current shortfall. This shortfall would be compounded by Council's preferred options for the Yorke Drive area, which entails development on the majority of the Yorke Drive playing fields.

To compensate for the loss of this space the Council and the master planning exercise has previously floated the idea of developing land to rear of Wolsey Road as new playing fields/recreation. It is unclear whether this is still an option and in any case the land is private paddocks and I consider this an unviable option due to costs and ownership issues. Therefore the additional site 1 in question is a vital space and is the only available and viable site which could be improved and invested in so to compensate for the loss of space at Yorke Drive.

## ***Public Open Space off Lincoln Road/Cedar Avenue***

---

The issue of ownership is irrelevant in this case and the principle of losing further playing field land is the only issue that should be considered.

I do not agree that the site should be allocated for retail and consider it not to be a reasonable alternative.

The owners/developers claim that their plans for housing on this site are now unviable and I do not agree with this position. Firstly the owners/developers have made no effort to amend the residential plans to make the scheme viable. This would presumably involve the removal or redesign of the principle riverside apartments (the market for which has been worst hit) for a more modest family housing design. Secondly they have made no attempt to market the site to others, who could deliver a successful housing scheme. The Council should allocate this site for residential which would make a sizeable contribution to the town's housing needs in a sustainable and accessible location.

The allocation for retail would result in several negative outcomes. Firstly it would impact severely on the setting of the listed brewery buildings and the new community establishing themselves inside. The brewery would in effect become an island surrounded by busy retail parks, which pay scant regard to its status.

Secondly, the additional traffic generated would further impact on these residents and on the wider road network. The authorities acknowledge that significant improvements would be required to handle the extra traffic, yet the physical environment on North Gate prevents this and is already under strain from surrounding retailers. Another negative impact would be on the riverside walk, which was developed as a key regenerative link. This path needs the passive security, which would be provided by a residential scheme overlooking the riverside at all hours. A retail park here does not achieve this and once the stores are closed in the evening, a dead and vulnerable space is left for much of the Eastern side of the riverside walk.

Most importantly, further retail on the scale envisaged in this location would negatively impact on the fragile health of the town centre, diverting away trade and investment. I consider this to be an out of centre development, which is not preferable. The type of retail envisaged by the developers would be unrestricted general retail, which could lead to several town centre retailers moving out. Retailers such as Marks and Spencer, Burton and Dorothy Perkins (Arcadia group retailers) and Argos act as important anchor stores for the town centre and they could conceivably move out, leaving large voids behind. Furthermore the Potterdyke scheme, an important town centre regeneration, would be severely affected and could be left unviable if further retail was allocated at North Gate.

I agree that the site is not suitable at the current time, due to the lack of capacity at the twin roundabouts at the A1/A46/A17. It should also be noted that the options for commercial development at Newark Showground would also be problematic. However the site may be suitable in the future once major highway changes have been made. It could in its own right help to provide new highway infrastructure. For example a new bridge could be constructed across the A1

## ***Public Open Space off Lincoln Road/Cedar Avenue***

---

linking Brunel Drive with the enlarged New Link business park, or even a new junction on the A1. This would provide new access for Brunel Drive and new pedestrian and cycle links at the minimum. The size of the development would require such a scale of investment and lesser improvements would severely impact on the A1/A46/A17 junctions, which in turn would lead to wider congestion on the Newark bypass. So much of the town's traffic flow depends on these junctions functioning and when they don't the evidence is seen throughout the town.

In terms of the type of employment the land would provide, the Council should be resisting further B8 distribution and focus on attracting higher skilled work in manufacturing and emerging sectors. The danger is that as a town, Newark becomes perceived as a low cost distribution base (with a town centre appendage) as opposed to a dynamic centre for innovation, ideas and production.

I don't wish to take a position on this site, other to say that the scale of the so called enabling development would seem, on the face of it, to be the primary portion of the overall proposal and as such the scheme should be fully assessed against the housing needs of Southwell.

---

**Comment Reference:** ADM/AS/17

**Post Town:**

**Company/Organisation:** Natural England

**Agent Post Town:**

**Agent Company/Organisation:**

**Additional Site Number:** Site 1

NE is unable to comment on each individual preferred land allocation, however, we support the approach which has assessed each site in terms of its potential impact on the natural environment and has rejected sites where the residual impacts of development on the natural environment are considered significant. We note that Additional Site 1 is currently public open space.

---

**Comment Reference:** ADM/AS/19

**Post Town:**

**Company/Organisation:** British Waterways

**Agent Post Town:**

**Agent Company/Organisation:**

## ***Public Open Space off Lincoln Road/Cedar Avenue***

---

**Additional Site Number:** Site 1

No comments

---

**Comment Reference:** ADM/AS/21

**Post Town:** **Company/Organisation:** Sport England

**Agent Post Town:** **Agent Company/Organisation:**

**Additional Site Number:** Site 1

Sport England would wish to emphasise the concern expressed in the consultation that the loss of open space should be judged with regard to the wider open space issues in the area. Has the evidence base Green Space Strategy or playing pitch strategy identified any shortfalls in the area which could be accommodated on this site.

---

**Comment Reference:** ADM/AS/25

**Post Town:** **Company/Organisation:** Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust

**Agent Post Town:** **Agent Company/Organisation:**

**Additional Site Number:** Site 1

Additional Site 1 – Public Open Space off Lincoln Road/Cedar Avenue

Green areas and open space are important to communities because they are reasonably close to the community it serves. The NPPF advises that development within Local Green Space (LGS) 'should be consistent with policy for Green Belts' (paragraph 78) – the policy for which is outlined in paragraphs 79 -92.

It is important to ensure however, that additional Green Infrastructure is created with the advent of new development within the Newark & Sherwood District.

## ***Public Open Space off Lincoln Road/Cedar Avenue***

---

New GI can provide real biodiversity benefits if designed with wildlife in mind. The aim should be for creating quality open spaces that provide real biodiversity benefits, sports and playing fields. Natural England recommends that local communities should have access to an appropriate mix of green spaces with at least 2 ha of accessible natural green space per 1000 population with the following accessibility criteria: No person should live more than 300 metres from their nearest area of natural green space; At least one hectare of Local Nature Reserve should be provided per 1000 population; There should be at least one accessible 20 ha site with 2 km; There should be one accessible 500 ha site within 10 km. Increasing the number of Green Flag sites in the District is another way of ensuring that high quality sites are provided.

---

**Comment Reference:** ADM/AS/33

**Post Town:**

**Company/Organisation:** Highways Agency

**Agent Post Town:**

**Agent Company/Organisation:**

**Additional Site Number:** Site 1

No comments

---

**Comment Reference:** ADM/AS/34

**Post Town:**

**Company/Organisation:** The Coal Authority

**Agent Post Town:**

**Agent Company/Organisation:**

**Additional Site Number:** Site 1

No comments

---

## ***Public Open Space off Lincoln Road/Cedar Avenue***

---

**Comment Reference:** ADM/AS/37

**Post Town:**

**Company/Organisation:**

**Agent Post Town:**

**Agent Company/Organisation:**

**Additional Site Number:** Site 1

2.1.0 Additional Site 1 - Public Open Space off Lincoln Road / Cedar Avenue

Question 1 – Do you agree with the Council’s assessment on Alternative Site 1?

NO - I believe the site should be retained as a public open space if at all possible. The electricity sub-station at the south west corner of the site should be fenced / walled off and trees planted around it as much as possible, also, I would suggest anti-climb paint on the walls around it.

---

**Comment Reference:** ADM/AS/4

**Post Town:** Manby

**Company/Organisation:** Trent Valley Internal Drainage Board

**Agent Post Town:**

**Agent Company/Organisation:**

**Additional Site Number:** Site 1

The site is located outside of the board’s district and does not impact on any of the board maintained systems.

---



*Land off North Gate*

## ***Land off North Gate***

---

**Comment Reference:** ADM/AS/12

**Post Town:** **Company/Organisation:** English Heritage

**Agent Post Town:** **Agent Company/Organisation:**

**Additional Site Number:** Site 2

We note the landowners desire to promote this site for retail use, rather than residential, notwithstanding the fact the site has planning permission for 180 dwellings. The site is located with Newark Conservation Area and adjoins two Grade II listed buildings to the north-east. The principle of redeveloping this site may have been established by the residential planning permission, but the different impact of retail rather than residential use will need to be carefully assessed in terms of the above heritage assets.

---

**Comment Reference:** ADM/AS/19

**Post Town:** **Company/Organisation:** British Waterways

**Agent Post Town:** **Agent Company/Organisation:**

**Additional Site Number:** Site 2

No comments

---

**Comment Reference:** ADM/AS/25

**Post Town:** **Company/Organisation:** Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust

**Agent Post Town:** **Agent Company/Organisation:**

## **Land off North Gate**

---

**Additional Site Number:** Site 2

Additional Site 2 - Land off North Gate

While there is no specific reference to 'brownfield first', local authorities are encouraged as a core principle of planning to reuse land that has been previously developed (NPPF paragraph 17) and are guided to consider 'setting a locally appropriate target for the use of brownfield land.' (NPPF Paragraph 111). Brownfield habitats however, (particularly early successional sites), can be important biodiversity resources. There is increasing development pressure on brownfield sites and therefore to ensure sustainability every effort should be made to retain and/or recreate this habitat within a site. We therefore feel there needs to be a criteria based policy to assess the suitability of previously developed land as appropriate and sustainable. Assess the biodiversity of the site through a desktop study of wildlife sites (Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation/Local Wildlife Sites) and protected species, followed by an ecological assessment of the site.

Open Mosaic Habitats on Previously Developed Land (formally called post industrial sites) are a UK Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) Priority Habitat. Policy 29 of the East Midlands Regional Plan (2009) considers 'Priorities for Enhancing the Region's Biodiversity' and states that Local Authorities should ensure no net loss of BAP habitats and help achieve UK BAP targets. The present target for the management and restoration of urban and post-industrial sites is 3000 ha by 2015. Therefore, there is conflict with this policy if all applications for previously developed land are considered favourably. We support for proposals for re-use of previously developed land outside development boundaries where it will result in the restoration or natural regeneration of the site e.g. sustainable wetlands. However, we feel there should be a presumption against development of brown field land for other types of development, where it has already developed significant nature conservation interest. Often previously developed land that has been left for some years will have developed significant biodiversity value.

---

**Comment Reference:** ADM/AS/30

**Post Town:**

**Company/Organisation:** NSK Europe Ltd

**Agent Post Town:** Nottingham

**Agent Company/Organisation:** Capita Symonds

**Additional Site Number:** Site 2

he key determinate in considering site 2 as an alternative site is the degree to which its allocation would assist in meeting the vision and objectives of the adopted Core Strategy, when compared to the preferred option for delivering Newark's future retail provision.

In particular the adopted vision seeks to enable 'a successful, diverse economy by providing employment opportunities to a local workforce, equipped with a wide range of skills arising from improved education, learning and training and encouraging tourism potential.'

## ***Land off North Gate***

---

It states that 'Newark's role as the Sub-Regional Centre will be strengthened through housing and employment growth in sustainable urban extensions, the regeneration of existing neighbourhoods, new economic and infrastructure investment, and the shortage of affordable housing will have been addressed.'

Strategic Objective 5 is 'To develop a strong, sustainable economy that will provide a diverse range of employment opportunities for local people by:

providing a range of well located sites and premises for employment development, including provision for small and medium sized firms;

- supporting the retention of existing jobs and the development of local businesses;
- promoting additional growth and diversification of the District's economy, linked to a desire to raise local aspirations and an ambition to secure new service-sector and higher skill level jobs and "knowledge-rich" business, that will increase the scope for good jobs and incomes available;
- actively attracting regional, national and international companies to the District;
- developing an improved education base with enhanced learning and training opportunities for local people, that will enable the attainment of higher educational standards/qualifications and skill levels; and

The North Gate site an out of centre location by definition. While the current application describes the site as operating as an edge of centre site, there is no such distinction in planning policy and one out-of-centre site cannot be more sequentially preferable than another. In actual fact, the site is 175m beyond what could be considered as an edge of centre location. As such the site has no locational advantage over other out of centre locations being considered.

We are aware from the current planning application for the site that the owner is proposing 2,215 sq m of unrestricted A1 retail floorspace as part of a speculative scheme. The application states that there are 'no committed occupiers'. The Newark and Sherwood Retail and Town centres Study 2010 states that 'for convenience goods, based on current market shares and taking into account commitments, we forecast that there is no capacity for additional convenience floorspace in Newark and Sherwood in the period 2009-2014, although this does rise to 1,336 sq m net by 2019 and 2,485 sq m net by 2024 and 2,686 sq m net by 2026.'...'Our quantitative assessment has identified capacity for further convenience goods floorspace within the District, and with the identification of the Carter Gate area and other smaller infill sites, there may be opportunities for small scale convenience goods floorspace within Newark town centre, perhaps an express format or stores selling local and organic products. Surplus capacity should also be directed towards existing smaller centres and areas of population growth, which we discuss in more detail later in this section.'

As such, and given the level of existing retail commitments within the town centre, there can be no justification for additional convenience shopping of the scale being suggested in the current planning application. The Council's commissioned assessment of the retail impact of the proposal is that unrestricted retail floorspace of the scale proposed for the site 'is likely to represent a significant diversion of trade from town centre shops that would justify refusing planning permission.'

There is some suggestion that due to the abnormal costs associated with flood risk alleviation and mitigation, the site would not be viable without unrestricted

## ***Land off North Gate***

---

retail use on a significant part of the site. Clearly this viability issue would rule the site out if the Council wishes to prevent the identified negative impacts on the town centre from unrestricted retail use i.e. it is unlikely that the site could be delivered as a bulky goods retail site alone. It is quite evident from the owner's planning submission, that were the site to be allocated for bulky good retailing, they would seek to achieve unrestricted A1 retail on a significant part of the site, with potential significant detriment to the vitality and viability of the town centre. As such there is a significant risk to the town centre in identifying the site as an allocation.

Further, notwithstanding the extensive (and evidently expensive) flood risk mitigation measures required in order to make the North Gate site developable, planning guidance requires a sequential approach to the identification of development sites. As such, sites that are not within a flood zone, must be preferred in sequential terms as part of any allocations strategy.

The North Gate site lies directly adjoining a Conservation Area, which is sensitive to redevelopment on its periphery. Bulky goods retail development necessitate a large scale format, linear form and circulation and parking provision that does not readily site well in a historic context. The potential for harm to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area is palpable.

The extant residential consent for the North Gate site is an appropriate and contextually sensitive development proposal. It will serve to contribute good quality housing in an area of recognised housing need. It has been accounted for in the overall balance of supply in preparing both the Core Strategy and the Site Allocations draft and its loss as a housing site will undermine future delivery of the District's housing growth requirement. It is of little surprise that the site is not currently viable in view of both the flood risk mitigation and the current housing market. However, the Core Strategy and the Site Allocations document are long term strategic documents which aim to benefit the District. They should not be set aside for short term gain. Over the longer term, the housing market will inevitably pick up enabling delivery of the housing allocation within the plan period.

The North Gate site is identified as an alternative to the provision of bulky goods retail as part of mixed use site NUA/MU/1 and it is important to understand the regeneration context of the Northern Road site in considering its future as a genuine mixed use opportunity. The additional sites consultation paper factually identifies that the Northern Road site is a key regeneration scheme for the town. NSK are fully committed to Newark in the long-term. Their firm aspiration, when practically possible and financially viable, is to secure a suitable (green/brown-field) site elsewhere Newark and construct a purpose-built state of the art operation, funded through the release of the Northern Road works for mixed use re-development. In fact, this relocation will not constitute a rationalisation of the business operation, although a purpose built site would allow a more efficient use of built space and greater opportunity for improved circulation and landscaping. Potentially, a re-location could see early development within one of the SUE employment areas, ensuring built in sustainability to the town's key growth locations. The search for a suitable site, which remains fully accessible by sustainable modes of transport to existing employees, is ongoing. The resulting development will reaffirm a long term commitment to the town by its biggest employer, with the realistic potential for growth and significant future employment opportunity in addition to those created at the Northern Road site. The genuinely mixed use development that can be viably achieved at the Northern Road site will deliver not only retail employment opportunities, but office and manufacturing job opportunities.

A key element of the Core Strategy is to deliver regeneration. Quite simply, the allocation of the Northern Road site has real potential to generate significant

## ***Land off North Gate***

---

regeneration, the positive impacts of which are long term and widespread. It will deliver the potential for one of the town's biggest and oldest employers to secure its future, to expand in the town and to deliver significant multi-skilled job opportunities. It has the potential to regenerate a large area of mostly poor quality, unsightly and outdated industrial buildings, while preserving the best industrial heritage as part of a comprehensive redevelopment. It has the potential to deliver new jobs in retail, business and manufacturing in one of the most deprived wards of the town. It has the potential to deliver, high quality, sustainably located residential opportunities within a walkable neighbourhood. And, it has the potential to do all of this in a key gateway location, next to the town's mainline railway station and adjoining the town's main employment location. The site at North Gate cannot deliver the same level of direct regeneration benefits over the long term. As a central tenet of the Core Strategy, the need to maximise the regeneration benefits of site allocation, weigh heavily in favour of the Northern Road site and against the North Gate site.

with reference back to Strategic Objective 5, site NUA/MU/1 has the clear potential to assist directly in the delivery of the objective through regeneration and reinvestment. No other site considered has similar potential. If the Core Strategy and subsequent Site Allocations document are to be tools for the positive delivery of benefit to the community of Newark and Sherwood, they must seek to maximise the potential benefits of development and be realistically aspirational. To do anything else is to sell the community short.

The locational advantage of the Northern Road site is that it already contains both employment and bulky goods retail, albeit in a unmodernised and unplanned form. The proposed mixed use development will result in a unique opportunity for providing sustainable pedestrian and cycle links, from the developed area, directly into the heart of the town, neighbouring employment land and to Northgate Station. Northgate Station is situated within easy walking distance of the edge of the Northern Road site, with 46 services a day operating between London, the East Midlands, Yorkshire, the North East of England and Scotland. The station is used by over one million rail passengers per year. Direct trains to London take less than 1.5 hours, and direct trains to Newcastle take less than 2 hours. Running parallel with the railway line but on the opposite side is a dedicated cycle path which runs directly into the station. Bus services 1, 1A, S7L and 87 run very frequently from directly outside the site into Newark Town Centre and Lincoln, with further connecting routes. As such the site is highly accessible by a range of modes of transport. The potential to provide a pedestrian foot bridge across the railway will further improve access to the town centre.

In respect of delivery, it is recognised that the comparison goods capacity increase to 4,911 sq m net by 2019, 15,040 sq m net by 2024 and 18,459 sq m net by 2026 is skewed towards the latter half of the plan period. As such, while, the relocation of the NSK site will take some time, the company is actively reviewing options and the Council can be confident that there is no risk to the delivery of the bulky goods retail element of the scheme within a reasonable timeframe and well within the plan period.

---

**Comment Reference:** ADM/AS/31

**Post Town:** Newark

**Company/Organisation:** Woodland Estates

**Agent Post Town:** Lincoln

**Agent Company/Organisation:** Globe Consultants Limited

## Land off North Gate

---

**Additional Site Number:** Site 2

The planning permission that exists for this site - which is now regarded as less than viable - was well considered in terms of its urban design and the wider regeneration and planning benefits it would have delivered. It acknowledged the sensitive location of the site adjacent to important heritage assets and the waterfront where there remain objectives for waterside environmental enhancements as part of the strategic river corridor. Furthermore it acknowledged that sites shouldn't seek to work in isolation but should form an integrated part of the overall townscape which must relate and connect accordingly.

The Council must decide whether the principle of retailing on this particular site, as a single rather than mixed use scheme, is acceptable in the context of established retail development policy and its objectives set out in support of the proposed development management policy DM10 "Retailing and Town Centre Uses". We are confident that the Council is best placed to determine that basic policy position and have no representations to make as a matter of principle. However, the strong caveat to that is the form of development that a simple retail allocation may seek to deliver. We can see from the planning application that is currently pending just how fundamentally flawed the proposals are in townscape terms when contrasted to what is approved. There is no consideration given to any of the basic urban design principles referred to above and it is very clear that such a form will fundamentally and adversely impact on the scope for a high quality development on the neighbouring site to the south which becomes equally disintegrated and compromised by the proposed clumsy service yard. It is accepted that such detailed assessment is for the development management process rather than here. Accordingly, comments have been submitted into that process but it is necessary to appreciate the basic matters here in relation to the proposed allocation of this sensitive site.

---

**Comment Reference:** ADM/AS/33

**Post Town:**

**Company/Organisation:** Highways Agency

**Agent Post Town:**

**Agent Company/Organisation:**

**Additional Site Number:** Site 2

No comments

---

**Comment Reference:** ADM/AS/34

**Post Town:**

**Company/Organisation:** The Coal Authority

## ***Land off North Gate***

---

**Agent Post Town:**

**Agent Company/Organisation:**

**Additional Site Number:** Site 2

No comments

---

**Comment Reference:** ADM/AS/37

**Post Town:**

**Company/Organisation:**

**Agent Post Town:**

**Agent Company/Organisation:**

**Additional Site Number:** Site 2

2.2.0 Additional Site 2 - Land off North Gate

Question 2 – Do you agree with the Council’s assessment on Alternative Site 2?

YES - I agree with the Council's suggestion that retail development would not be the preferred choice for this site.

Flood defences will need to be improved in this area to reduce the risk of flooding. As always, I would suggest that any development here should be in keeping with the character of the town as it adjoins the historic areas of Newark and I would suggest extending the Conservation Area to include the area between Northgate and the river to protect it from inappropriate development. Once again, I would suggest fencing / walling around the electric substation and measures such as anti-climb paint, tree planting etc.

Although not part of this site, I would suggest the scrapyards located on the riverside should be relocated out of town as this is a poor use of a prominent site and it is an eyesore and cause of noise pollution. Relocation of the aforementioned scrapyards would improve this area no end and this should be considered in the future.

---

**Comment Reference:** ADM/AS/38

**Post Town:**

**Company/Organisation:**



## ***Land off North Gate***

---

**Agent Post Town:**

**Agent Company/Organisation:**

**Additional Site Number:** Site 2

I agree with the Council's assessment of Additional Site 2 and would OBJECT to its allocation for retail. It has always been unfortunate that the Northgate Retail Park was granted permission, pulling trade out of the town centre. Exacerbating this by a greater concentration of comparison goods retail provision on Northgate would only serve to further undermine the town centre.

It is clear that the site's developers overpaid for the site at the height of the market and are now trying to recover their losses. This, however, is not a concern of the planning process and housing development here should remain the key focus.

---

**Comment Reference:** ADM/AS/4

**Post Town:** Manby

**Company/Organisation:** Trent Valley Internal Drainage Board

**Agent Post Town:**

**Agent Company/Organisation:**

**Additional Site Number:** Site 2

The site is located outside of the boards district and does not impact on any of the board maintained systems.

---

**Comment Reference:** ADM/AS/41

**Post Town:** London

**Company/Organisation:** Newark Property Developments Ltd

**Agent Post Town:** Leicester

**Agent Company/Organisation:** Roger Tym & Partners

**Additional Site Number:** Site 2

## ***Land off North Gate***

---

### 2 SUMMARY OF ORIGINAL RESPONSE

2.6 We note and support the requirement identified in the allocations document for additional retail floorspace in Newark

2.7 With regard to the market evidence, it is clear that the demand for new housing is low, given restrictions in the availability of mortgage finance, which is likely to continue for the foreseeable future. The low levels of demand have had a major impact on house prices in the locality, particularly at the adjoining development of the Brewery. This evidence of low values for residential development, slow rates of sales and high costs of development finance all contribute to the conclusion of our viability assessment that the North Gate site is not viable for residential use. All market indicators suggest that it will also not become viable for residential development for the foreseeable future. As such, it cannot be considered 'deliverable' as required by the NPPF.

2.8 The characteristics of the North Gate site are particularly well suited to retail development, given the high levels of profile and accessibility it would be able to offer to retailers. Comparable evidence from recent development in the same location demonstrates that such development would be viable and deliverable and would be able to attract high quality retailers.

2.9 Conversely, the NSK site that is proposed to be allocated for mixed use development including bulky goods retailing, is unlikely to be attractive to retailers or retail developers. It has no profile or visibility to passing trade as a result of its location on an access road into an industrial estate and is not easily accessible. Any development would also have to contend with some additional/abnormal development costs and it is unclear whether this quality of location could attract the values required to ensure sufficient viability to cover these additional costs.

2.10 Taking all the above considerations into account, we propose that the North Gate site is allocated for retail development, as an alternative to the NSK site, instead of its currently undeliverable allocation for residential use.

2.11 We demonstrated that the North Gate site is clearly sequentially preferable to the NSK site and we provide further evidence on this in the following section.

2.12 The impact of additional retail floorspace on the existing centres will be far less if North Gate is developed for retail than if the NSK site is developed for retail. There is far more potential for linked trips from the North Gate site both to the town centre and to other retail uses in the area than from the NSK site. The NSK site will operate as a standalone facility and therefore will not benefit the established town centre of Newark.

## ***Land off North Gate***

---

2.13 The site on North Gate is a prominent site on the main route into the centre of Newark. Considerable investment has been given to the former brewery site to ensure a development of the highest standard. If the North Gate site is not allocated for retail no development is likely to come forward.

2.14 There is an identified requirement for retail development and the value of retail development will ensure that the site can be developed to a high design standard with a strong frontage onto North Gate that compliments the Brewery site and ensures that this forms an attractive gateway into the centre.

### **3 COMPARISON OF THE NSK SITE AND NORTH GATE**

3.15 The additional sites consultation document at paragraph 2.2.1 acknowledges that the site is suitable for retail development but states that 'highways improvements would need to be made and.... flooding is also an issue.

3.16 The document goes on to state that the NSK site is a key regeneration site for the town and in order to achieve this aim a mixed use development is preferable. Therefore the North Gate site is not presently the Council's preferred choice.

3.17 Appendix 2 of the additional sites consultation provides an assessment of sites under Spatial Policy 9 of the Core Strategy. The assessment is that the site meets criteria 1-8 but does not meet criteria 9. Criteria 9 states 'Not be located in areas of flood risk or contribute to flood risk on neighbouring sites'. However the commentary box of the assessment states that the site is suitable for retail use subject to highways improvements and flood risk.

3.18 It is therefore clear from the Additional Site Consultation document that the main issues regarding the use of this site for retail are;

Flood Risk

Highways

Regeneration Benefits

We therefore address these three points below.

Flood Risk

3.19 A flood mitigation strategy was approved for the extant residential scheme. At the time of approval there were no outstanding issues in relation to flood risk.

3.20 A revised flood compensation scheme for the retail application was submitted to and approved by the Environment Agency in July 2011, prior to the application being submitted.

## ***Land off North Gate***

---

3.21 Reference was made to flood risk in the submitted Design and Access Statement and has not been raised as an issue during the application process.

3.22 We therefore conclude that although the site does sit within a flood risk area this can be successfully mitigated and there are no outstanding objections from the Environment Agency regarding this. We therefore do not see this as a negative factor when compared to the NSK site.

### Highways

3.23 A Transport Assessment was submitted with the application, this has been agreed by the County Highways Authority and there are no outstanding highways issues with the proposed use.

3.24 We therefore do not understand how Highways can be raised as an issue for this site when the retail application includes an accepted Highways Scheme.

3.25 The North Gate should be seen as a major regeneration scheme for the town centre and should be given the same weight if not more than the NSK site in this regard.

3.26 The original planning application for the site included the redevelopment of the listed Warwick & Richardsons Brewery and the Maltings site. These listed buildings were in a state of extreme disrepair and collapse and substantial sums of money were spent in completing the development, comprising 54 residential units and 3 retail units to an award winning standard.

3.27 At the time the Council recognised that the regeneration of this key gateway site was important and reduced the payments required under the s106 agreement to reflect this. However the Section 106 agreement linked all three planning consents and did not permit occupancy of the new build elements until the Brewery refurbishment was completed.

3.28 The Brewery building was therefore brought back into use at significant cost but unfortunately with the downturn in the housing market not only have sales of the apartments within the Brewery building stalled, it has also become unviable to develop the new build houses.

3.29 The Maltings is a Grade II listed building which sits on the waterfront directly to the north of the application site. There has been no interest in this site for years as it is cut off from the main through flow of traffic on Northgate and has no street presence. Subsequent to the application for the retail development being submitted the applicants have had interest from a national leisure operator to bring the Maltings building back into use as a public house and restaurant, as per the existing planning consent. However the national operator has

## ***Land off North Gate***

---

confirmed that they can only take this space if the retail park were granted permission.

There is a real danger the Maltings will fall into disrepair if a tenant is not secured

3.30 In addition the Brewery building has three retail units on its ground floor. Two of these units are let to independent traders as a clothes boutique and quality cafe. Should the Maltings building be brought back to use it would improve the chance of the remaining unit gaining an occupier.

3.31 This is not only a positive benefit in terms of bringing these important buildings back into use, but it also creates jobs and employment for local people and would act as a catalyst for further investment in the area. We anticipate that the proposed retail scheme plus the jobs created at the Maltings and Brewery site will account for over 150 jobs.

3.32 We also highlight that the proposed retail scheme for the North Gate site has been designed to open up views to the river and provide a new walkway between North Gate and the river and amenity space alongside the river frontage.

3.33 The regeneration benefits also include bringing a prominent/gateway site back into use, the North Gate is on one of the main routes into Newark and is currently vacant with no prospect of being developed for residential use.

3.34 We therefore conclude that in addition to the employment and regeneration benefits of allocating this site for retail development, the redevelopment of this site will support the redevelop and refurbishment of the listed Brewery buildings, will enable the listed Maltings building to be brought back into use, will provide an attractive gateway development onto North Gate which relates well with the surrounding buildings and will open up the river frontage and provide a new river front link.

### **Sequential and Impact Test**

3.35 The compliance with the sequential test and impact test of allocating this site for retail development have been fully demonstrated through the current application and addressed in the original submission to the consultation document.

3.36 The Council's own retail consultant concluded that there are no sequentially preferable sites suitable for retail development (this conclusion was formed subsequent to the allocation of the NSK site for retail and in the knowledge that the NSK site was being promoted by the local authority) and that there would be no significant adverse impact on the existing centres if this site were to come forward for retail development.

3.37 However given that the Additional Sites Consultation report clearly states that the NSK site is the preferred choice, we felt it important in this response to highlight that the North Gate site is sequentially preferable to the NSK site and given it is comparable in all other

## ***Land off North Gate***

---

respects we would provide additional justification on this point.

3.38 This is particularly important because the Council have concluded that this scheme on its own would not have a significant adverse impact on the existing centres and therefore the proposal can only be deemed unacceptable on sequential grounds not impact.

3.39 Attached to Appendix 1 are 2 plans which demonstrate not only the proximity of North Gate site to the Town Centre boundary and primary shopping area but also to the other retail uses that surround it. From this it can also be clearly seen that the North Gate site is better related to the Town Centre than the NSK site.

3.40 The NPPF states that

They should require applications for main town centre uses to be located in town centres, then in edge of centre locations and only if suitable sites are not available should out of centre sites be considered. When considering edge of centre and out of centre proposals, preference should be given to accessible sites that are well connected to the town centre (our emphasis)

3.41 As can be seen from Figure 1 the site is extremely well connected to the Town Centre it forms a legible connection between the town centre boundary and the other retail uses along North Gate.

3.42 The North Gate site is 250m from the town centre boundary and 475m from the primary shopping frontage, however given its close proximity to the Morrison's supermarket (which is part of the town centre) and the level walk along a straight road from the centre to the site, we believe the site will function as edge of centre.

3.43 In addition the North Gate site is surrounded by complimentary retail facilities including the established retail park to the NE, the BP Petrol Service Station and car wash, Halfords, Aldi, Selecta Tyre Ltd, and the Northgate Retail Park - Next, Boots, Curry's Homebase etc. Therefore the potential for linked trips between the site and city centre and the site and other retail uses is extremely high. This has already been noted with pedestrian trade passing from the Northgate Retail Park to the Brewery and then into the Town centre.

3.44 The site will be accessed via North Gate, an important major thoroughfare in Newark, providing the main link between the town centre and the A46 bypass as well as the A1. Running north from the application site, North Gate crosses the East Coast railway line, and continues on to meet the A46, A17 and A1 roads on the northern edge of the town

3.45 The application site is also accessible by public transport, and benefits from direct access to the local bus network. The nearest bus stops serving the site are 120metres to the south, at the junction with Cow Lane and North Gate. This stop is served by a number of bus

## ***Land off North Gate***

---

services, which operate at hourly frequency or greater.

3.46 The site is also within ten minutes' walk of both of Newark's rail stations, with Newark Northgate located on the East Coast main line and providing services to a wide range of destinations, including London, Grantham, Peterborough and Leeds.

3.47 The site therefore has excellent access by a choice of means of transport and can be considered as a sustainable site.

3.48 The NSK site is on the Eastern side of the Railway line and therefore pedestrian access from this site to the town centre is severely constrained. The walking distance from this site to the town centre would be between 950 and 1500m. The Council has aspirations to construct a flyover across the railway line which would bring the walking distance down to around 750m. However there is no connectivity between this site and the town centre or the existing retail park on Northgate and it would therefore operate as a standalone retail facility with no potential for linked trips.

3.49 It is clear that under the sequential test the North Gate site is preferable for retail uses to the allocated NSK site.

### **Deliverability and Viability**

3.50 A key underlying principle of the NPPF is promoting sustainable development and part of this is ensuring that the plans and policies within those plans are viable and deliverable.

The section dealing with Plan making states;

Pursuing sustainable development requires careful attention to viability and costs in planmaking and decision-taking. Plans should be deliverable. Therefore, the sites and the scale of development identified in the plan should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened. To ensure viability, the costs of any requirements likely to be applied to development, such as requirements for affordable housing, standards, infrastructure contributions or other requirements should, when taking account of the normal cost of development and mitigation, provide competitive returns to a willing land owner and willing developer to enable the development to be deliverable (our emphasis)

The NPPF also states that for a plan ;

Positively prepared – the plan should be prepared based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements, including unmet requirements from neighbouring authorities where it is reasonable to do so and consistent with achieving sustainable development;

3.51 It has not been made clear if the NSK site is deliverable or viable for this type of

## ***Land off North Gate***

---

development. The NSK site is currently still operating as a factory site. To our knowledge no scheme proposals have been submitted.

3.52 It is clear that the North Gate site is deliverable in terms of providing the retail floorspace that the Local Authority needs. The Council's own retail study identified a quantitative need for additional comparison floorspace and a qualitative need for bulky goods retail floorspace. The North Gate site can deliver this.

3.53 Allocating this site for retail development is therefore fully in accordance with the aims and objectives of the NPPF.

### **4 CONCLUSION**

4.54 The site has no outstanding Flood Risk or Highways issues and therefore the NSK cannot be seen as preferable under these indicators

4.55 The site provides considerable regeneration benefits that are comparable if not greater than the NSK site.

4.56 The North Gate site has met the sequential test and the impact test set out in the NPPF and we have demonstrated that the site is sequentially preferable to the NSK site.

4.57 Retail development on the site is deliverable and viable which is in accordance with the key aims of the NPPF.

---



***Land East of Newlinc Business Park (Currys / DSG Distribution Centre)***

## ***Land East of Newlinc Business Park (Currys / DSG Distribution Centre)***

---

**Comment Reference:** ADM/AS/10

**Post Town:** Coddington

**Company/Organisation:** Coddington Parish Council

**Agent Post Town:**

**Agent Company/Organisation:**

**Additional Site Number:** Site 3

1. The Coddington Parish Council totally concurs with the Council's comments in relation to this proposed site, relating to the resulting over-allocation of employment land and conflict with the Core Strategy. The District Council's views are set out at paragraph 2.3.3 of its report.
  2. The Coddington Parish Council also agrees and supports the concerns expressed in regard to the proposed site contained in Appendix 2 of the Council's Report, with the addition of the following issues:
    - a) Development of this site would lead to the coalescence of the Newark Urban Area and Coddington.
    - b) There would be further unacceptable noise and light intrusion for the residents of Coddington, particularly for those living in close proximity to the site.
    - c) The development of the site would adversely affect the setting of the adjoining Conservation Area, and of Footpaths No 4, 4A and 5.
    - d) The road network is totally inadequate to serve the proposed development, the A46, A17 and the A1 roundabouts already being over capacity.
- 

**Comment Reference:** ADM/AS/12

**Post Town:**

**Company/Organisation:** English Heritage

**Agent Post Town:**

**Agent Company/Organisation:**

**Additional Site Number:** Site 3

## ***Land East of Newlinc Business Park (Currys / DSG Distribution Centre)***

---

We agree with the Council's assessment that this site is not suitable for a proposed extension to the existing business park. As the assessment notes in Appendix 1 (and in the Addendum Sustainability Appraisal), the site could have a detrimental impact on Coddington Conservation Area to the south-east. There are also potential detrimental impacts on the wider setting of Newark. A large development in this location could harm views towards the historic town centre.

---

**Comment Reference:** ADM/AS/19

**Post Town:** **Company/Organisation:** British Waterways

**Agent Post Town:** **Agent Company/Organisation:**

**Additional Site Number:** Site 3

No comments

---

**Comment Reference:** ADM/AS/22

**Post Town:** **Company/Organisation:** Gazeley UK Ltd

**Agent Post Town:** **Agent Company/Organisation:**

**Additional Site Number:** Site 3

Additional Site 3 - Land East of Newlinc Business Park, Winthorpe

Gazeley UK Ltd agree with the Council's assessment.

Core Strategy Spatial Policy 2 confirms that Newark Urban Area will be the main location for employment growth . The subject site is outside the Newark Urban Area which remains the main focus for employment provision. The Core Strategy identifies sufficient land to meet the employment land requirement to 2026 without the further need for additional 47.8 hectares.

## ***Land East of Newlinc Business Park (Currys / DSG Distribution Centre)***

---

Land previously granted planning permission (15.6 hectares) at Jessop Way within the Newark Industrial Estate remains available for employment development together with further expansion land at Stephenson Way (NUA/E/2). Both these strategic sites are capable of meeting large scale future employment demand and delivering flexible unit sizes for both B2 and B8 uses whilst satisfying all of the guiding principles listed in Core Strategy Spatial Policy 9.

In accordance with Spatial Policy 9, the site under consideration fails to meet a number of the guiding principles listed. In particular the site is not sustainable as it is not well related to existing facilities and services or capable of being served by public transport.

The land forms an important separation zone which affords protection to the Coddington Conservation Area. Large scale employment development in this location would have a prominent and adverse impact on the landscape and the designated Conservation Area.

In allocating sites for development consideration must be given to the impacts on existing infrastructure. The Highways Agency are unsupportive of further large scale employment development in this location due to impacts and capacity constraints on the A1/A46/A17 junction.

Further employment development in this location would be contrary to the spatial approach set out within the Core Strategy and should not be supported.

---

**Comment Reference:** ADM/AS/25

**Post Town:** **Company/Organisation:** Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust

**Agent Post Town:** **Agent Company/Organisation:**

**Additional Site Number:** Site 3

Additional Site 3 - Land East of Newlinc Business Park (Currys / DSG Distribution Centre) A survey of the site would be required to assess its ecological value and whether there would be a need for further surveys to ensure that protected species are properly considered in the determination of any planning application.

---

**Comment Reference:** ADM/AS/3

**Post Town:** Crawley **Company/Organisation:** Thomas Eggar

## ***Land East of Newlinc Business Park (Currys / DSG Distribution Centre)***

---

**Agent Post Town:**

**Agent Company/Organisation:**

**Additional Site Number:** Site 3

We act for the owners of the Newlink Business Park Newark on Trent Nottinghamshire

We have received the Councils Additional Sites Consultation Paper, which refers to the Land East of Newlink Business Park and submit this letter as a response to question 4.

Do you agree with the Councils assessment on Alternative Site 3?

Newlink Business Park is a major distribution centre on the A1/A46/A17 junction. The significance of this location was expressly recognised in paragraph 31 of Nigel Paynes report on the examination into the Newark and Sherwood Core Strategy and Development Plan document dated 11th March 2011. Paragraph 31 reads as far as relevant.

The recent success in attracting a major logistics investment locally (Currys/Dixons) confirms the potential of the area and the A1 corridor in particular for further growth in B8 and BS uses, partly due to the good road and rail links. These are soon to be enhanced by the completion of the A46 dual carriageway route to the south of Newark in 2012.

The Newlink Business Park site, strategically placed as it is on the road network, is an ideal location for distribution related employment, and has been proven to be attractive to a very major operator.

Despite the obvious attractions of the site, the council has assessed it as unsuitable for allocation for employment use as

The allocation of the site for employment use is contrary to the core strategy and

The Highways Agency and Highways Authority have raised concerns about the ability of the A1/A46/A17 junction to cope with the additional traffic caused by additional development at the Site.

We do not agreed with the Councils assessment of the site and request that the Council reconsiders allocating the site as employment land for the following reasons.

### 1. Compatibility with the Core Strategy

The council has stated that allocating the site, in addition to the sites already allocated for employment use, will result in a 33 acre oversupply of employment land within the District. It has also stated that there is no need for additional employment land within Sutton on Trent as there is already a long standing employment

## ***Land East of Newlinc Business Park (Currys / DSG Distribution Centre)***

---

land allocation within the locality, where new development will be considered.

Allowing an oversupply of employment land within the district would be a sensible policy measure, given that the Inspectorates report into the core strategy development plan document recognised the potential risk for the council to lose up to 100 hectares of its allocated employment land over the local plan period to 2026. Given recent changes in national planning policy, it is possible that the Inspectorates report has underestimated the amount of employment land that is likely to be lost during this time period.

Paragraph 22 of the National Planning Policy Framework directs local planning authorities to avoid the long term protection of sites allocated for employment use where there is no reasonable prospect of those sites coming forward and to review its land allocations regularly to ensure that employment land can be released for other uses if necessary. In the current economic climate, it is highly unlikely that all of the mixed use schemes envisaged by the Council will prove attractive to developers for employment purposes, and there must be a very real possibility that some will be redeveloped for other uses.

The Newlinc Business Park Site, strategically placed as it is on the road network, is an ideal location for distribution related employment, and has been proven to be attractive to a very major operator. If allocated for employment use, it is likely to prove highly attractive to large scale operators in a variety of sectors.

Additional, the site is not suited for any other type of development. Its location means that it cannot be used for housing if a high level of residential amenity is to be enjoyed by its applicants, and it is similarly unsuited for community uses.

When viewed as a whole, the allocation is clearly compatible with the aims of the core strategy. Allocating the site for employment land will free up other, more suitable, sites for housing allocations, enabling the Council to meet the higher housing targets it has agreed within the Newark Growth Point.

It would also act as an incentive for improving the public transport links between the site, Sutton on Trent and the Newark Urban Centre, a stated aim of the recently adopted Core Strategy.

### **2. Highways Concerns**

We enclose a report from Intermodal Transportation Ltd, our clients Highways Consultant, addressing the Councils Concerns about the infrastructure requirements that would arise out of allocating the Site as additional employment land.

As can be seen from the report, the likely increase in traffic as a result of allocating the Site for B8 employment use would not exceed the traffic flow cap already in place for the existing warehouse that are adjacent to it. As a result the predicted increase in traffic flow would not detrimentally affect the adjacent highway network.

Additionally, any development of the Site is likely to involve the payment of a site specific s.106 contribution, which could be used towards the proposed highway improvements at the A1/A46/A17 junction and neighbouring junctions. Using developers contributions in this way would free up the Councils Community

## ***Land East of Newlinc Business Park (Currys / DSG Distribution Centre)***

---

Infrastructure Levy receipts for other necessary infrastructure projects within the district.

---

**Comment Reference:** ADM/AS/3

**Post Town:** **Company/Organisation:** Newlink Business Park

**Agent Post Town:** **Agent Company/Organisation:** Thomas Eggar LLP

**Additional Site Number:** Site 3

### 1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Intermodal Transportation Ltd (ITL) was commissioned by Dixons Retail plc to offer advice in relation to highway and transportation matters appertaining to proposed extension of the Newlink Business Park, at Newark-on-Trent. This proposal is to support the extension of the business park on land to the east through the review of the Local Development Framework and specifically this statement has been prepared to address the highway and traffic reasons that the Local Planning Authority (LPA) cites for not allocating the site for employment development as contained within the Additional Sites Consultation Paper (ASCP).

1.2 Extant planning consents exist for two alternative development proposals on land to the north-west of the Dixons Warehouses; namely for 12,936 m<sup>2</sup> of B8 use (including 1,176 m<sup>2</sup> of integral office space) and 4,134.9 m<sup>2</sup> of B1 use and for 12,936 m<sup>2</sup> of B8 use (including 1,176 m<sup>2</sup> of integral office space) and a 905 m<sup>2</sup> car dealership.

1.3 The current site for consideration is located to the east of the Dixons warehouses on adjacent agricultural land. The proposal is for the development of up to 69,675m<sup>2</sup> (750,000 ft<sup>2</sup>) of B8 (Warehouse and Distribution) to be allocated through the review of the Local Development Framework.

1.4 As part of the original 01/006/08/OUT permission a traffic limit was set (condition) amounting to 1,400 capped vehicle movements during the peak hour to and from the entire Newlink Business Park site. Flexibility to consider various permutations of B1, B2 and B8 development on the site was allowed by imposing fixed peak hour deemed trip rates for each of the possible future land uses. In 2005 a further consent retained the vehicle movement cap in a modified form to take account of the traffic (surveyed in

## ***Land East of Newlinc Business Park (Currys / DSG Distribution Centre)***

---

2005) then being generated by the Dixons warehouse. The consent also adopted the TRICS based trip rates put forward by ITL in their Transport Statement prepared to support the 2005 planning submission.

1.5 The purpose of this statement is to review the previous planning (traffic) conditions in the light of the previous planning history, the actual reserve capacity when viewed against the traffic cap and the new National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) document released since the issue of the ASCP. Hence, for the further allocation of B8 employment development to the east an independent assessment of the available capacity on the adjacent highway network to accommodate this further development has been made.

NEWLINK BUSINESS PARK, NEWARK-ON-TRENT, NOTTINGHAMSHIRE  
EXTENSION OF BUSINESS PARK, TRANSPORT STATEMENT

2

IT501R-30-04-12

### 2 DESCRIPTION OF THE LOCAL ROAD NETWORK

2.1 The site is situated to the east of the A17/A46 Winthorpe Roundabout and to the east of the A1 trunk road. Access to the A1 trunk road is achieved via a 'banjo' type gradeseparated interchange only a short distance from the site. The roundabout located on the western side of the A1 carriageway is known as the A1/A46 Brownhills Roundabout and provides access to and from the A1 northbound carriageway as well as the B6166 into Newark and the A46 to the west.

2.2 Vehicular access to the Newlink site is from a purpose built roundabout connection with the A17. From this connection with the A17 a short section of dual carriageway provides access to an internal roundabout. This currently serves the two Dixons warehouses and would eventually serve the development on the whole of the site including the residual consented land which has not been physically built out. Access to the land being considered for expansion of the business park would be likely to require a further junction onto the A17 to the east of the current access.

2.3 At the time of the 2005 planning application ITL had been in discussion with the Highways Agency (HA) to establish what benefits have accrued in relation to capacity of the A1/A46 junctions following implemented improvements to the A1 slip road junctions. The improvements to the A1 slip road junctions were to accommodate the traffic associated with the Newlink Business Park and 15 years of growth to background traffic and were funded by Dixons. The resulting improvement was to ensure that the



## ***Land East of Newlinc Business Park (Currys / DSG Distribution Centre)***

---

junctions would be 'no worse' in the forecast year as a result of the development.

NEWLINC BUSINESS PARK, NEWARK-ON-TRENT, NOTTINGHAMSHIRE

EXTENSION OF BUSINESS PARK, TRANSPORT STATEMENT

3

IT501R-30-04-12

3 TRAFFIC ASSESSMENT RELATING TO EXTANT

PLANNING CONSENTS

3.1 The key issues discussed in this section focus on:

- Existing traffic flow cap;
- TRICS trip generation of various land uses;
- Actual trip rate for Dixons depot operation;
- Estimated traffic generation for the subsequent Extant Development; and
- Estimated traffic cap available for further B8 or B1 expansion.

EXISTING TRAFFIC FLOW CAP

3.2 The original planning permission for the Newlinc Business Park site set a peak hour capped limit of 1,400 vehicle movements (in and out summed).

3.3 The trip rates shown in Table 3.1 below were set for each land use category because the mix of the development was not determined as part of the original application. In this way the ultimate developer of the land could select a preferred development strategy/mix to suit market demands as long as the theoretical peak hour flow did not exceed the cap.

Table 3.1: Schedule of Deemed Trip Rates for the 2001 Consent \*

Land Use Peak Hour trip rate (Two-way flow)

per 100m<sup>2</sup> GFA

B1 2.4

B2 2.15

B8 1.0

Hotel 2.67

Car Dealership 5.0

\* Hotel and Car Dealership trip rates were added later in separate planning permissions

3.4 No refinement of the B1 classification into B1(a), B1(b) or B1(c) sub-categories was scheduled in the condition.

TRICS TRIP GENERATION ANALYSIS

## ***Land East of Newlinc Business Park (Currys / DSG Distribution Centre)***

---

3.5 Dixons were not party to the original discussions, appertaining to the first planning consent, that led to the parameters being set for the traffic limit or the various trip rates assigned to the alternative land use classifications. Accordingly, as part of the review undertaken in 2005, ITL interrogated the TRICS database (version 2005(a)) to compare NEWLINK BUSINESS PARK, NEWARK-ON-TRENT, NOTTINGHAMSHIRE EXTENSION OF BUSINESS PARK, TRANSPORT STATEMENT

4

IT501R-30-04-12

the expected trip rate for each possible land use category against that agreed for the original planning permission.

3.6 In reviewing the data held on the TRICS database (2005), ITL undertook a regional search of appropriate sites. However, sample sizes were small and, therefore, the search was widened to all sites on the database. Wherever possible, due to the relative remoteness of the application site from Newark town centre, further interrogations were carried out for either 'out of centre', 'freestanding' or industrial zone locations (as classified by TRICS). The 85%ile trip rates have been listed to give a degree of comfort that the trip rate figures are robust. The results of the TRICS runs are contained in Appendix A.

3.7 Table 3.2 below sets out the various trip rates determined from TRICS for each of the five land uses previously considered. Note, if regional data was available the local trip rate has been identified. However, where the sample was too small the 'all sites' trip rate has been given. Where different, the highest of either the AM or PM peak hour is shown.

Table 3.2: Schedule of 85%ile Two-way Trip Rates from TRICS

Land Use Peak Hour trip rate

(per 100m<sup>2</sup> GFA) AM

Peak Hour trip rate

(per 100m<sup>2</sup> GFA) PM

All Sites or

Local Selection

Business Park: B1 2.30 1.71 All

Industrial Estate: B2 1.86 1.42 Local

Warehousing: B8 0.33 0.49 All & Local

Hotel 1.15 1.08 All

## ***Land East of Newlinc Business Park (Currys / DSG Distribution Centre)***

---

Car Dealership 1.86 2.24 Local

3.8 Clearly there are significant differences between the 2005 TRICS research and the theoretical figures attached to the 2001 consent, as shown in Table 3.1. In every instance, the TRICS figure is less than the equivalent figure in the old condition; for B8 and hotel uses, with differences more than 100% of the TRICS figure. The planning consent issued in 2005 in relation to application number 05/00077/OUTM contained conditions relating to traffic generation and trip rates to be used for assessment of allowable future development. The planning decision notice is reproduced at Appendix B and the approved trip rates are summarised in Table 3.3 on the following page.

NEWLINK BUSINESS PARK, NEWARK-ON-TRENT, NOTTINGHAMSHIRE  
EXTENSION OF BUSINESS PARK, TRANSPORT STATEMENT

5

IT501R-30-04-12

Table 3.3: Schedule of Two-way Trip Rates from 2005 Planning Decision  
Notice

Land Use Peak Hour trip rate (per  
100m<sup>2</sup> GFA) AM

Peak Hour trip rate (per  
100m<sup>2</sup> GFA) PM

Business Park: B1 2.30 2.30

Industrial Estate: B2 1.86 1.86

Warehousing: B8 0.49 0.49

Hotel 1.15 1.15

3.9 It can be seen by comparison of Tables 3.2 and 3.3 that the TRICS 2005 trip rates were adopted by the planning authority as the basis for traffic generation calculations in relation to further development of the site, however it should be noted that where the AM and PM peak hour trip rates varied the planning authority has taken the largest of the two values to apply to both peak hours, and therefore has been cautious.

3.10 The available traffic generation demand that could be accommodated in 2005, to avert a breach of the cap, was 1337 maximum vehicle movements in any one hour, which reflects the earlier 1400 vehicle movements as a maximum specified in connection with the development consent given in 2001 reduced to take account of the Dixons warehouse already developed and operating on part of the site. The planning authority adopted the cautious approach by taking the highest observed hour total from the

## ***Land East of Newlinc Business Park (Currys / DSG Distribution Centre)***

---

'shoulder' of the peak as the reduction to the 1400 vehicle movement cap (63 vehicles shown in Table 3.4).

3.11 The following section reviews the trip generation characteristics of the Dixons operation located on the site, comparing the 2005 survey for one operational warehouse with a further survey carried out in 2007 with two warehouses operating. The consent issued in 2005 is still current although it should be noted that the main B8 use on the site was developed and occupied by Dixons following grant of planning consent. It is the remainder of the land that is the subject of the current planning permissions.

### **DIXONS DEPOT TRIP RATE**

3.12 The Dixons Service and Distribution warehouse is a B8 land use. In 2005, at the time of the previous planning application, the depot had been open for some 18 months and had settled down to a steady operational pattern. The depot was the only operational building on the site at that time and it was decided to establish its trip rates by carrying out a traffic survey. Accordingly, automatic traffic counters (ATC) were placed on each side of the short section of dual carriageway leading to the site for a week commencing Friday 11th February 2005. The survey was to establish traffic volumes, with vehicles classified by type/size.

NEWLINC BUSINESS PARK, NEWARK-ON-TRENT, NOTTINGHAMSHIRE  
EXTENSION OF BUSINESS PARK, TRANSPORT STATEMENT

6

IT501R-30-04-12

3.13 A further traffic count was undertaken at the Newlinc access in September 2007 which follows the completion of the second Dixons warehouse on the Newlinc site. The 2007 survey provided an update on the traffic generation of the Dixons operation at the site and, although the traffic flow and trip rate were expectantly higher than recorded in 2005, the Dixons collective warehouse operation generated lower movement than TRICS average B8 trip rates.

3.14 The results of the surveys can be found in Appendix C and the average weekday peak period hourly two-way flows are summarised in Table 3.4 below. This enables an evaluation of peak hour 'shoulder' trip patterns in order to identify the highest peak period traffic flows attributable to the current Dixons' operation.

Table 3.4: Observed Peak Period Average Hourly Two-way Flows for Dixons Depot  
Time Period Weekday Average Two-way  
Flow

## ***Land East of Newlinc Business Park (Currys / DSG Distribution Centre)***

---

(2005 - 1 Dixons Warehouse)

Weekday Average Two-way

Flow

(2007 - 2 Dixons

Warehouses)

AM Peak Period:

0700-0800 50 206

0800-0900 53 154

0900-1000 33 92

PM Peak Period:

1600-1700 63 153

1700-1800 42 126

1800-1900 37 98

3.15 From these results it can be seen that the average weekday flows during the traditional network peaks of 0800-0900 and 1700-1800 hours were 53 and 42 respectively in 2005 and 154 and 126 respectively in 2007 with two warehouses operating. The depot development peak hour varied only slightly during the week, being 1300-1400 hours for most weekdays in the 2005 survey and 1400-1500 hours during the 2007 survey. The 1400-1500 was almost the same as the peak for the earlier survey on most days recorded and is therefore most likely to be the hour with the highest traffic flows for the development. This development peak hour, therefore, occurs when the background network flows would typically be lower.

3.16 Undoubtedly, the deemed capped limit for the site was set by the HA for capacity reasons and the greatest demands on the road links and nearby trunk road junctions would occur during the commuter/network peak periods. ITL has, therefore, calculated the highest average peak period weekday hourly two-way trip rate for the Dixons depot based on this highest flow to take account of the peak hour shoulders. The highest average peak period weekday flow during these periods was 63 vehicles in 2005, which occurred during the hour commencing 1600-1700 hours, and 206 vehicles in 2007, which occurred during the hour commencing 0700-0800 hours.

NEWLINK BUSINESS PARK, NEWARK-ON-TRENT, NOTTINGHAMSHIRE

EXTENSION OF BUSINESS PARK, TRANSPORT STATEMENT

7

IT501R-30-04-12

## ***Land East of Newlinc Business Park (Currys / DSG Distribution Centre)***

---

3.17 The Dixons Distribution depot (both warehouses combined) has a gross floor area (GFA) of (66,424 + 67,817) 134,241 m<sup>2</sup>. Based on the scheduled (2005 planning consent) trip rate of 0.49 per 100m<sup>2</sup> (as shown in Table 3.3) for B8 use, the depot would be expected to take up 658 trips out of the 1,400 site trip allowance. However, using the highest average weekday peak hour flow within the peak periods taken from the recent (2007) traffic survey (as shown in Table 3.4) the two-way peak hour trip rate of 0.153 per 100m<sup>2</sup> per hour can be calculated. This is substantially less than both the scheduled trip rate and also than the TRICS trip rate of 0.49 per 100m<sup>2</sup>.

3.18 This exercise demonstrates that the B8 trip rate derived from the TRICS evaluation is more than robust because it is more than 3 times the actual peak hour trip rate measured from the site survey. The use of the TRICS trip rate would in our opinion continue to provide a robust assessment of trip generation for other B8 end users on the site.

### **ESTIMATED TRAFFIC GENERATION EXTANT B1/B8 PERMISSION**

3.19 The Planning Authority needs to be satisfied that the deemed capped limit of 1400 peak hour vehicle movements would not be breached as a result of any of the extant permissions being implemented. ITL have therefore considered the traffic generation arising from the development proposal using the trip rates scheduled in the 2005 planning consent notice, as summarised in Table 3.3 above, for the proposed development, combined with the actual traffic flows recorded for the Dixons operation in the 2007 traffic count. This is consistent with the approach previously adopted by the LPA and the resulting traffic flows are presented for the peak hours in Table 3.5 below.

Table 3.5: Peak Hour Flows for Proposed Development Mix.

Land Use GFA

(m<sup>2</sup>)

Trip Rate Source Two Way Traffic Flow

Dixons (existing) 134,241 Observed Trips 154

Proposed

Warehouse:

B8 11,760 TRICS (Refer to Table 3.3) 58

B1\* 1,176 TRICS (Refer to Table 3.3) 27

Office: B1 4,138 TRICS (Refer to Table 3.3) 95

Total 334

\*Allied to B8 unit but considered as pure B1 use for robustness.

## ***Land East of Newlinc Business Park (Currys / DSG Distribution Centre)***

---

3.20 It can be seen from the above assessment that demand during the peak hours, using TRICS trip rates for proposed development (worst case) and using the actual recorded flows from the Dixons operation, the demand of the whole development site would amount to only 23% of the deemed capped figure.

3.21 The 2005 planning consent conditioned that traffic generated by the consented development should not exceed 1337 vehicle movements in either of the daily peak hours. This is based on the 1400 vehicle movement cap imposed on the 2001 planning consent less the 2005 surveyed traffic from the Dixons warehouse located on the site.

NEWLINC BUSINESS PARK, NEWARK-ON-TRENT, NOTTINGHAMSHIRE  
EXTENSION OF BUSINESS PARK, TRANSPORT STATEMENT

8

IT501R-30-04-12

Using the same principle for this application the development site trip generation cap would be set at 1400 minus 206 (highest survey hour for the peak and 'shoulder' peak) giving 1194 'spare' vehicle movements available for development traffic.

ESTIMATED TRAFFIC GENERATION EXTANT B1/B8 AND CAR DEALERSHIP  
PERMISSION

3.22 The Planning Authority needs to be satisfied that the deemed capped limit of 1400 peak hour vehicle movements would not be breached as a result of the application proposals.

ITL have therefore considered the traffic generation arising from the development proposal using the trip rates scheduled in the 2005 planning consent notice, as summarised in Table 3.3 above, for the proposed development, combined with the actual traffic flows recorded for the Dixons operation in the 2007 traffic count. This is consistent with the approach previously adopted by the LPA and the resulting traffic flows are presented for the peak hours in Table 3.6 below.

Table 3.6: Peak Hour Flows for Proposed Development Mix.

Land Use GFA

(m<sup>2</sup>)

Trip Rate Source Two Way Traffic Flow

Dixons (existing) 134,241 Observed Trips 154

Proposed

Warehouse:

B8 11,760 TRICS (Refer to Table 3.3) 58

B1\* 1,176 TRICS (Refer to Table 3.3) 27

## ***Land East of Newlinc Business Park (Currys / DSG Distribution Centre)***

---

Car Dealership 905 TRICS (Refer to Table 3.2) 20

Total 259

\*Allied to B8 unit but considered as pure B1 use for robustness.

3.23 It can be seen from the above assessment that demand during the peak hours, using TRICS trip rates for proposed development (worst case) and using the actual recorded flows from the Dixons operation, the demand of the whole development site would amount to only 18.5% of the deemed capped figure.

ESTIMATED TRAFFIC CAP AVAILABLE FOR FURTHER EXPANSION OF B8 DEVELOPMENT

3.24 Since the extant planning consent for a combined B1 and B8 development would provide the largest traffic generation for the land located on the northern side of the Dixons Warehouse it has been assumed that this traffic can be reviewed in the context of the baseline established in 2001 when considering the potential for further employment development on the proposed allocation site.

3.25 It can be seen from Table 3.5 above that the extant consent would be expected to attract 180 two-way trips during the peak hour. The 1,400 vehicle trip cap set by the Highways Agency for the Newlink development site in 2001 was only partly utilised in the 2008 traffic survey with a maximum of 206 movements within the peak period considered for assessment (the peak hours and the one hour period either side of the NEWLINK BUSINESS PARK, NEWARK-ON-TRENT, NOTTINGHAMSHIRE

EXTENSION OF BUSINESS PARK, TRANSPORT STATEMENT

9

IT501R-30-04-12

AM and PM peak hours). Therefore it can be deduced that there would still be significantly less traffic attracted to Newlink with the extant development for further B1 and B8 development in place, with 206 plus 180 (386 total) trips in the highest peak hour. Applying this to the cap value would show that there is 'spare capacity' within the adjacent network for development that attract up to 1,014 peak hour movements before the previously set cap would be reached.

3.26 If the alternative extant permission (B1/B8/Car dealership) was built out then there would theoretically be 1,089 peak hour movements before the cap was exceeded. This is based on the figures from Table 3.6.

3.27 It is therefore concluded that there is capacity within the previously agreed vehicle trip cap for Newlink to allow development of up to 207,938m<sup>2</sup> of B8 development (or 44,086m<sup>2</sup> of B1 office development) without imposing any further burden on the road



## ***Land East of Newlinc Business Park (Currys / DSG Distribution Centre)***

---

system than otherwise could have been anticipated when all permissions on the Dixons site were approved.

---

**Comment Reference:** ADM/AS/32

**Post Town:** Lincoln

**Company/Organisation:** NDC Group

**Agent Post Town:** Lincoln

**Agent Company/Organisation:** Globe Consultations Limited

**Additional Site Number:** Site 3

We are supportive of the Council's conclusions on this proposed additional site. The site area is of such a size that its release via an allocation at this particular time would undermine the carefully considered planning and development strategy that the Council, in consultation with the community, has drafted. There can only be so much demand at any particular time and for that demand to be managed and directed to where it can achieve most benefit requires planning decisions to be robust and considered. Whilst there is a need for sufficient employment land to be allocated to allow investors and developers a degree of flexibility this is catered for within the existing allocations for employment and mixed use.

Our particular concern is the development of the land immediately north of this site. It offers scope for a range of carefully considered uses in association with the strategic planning and development of the Showground/Events centre with which it has a close geographical and functional relationship. The careless allocation of this proposed additional site at this time would seriously undermine the ability of those properly supported through the LDF process to deliver the numerous benefits that are planned.

---

**Comment Reference:** ADM/AS/33

**Post Town:**

**Company/Organisation:** Highways Agency

**Agent Post Town:**

**Agent Company/Organisation:**

**Additional Site Number:** Site 3

## ***Land East of Newlinc Business Park (Currys / DSG Distribution Centre)***

---

The Highways Agency has concerns over Site 3 which comprises a 47 hectare extension to the Newlinc Business Park near the A1/A46/A17 junction. The supporting information in the Consultation Paper already notes that the Highways Agency and Local Highway Authority have concerns over potential highway impact. It is also indicated that “The Highways Agency believes that, if this development were added to the employment land currently proposed and already allocated, that it would be difficult to provide for adequate junction improvements at the A1/A46/A17 junction which are planned for the Core Strategy.”

The A46/A1 junctions (junctions east and west of the A1) are already under pressure and the committed and allocated developments in Newark will significantly increase traffic demand at these junctions. The Agency has been closely involved with Newark and Sherwood District Council (and LPA partners) in reviewing and developing the transport evidence base to support the adopted Core Strategy, including the recent CIL charging schedule. This work has helped to provide a greater understanding of the cumulative impacts of committed and allocated development across the District and has demonstrated that there are impacts on the A46 around Newark, particularly at the junctions with the A617 and A1/A17.

In response to this, the Highways Agency is investigating options for improving both the A1/A46/A17 junction and the A1/A46/B6166 Lincoln Road junction. It is anticipated that these improvements at these junctions will be brought forward through a combination of CIL and HA funding. However, constraints on the level of funding that may be available will limit the nature of these improvements to improved at-grade junctions rather than any major improvement involving further grade separation or new carriageway/over-bridges.

A new 47 hectare employment site has the potential to generate in excess of 800 two way vehicle trips in the AM and PM peak hours most of which may be expected to use the A46/A1 junctions. Additional traffic of this magnitude would be difficult to accommodate within the scope of junction improvements currently being considered. If future traffic demand cannot be effectively managed this will lead to increased queuing at the A1/A46 junctions which could impact on the A1 mainline carriageway as well as causing significant delays to traffic using the A46.

At a meeting on the 20th March 2012 between the HA and Newark and Sherwood District Council, the potential for development on the Showground site was discussed. This included discussions on potential allocations at the Showground site. A range of potential allocations were discussed including a hotel, garden centre and employment uses, together with implications for the A46/A1 junction. At the meeting it was suggested that, although a hotel and garden centre may be acceptable prior to provision of improvements at the A46/A1 junction, significant employment development may need to be delayed until such time as improvements have been carried out.

The HA has considered this further and has concluded that it concurs with the stance taken in the Supporting Planning and Design Statement produced by Lichfield Planning LLP which states that the employment development proposed on the Showground would not be implemented until works have been completed by the HA at the A46/A1 junction.

AECOM has separately examined a Transport Assessment produced by Morgan Tucker in support of a hotel and pub/restaurant on the Showground site. This proposal would have limited impacts on the A1/A46/A17 junction and is considered acceptable. The Agency is prepared to consider other proposed development (in advance of the employment development detailed above) on their merits; assessing whether the SRN has the capacity to accommodate them.

## ***Land East of Newlinc Business Park (Currys / DSG Distribution Centre)***

---

### Summary

The Highways Agency welcomes the opportunity to comment upon the Newark and Sherwood Allocations and Development Management Additional Sites Consultation Paper. Comments in this note should be read together with comments previously provided on the Options Report consultation. As referred to above, the HA's specific interest relates to the A1 and A46 and the Agency has a major concern that site 3 in the Consultation Paper could have a severe impact on the future operation of the A1/A46.

The Agency notes that the District Council consider the site to be contrary to the core strategy and, in recognition of the site's potential impact on the A1/A46 junctions, considers that the site is unsuitable for the scale of development proposed

---

**Comment Reference:** ADM/AS/34

**Post Town:** **Company/Organisation:** The Coal Authority

**Agent Post Town:** **Agent Company/Organisation:**

**Additional Site Number:** Site 3

No Comments

---

**Comment Reference:** ADM/AS/37

**Post Town:** **Company/Organisation:**

**Agent Post Town:** **Agent Company/Organisation:**

**Additional Site Number:** Site 3

## ***Land East of Newlinc Business Park (Currys / DSG Distribution Centre)***

---

2.3.0 Additional Site 3 - Land East of Newlinc Business Park (Currys / DSG Distribution Centre)

Question 3 – Do you agree with the Council’s assessment on Alternative Site 3?

YES - The site should be retained as open space / green belt as it is adjacent to the Conservation Area. Further tree planting around the business park should be considered as part of the plans and I agree that the site is considered unsuitable.

---

**Comment Reference:** ADM/AS/4

**Post Town:** Manby

**Company/Organisation:** Trent Valley Internal Drainage Board

**Agent Post Town:**

**Agent Company/Organisation:**

**Additional Site Number:** Site 3

The site is located within the boards district. Although there are no board maintained watercourses located within the site it is understood the site drains into the boards drainage system. Therefore the boards consent will be required prior to any alterations in surface water discharge from the site. Any works to alter the private watercourse running through the site will also require prior consent. The board are aware of past flooding complaints on the north side of the A17 carriageway and therefore recommend that surface water is attenuated on site using sustainable drainage systems.

---

*Land at Crew Lane/Fiskerton Road*

## ***Land at Crew Lane/Fiskerton Road***

---

**Comment Reference:** ADM/AS/11

**Post Town:** Southwell

**Company/Organisation:**

**Agent Post Town:**

**Agent Company/Organisation:**

**Additional Site Number:** Site 4

My wife and I have been residents of Crew Lane, Southwell for nearly 30 years. During those years there has been a lot of changes, with the development of a large number of industrial units together with a mushroom farm and an elderly care home.

As a result of this Crew Lane has been pushed to the limit by the increase in traffic. It is because of this, and also the scale of the development and lack of infrastructure, in what is a very popular area for walkers and is also a designated and well used bridleway, we feel this project should not be given the go ahead.

Our response to your consultation re the above Additional Sites Plan, Site 4 - Southwell are as follows:-

The proposal as shown on Map 3.1 of the above report shows this development to be in open countryside separated from the town envelope, and would in the event of a Southwell By-Pass being implemented be isolated even further with the By-Pass and the Industrial/Employment site between the residential areas.

The Proposal and any subsequent plans have yet to be seen by the local residents, but on information gleaned by word of mouth only, such a residential development of 290 houses would swamp the facilities at the Crew Lane end of town, both by the limited access available and the roadways unsuitable for the amount of traffic this over-intensive venture would create.

This overspill into green fields, and countryside views of the approaches to The Workhouse would be decimated.

Whilst appreciating that we should encourage new business ventures to the town and the employment thus created. The argument has yet to be won that the proposed ventures, which include a jockey school, would be viable concerns when there are facilities in nearby Doncaster not fully taken up. Plus no information as to how many jobs would be created.

Having made the previous point, we would then ask exactly how one part of this bid, namely the business venture, can have absolutely anything to do with a requirement to build 290 new homes. This is a private business enterprise and should have no bearing one upon the other. It should stand or fall on its own merits, and any housing application should be based on the criteria set out by the local council after their consultation with the community earlier this year.

## ***Land at Crew Lane/Fiskerton Road***

---

Having seen the recommendations of the Council that this site is not considered suitable following their Site Appraisal Criteria, we agree with that decision. This site application fails on all the criteria, and we are against the application.

We also wish to point out that as one of only 4 households at the top end of Crew Lane, we should have been informed of any proposals of this nature. The fact that we have only 'fallen' upon information, and have no official information, means that we have no details, and as we all know the devil is in the detail!

---

**Comment Reference:** ADM/AS/12

**Post Town:** **Company/Organisation:** English Heritage

**Agent Post Town:** **Agent Company/Organisation:**

**Additional Site Number:** Site 4

We agree with the Council's assessment that this site is not suitable for a proposed mixed use housing and employment development. It is a large site on the edge of Southwell with the potential to harm the setting of the historic town and its conservation area, as well as harm the setting of the Grade II\* listed and registered Workhouse to the north-west.

Please see the general comments we made regarding site allocations as part of our response to the 2011 consultation. Many of the general comments made then apply to the above sites.

---

**Comment Reference:** ADM/AS/14

**Post Town:** **Company/Organisation:** National Trust

**Agent Post Town:** **Agent Company/Organisation:**

**Additional Site Number:** Site 4

## ***Land at Crew Lane/Fiskerton Road***

---

National Trust agrees with the Council's conclusion that this site is not suitable for allocation. The site is not well related to the built up area of Southwell and if there was a need to be make a greenfield allocation on this scale then a wider assessment of potential suitable sites, including within and adjoining other settlements should be undertaken. The level of development proposed overall in this area would be excessive and beyond the needs of Southwell as identified in the Core Strategy.

The Trust is also particularly concerned about the impacts upon the landscape character of the area and the impacts upon the setting of heritage assets in Southwell such as The Workhouse. The proposers have made no assessment of the likely landscape and visual impacts of the proposals and it is contended that the significant extension of the urban area would substantially and adversely impact upon the special qualities of Southwell and its immediate surroundings.

---

**Comment Reference:** ADM/AS/15

**Post Town:** Nottingham

**Company/Organisation:** David Wilson Homes North Midlands

**Agent Post Town:**

**Agent Company/Organisation:**

**Additional Site Number:** Site 4

None of the additional/alternative sites are in Farnsfield. Three are in Newark and one is in Southwell. Nor is there any suggestin and (or all) of them could meet housing requirements in Farnsfield. As such, their identification does not impact on existing site ref. Fa/MU/1(71)-Ash Farm, Farnsfield, which remains suitable and available for development.

---

**Comment Reference:** ADM/AS/18

**Post Town:**

**Company/Organisation:**

**Agent Post Town:**

**Agent Company/Organisation:**

**Additional Site Number:** Site 4



## ***Land at Crew Lane/Fiskerton Road***

---

Thank you for informing us of the Additional Sites under consideration as part of Newark and Sherwood's Local Development Framework.

With regard to Additional Site 4, and in answer to Question 4 posed in the document, we are in total agreement with the Council that the proposed site is not suitable for all the reasons given:

- access to either Crew Lane or Fiskerton Road (a 'B' road meeting the A612 at Easthorpe, and already congested)
- the detached nature of any housing development on the site,
- the impact on the landscape, which would be impossible to mask from the A612 from Newark. There are also good views of the Minster from the road which would be affected by these proposals. The signs to the town would need to be changed to 'Historic Minster Town with detached Eyesore'!

We are also not convinced of the need for further employment opportunities, as currently, a large office block and at least one light industry building have been empty for some time in the area already developed.

We therefore agree that proposed site 4 is not suitable.

---

**Comment Reference:** ADM/AS/19

**Post Town:** **Company/Organisation:** British Waterways

**Agent Post Town:** **Agent Company/Organisation:**

**Additional Site Number:** Site 4

no comments

---

**Comment Reference:** ADM/AS/2

**Post Town:** Southwell **Company/Organisation:** Minster Veterinary Centre Ltd

**Agent Post Town:** London **Agent Company/Organisation:** Tibbalds Planning & Urban Design

## ***Land at Crew Lane/Fiskerton Road***

---

**Additional Site Number:** Site 4

Land at Crew Lane/Fiskerton Road, Southwell

I write in response to your assessment of the suitability of Alternative Site 4 (Land at Crew Lane/Fiskerton Road, Southwell) as an alternative to the 6 sites which the Council has previously put forward as its preferred sites for housing development in Southwell. I am of course the owner of Alternative Site 4. However, I am writing not only as the landowner and promoter of the Southwell and East Midlands Animal Centre (SEMAC) project, but also as a local person wanting to ensure that Southwell gets the housing it needs in the location best suited to the town.

I agree with your assessment of Alternative Site 4 when judged against your Criteria 3, 6, 7, 8 and 9 at Appendix 2 of the consultation paper. Although I would add for clarity:

- In relation to Criteria 3, whilst the site is already well serviced by public transport my intention is to work closely with local bus operators to meet the increased needs generated not only new residents on this site but also to service the additional demands of the SEMAC project at NTU's Brackenhurst Campus. As identified in the accompanying BWB report the site is also well connected with footpaths and bridleways and cycle access can be achieved via a number of routes which connects not only to the Town but also the local railway stations. With my development partner I am also committed to developing and implementing a Green Travel Plan in order to facilitate this.

- In relation to Criteria 6, 7 and 8 it is my intention to focus public open space at the southern part of the site adjacent to Fiskerton Road and leave a substantial area undeveloped, changing this from agriculture to create new nature conservation/biodiversity areas and new open space/local amenities. In this way the development of this site will conserve any existing features (including the footpath and bridleway) and strengthen the overall role this site plays to Southwell as a nature, biodiversity, landscape and recreation resource. I feel that this meets the Council's objectives within the Landscape Character Assessment to conserve and reinforce.

- In relation to Criteria 9, in line with the advice I commissioned from consultant BWB, it would be my intention to mitigate any increased waterflows using SUDS or other appropriate techniques to ensure that there is no increased floodrisk to nearby properties if the site is developed (see Section 7 of the accompanying report).

However, I strongly disagree with your assessment of the site's suitability when judged against Criteria 1, 2, 4 and 5. Please note:

- In relation to Criteria 1 and 2, I wholeheartedly recognise the importance of integrating new housing development with the existing settlement of Southwell. I specifically acquired this land with that in mind. My land is immediately adjacent to sites designated through the LDF process as potential employment land (Sites SO/E/1 and SO/E/2) and for clarity I do not propose any significant employment development on my land (with the exception of a new Minster Veterinary Practice) and the proposal is therefore not contrary to the Council's employment strategy as stated. I recognise issues surrounding highways access and the potential bypass

## ***Land at Crew Lane/Fiskerton Road***

---

need to be addressed. My phasing proposals outlined below recognise this and my intention is to work closely with the adjacent landowners to bring forward an acceptable mixed use development solution to my land and theirs which integrates their employment allocation with my housing proposals, using the Minster Veterinary Practice building as part of that connectivity. I believe that this joint approach is possible.

- In relation to Criteria 4, I feel that the simple assumption previously made of the site being for 450 homes has created the impression that the site cannot be accessed from either Fiskerton Road or Crew Lane and is dependent on the construction of the bypass. My proposal is to bring forward this site for up to 300 homes and a relocated Minster Veterinary Practice, with two points of access and delivered in two phases. The first access would be gained from Fiskerton Road and would serve up to 150 homes in line with your local 6C's Design Guide 2011. The second access, subject to resolution of an agreed masterplan with neighbouring landowners and further dialogue with the highways authority, would be achieved from Crew Lane. These choices have been made following comprehensive research by BWB and discussions with partners and a potential development partner to ensure that this site can deliver new homes at an early stage, both to meet Southwell's housing needs and to enable cross funding to the SEMAC project. Please see the accompanying BWB report and Masterplan proposals for more detail on our plans.

- In relation to Criteria 5, the assumption in the consultation paper is that I intend to develop the entire site. However, as expressed above, my intention is only to develop an area sufficient to accommodate up to 300 new homes. This would leave a meaningful area of the site undeveloped which I would plan to focus at the southern end of the site creating a new nature conservation and local amenity resource. The selection of this part of the site, adjacent to Fiskerton Road, for the location of this has been deliberately chosen to take account of the need to protect important views from the Workhouse and the views of local people, expressed to me during a variety of consultations on the SEMAC proposal, that they would like to see the locally valued adjacent Christmas Trees enhanced as an important local landscape feature along with improved footpaths and bridleways. As a result of this undeveloped area, my proposal is in fact to bring forward up to 300 new homes, rather than the 450 identified in the Consultation Paper.

Considering all 9 Criteria in the round, I firmly believe that this site can be developed for housing and meet all 9 of your Criteria, with up to 150 homes being clearly deliverable in the short term and a further 150 homes being deliverable in due course with the benefit of further work which is already underway.

In addition to the above I would also, as invited, like to make comments on the effect the addition of my site has on the overall assessment of housing sites within the Core Strategy.

My understanding is that Southwell needs to provide up to 290 net new homes within the next plan period. As you know the other 6 sites you have identified as your preferred sites, whilst having merits when scored against your criteria, in practice have not so far come forward for development despite being proposed in some cases, for housing for many years. Your criteria do not acknowledge broader deliverability issues including the willingness of landowners to sell at a reasonable price, the presence of public support and other key factors which will ultimately determine whether each site is developed or not. As you know I have brought forward the SEMAC project since the Core Strategy was adopted and I have not therefore had the opportunity to comment on the criteria chosen. However, I would argue now that the absence of these broader deliverability criteria, particularly when presented with the deliverable proposals I am putting forward for SEMAC, raises questions over the soundness of your overall current strategy for meeting Southwell's housing needs.

## ***Land at Crew Lane/Fiskerton Road***

---

In contrast, in a short space of time I have acquired a potential housing site and selected a development partner with significant experience and track record delivering high quality housing. Given the Government's commitment to Localism, I have also undertaken a range of public consultation and have galvanised significant local support from partners and Southwell residents for the SEMAC project. This project not only has the potential to bring forward up to 300 homes (of which up to 150 could be delivered in a matter of 2-3 years) in a sustainable location seemingly acceptable to local people but also would achieve significant other economic, social and environmental benefits via development on other sites in Southwell (e.g. NTU's Brackenhurst Campus). I believe that the selection by the Council of my site, in place of some of the existing proposed housing sites, would significantly strengthen the soundness of the strategy for meeting Southwell's housing needs.

### **Any Other Comments**

These comments should be read in conjunction with the attached reports prepared by BWB ("Land at Crew Lane/Fiskerton Road, Southwell (Additional Site 4): Site Appraisal") and BAND/Eye ("SEMAC and Land at Crew Lane/Fiskerton Road – Draft development proposals – April 2012") which inform and support my comments above.

I have mentioned above some recent public consultation. This included a presentation I gave to Southwell Town Council on 4th April which, in addition to Councillors, at least 20 local people attended. I also organised my own SEMAC consultation event on 26th April which a further 38 local people attended. I imagine that some people will let you have comments directly but I have also set up a consultation e-mail address which enables me to capture all feedback and ensure that the project responds positively to this. Notwithstanding that your consultation process ends on 1st May my commitment to the SEMAC project means that I will be continuing with public consultation in the coming weeks and months. With this in mind for information a piece will be published in the Bramley this week.

---

**Comment Reference:** ADM/AS/20

**Post Town:** Southwell

**Company/Organisation:**

**Agent Post Town:**

**Agent Company/Organisation:**

**Additional Site Number:** Site 4

Crew Lane, Southwell is a narrow countryside lane and is used by farmers with their tractors and machines to tend their crops. It is not suitable for a large housing development etc, as this would mean lots of traffic which would cause lots of problems on such a narrow road.

I live not far from the proposed site and it would make a large impact on the countryside as you can see for miles around.

---

## ***Land at Crew Lane/Fiskerton Road***

---

**Comment Reference:** ADM/AS/23

**Post Town:** **Company/Organisation:** Southwell Traffic Action Group

**Agent Post Town:** **Agent Company/Organisation:**

**Additional Site Number:** Site 4

I wish to make my concerns felt in general about the proposed allocations of land for development in Southwell and the the proposal by SEMAC in particular. We have had a long campaign to try to improve safety on the A612 through Southwell, with a degree of success. However, the idea of industrial scale development on the edge of town, without the infrastructure to take the additional traffic, some of which will involve HGVs as well as lighter vehicles, is not well thought out. It would be grossly unfair for residents in the Easthorpe and Fiskerton Road to have to endure additional traffic. Access must be obtained via other routes than through the town, even if means a purpose built road. The road here is centuries old and not fit for 21st century traffic. Our homes are fragile and many are several hundred years old and only a few feet away from the traffic. We do not wish to have undone the small improvements made recently by NCC Highways along Easthorpe and Church Street.

There are also problems with the drains and there have been several blockages recently when sewage has backed up and overflowed. Here again, the infrastructure must be augmented to cope with additional impact from any new development.

While I appreciate the need for housing and some economic opportunities, these should not be on too large a scale or come at a cost to the town without the provision of necessary infrastructure and in particular access roads to avoid further congestion and damage to property along the A612. I trust these concerns will be taken into consideration.

---

**Comment Reference:** ADM/AS/25

**Post Town:** **Company/Organisation:** Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust

**Agent Post Town:** **Agent Company/Organisation:**

**Additional Site Number:** Site 4

## ***Land at Crew Lane/Fiskerton Road***

---

Additional Site 4 – Land at Crew Lane/Fiskerton Road

A survey of the site would be required to assess its ecological value and whether there would be a need for further surveys to ensure that protected species are properly considered in the determination of any planning application.

---

**Comment Reference:** ADM/AS/26

**Post Town:**

**Company/Organisation:**

**Agent Post Town:**

**Agent Company/Organisation:**

**Additional Site Number:** Site 4

I agree with the Council's assessment that the site is not considered suitable.

The scale of development, coupled with the nature, location and 'sculpture' of the site would have a significant adverse impact on the Eastern/South Eastern landscape of Southwell.

The mix of employment/housing is unspecified.

It should be noted that the Developer is currently lobbying throughout Southwell a scheme which appears to be in a state of constant change/flux.

---

**Comment Reference:** ADM/AS/27

**Post Town:**

**Company/Organisation:** Caunton Properties Limited

**Agent Post Town:** Pitsford

**Agent Company/Organisation:** Brian Barber Associates

**Additional Site Number:** Site 4

The site is not considered appropriate for mixed use development due to sustainability issues, uncertainties as to the extent of the mix of uses proposed and clarification as to how such an allocation would facilitate university and racecourse related development or how this would be accommodated within a site allocation.

## ***Land at Crew Lane/Fiskerton Road***

---

The site lies outside the settlement boundary and is separated from it by employment uses ( existing and proposed allocations) and, therefore, would have poor connectivity for residential occupiers to services and facilities within Southwell, in conflict with Spatial Policy 9 requirements.

The Council's site assessment also clearly sets out that there are a number of constraints which impact on the suitability of the site for a mixed use residential/employment allocation which has resulted in an overall assessment that the site is not suitable for either residential or employment land. This assessment is supported by Caunton Properties Limited.

---

**Comment Reference:** ADM/AS/28

**Post Town:** Southwell

**Company/Organisation:** Southwell Town Council

**Agent Post Town:**

**Agent Company/Organisation:**

**Additional Site Number:** Site 4

Land at Crew Lane /Fiskerton Road

Southwell Town Council agrees with the NSDC assessment on Alternative site 4 that this site is considered NOT SUITABLE.

The Town Council submitted a response to the Allocations and Development DPD which was formulated after much consultation with residents and is a carefully considered document which accommodates the proposed number of houses for Southwell. This alternative site is out of line with the DPD and contrary to the whole approach of the Town Council response.

---

**Comment Reference:** ADM/AS/29

**Post Town:** Basford

**Company/Organisation:** Antony Aspbury Associates Ltd

**Agent Post Town:**

**Agent Company/Organisation:**

**Additional Site Number:** Site 4

## ***Land at Crew Lane/Fiskerton Road***

---

We support the Council's assessment that the proposed site at Crew Lane / Fiskerton Road, Southwell is not a suitable site for development at this point in time. there are a number of reasons why we support the Council's position.

The site promoted at 15.5 hectares, is extremely large in the Southwell context, and potentially capable as, the Council indicate, of accommodating both the housing and employment requirements for the Southwell Area on this single site. If this site were to be allocated alongside the preferred sites, the scale of development proposed could effectively be double the quantum ratified in the adopted Core Strategy. Such increase would be contrary to the strategy of the Core Strategy which proposes a Newark based concentration on both housing and employment. With Southwell having a strong housing market and being located very close to Newark, there is a real prospect that a single large housing allocation could undermine development progress on one or more of the Strategic Urban extensions for Newark .

We similarly cannot support the consideration of this site as an alternative to the seven "preferred" residential site options put forward in the initial Allocations and Development Management Options Consultation. The selected sites identified to meet the residual housing need for Southwell, provide a range of development opportunities which will ensure choice and competition in the market for land as required by paragraph 47 of the NPPF. A single site option does not deliver choice or competition and can potentially lead to a constrained supply in circumstances where depressed land values may lead to a drip feed supply of land to the market. The current approach of around seven housing sites and two separate employment sites ensures a good range spread and distribution across the settlement and a very good prospect of delivery, in accordance with new NPPF guidance.

A further major consideration is the access constraint and the views of the County Council indicating that access from Crew Lane and /or Fiskerton Road would not be acceptable in advance of the construction of a Southwell by-pass. As such route is no more than a "long term aspiration in the Local Transport Plan" there are certainly no guarantees that the by-pass will be in place to assist the delivery of development in Southwell within the lifetime of the Site Allocations DPD. Thus the proposal, in our opinion, fails the test of paragraph 47 ( footnote 12) of the NPPF as it is not considered to be a reasonable prospect for viable development within the plan time frame of the DPD.

---

**Comment Reference:** ADM/AS/33

**Post Town:** **Company/Organisation:** Highways Agency

**Agent Post Town:** **Agent Company/Organisation:**

**Additional Site Number:** Site 4

No comments

---



## ***Land at Crew Lane/Fiskerton Road***

---

**Comment Reference:** ADM/AS/34

**Post Town:** **Company/Organisation:** The Coal Authority

**Agent Post Town:** **Agent Company/Organisation:**

**Additional Site Number:** Site 4

No comments

---

**Comment Reference:** ADM/AS/35

**Post Town:** **Company/Organisation:**

**Agent Post Town:** **Agent Company/Organisation:**

**Additional Site Number:** Site 4

Agree with the council tht the site on Crew Lane Site 4, is not suitable for reasons stated by the council in relation to access and impact on landscape, also the impact on the future bypass.

---

**Comment Reference:** ADM/AS/36

**Post Town:** **Company/Organisation:**

**Agent Post Town:** **Agent Company/Organisation:**

## ***Land at Crew Lane/Fiskerton Road***

---

**Additional Site Number:** Site 4

I agree with the council that this site is not suitable for the following reasons

- 1 Access not available in a safe manner
  - 2 Bypass difficulties
  - 3 Impact on landscape
- 

**Comment Reference:** ADM/AS/37

**Post Town:**

**Company/Organisation:**

**Agent Post Town:**

**Agent Company/Organisation:**

**Additional Site Number:** Site 4

- 3) Additional Site - Southwell
- 3.1 Additional Site 4 – Land at Crew Lane/Fiskerton Road

Question 4 – Do you agree with the Council’s assessment on Alternative Site 4?

YES - I agree that the site is not suitable for development as it would have significant impact on landscape.

---

**Comment Reference:** ADM/AS/38

**Post Town:**

**Company/Organisation:**

**Agent Post Town:**

**Agent Company/Organisation:**

**Additional Site Number:** Site 4

## ***Land at Crew Lane/Fiskerton Road***

---

I do not agree with the Council's assessment of Additional Site 4 and would SUPPORT its allocation, rather than the sites currently being proposed. Without having sight of the Highways Authority's comments it is hard to make a proper critique of the Council's conclusions about the potential access constraints. As you will be aware, however, there is always a solution to highways access and egress concerns and, given the size of the proposed site, and thus the capital that will be available to work with, it is far from being a foregone conclusion that such issues cannot be addressed. This being so, natural justice if nothing else would suggest that any decision by the Council is deferred until work can be completed by those promoting the site to establish whether a solution is achievable. It would be interesting to know whether those promoting preferred housing sites elsewhere in the town have undertaken sufficient work to demonstrate that their proposals will not create or exacerbate highways or other problems. Nothing is so far available publically to suggest that this is the case.

It is also unclear how the Council has reached the conclusion about the potential landscape impact of the proposal. It does not appear to fall within the proposed protected view zones for the town and, given the size of the site, there is no reason to suppose that all of it is required to meet the allocation requirement. Thus, the higher parts of the site could remain undeveloped.

Additional Site 4 could happily accommodate the totality of Southwell's housing need for the plan period and beyond, doing away with the need for further piecemeal erosion of the town's character. It would also mean that there would be no need to allocate sites off Halam Road and Lower Kirklington Road, which the Council's own initial Options Report acknowledges are important gateways to the town (rather thoughtlessly dismissed by the Report as being constraints of any concern). None of these sites have any significant local support, as the Council's Consultation Summary (notwithstanding its concerning amount of focus on the views of local Councillors) demonstrates. Indeed, residents are dismayed at the thought of the loss of the rural approaches to the town and the further erosion of the setting of the Southwell Trail. There is, however, strong support for development to the east. This being so, allocation of the land off Crew Lane would be a very sensible way of alleviating local concerns and securing the long-term development potential of the town, in line with the strategic approach set out by the Core Strategy.

Finally, and most pertinently, if Southwell is to receive more housing then it would be foolish of the Council to dismiss an option that could actually secure wider benefits to the town, in terms of leisure, tourism and economic development, in favour of sites that offer nothing but houses and the loss of highly regarded approaches to the town.

---

**Comment Reference:** ADM/AS/39

**Post Town:** Southwell

**Company/Organisation:**

**Agent Post Town:**

**Agent Company/Organisation:**

**Additional Site Number:** Site 4

## ***Land at Crew Lane/Fiskerton Road***

---

I agree with the Council's view that this site is unsuitable.

---

**Comment Reference:** ADM/AS/4

**Post Town:** Manby

**Company/Organisation:** Trent Valley Internal Drainage Board

**Agent Post Town:**

**Agent Company/Organisation:**

**Additional Site Number:** Site 4

The site is located outside of the boards district. It is assumed this site ultimately drains to the River Greet Main River. Therefore any increases in surface water discharge should be discussed with the Environment Agency.

---

**Comment Reference:** ADM/AS/40

**Post Town:** Southwell

**Company/Organisation:**

**Agent Post Town:**

**Agent Company/Organisation:**

**Additional Site Number:** Site 4

I don't understand the Highway's comments that the access to the site is restricted. There is a wide access on to Crew Lane from Upton Road to supply the Industrial Estate that exists, so it is only required to widen Crew Lane from the junction with the original Lane to the site itself.

Therefore, I don't agree that the development of the site is dependant on a by-pass and, as is rightly stated, anything to the east would be isolated from the rest of the town.

The extension of the site up to Fiskerton Road would be a concern as it would be very visible when approaching Southwell from Upton. However it should not be

## ***Land at Crew Lane/Fiskerton Road***

---

intrusive if confined to the lower part of the field.

---

**Comment Reference:** ADM/AS/5

**Post Town:**

**Company/Organisation:**

**Agent Post Town:**

**Agent Company/Organisation:**

**Additional Site Number:** Site 4

I would like to put forward my objections to the proposed Veterinary Centre/Housing/Jockey School to be situated on and around Crew Lane, Southwell.

- The site is in very open countryside, situated on its own.
  - It has no connection to Southwell- it would create its own new village on the outskirts.
  - Traffic in this area of Southwell is already heavily congested and couldn't cope with any additional housing and the traffic this creates.
  - It would be a negative visual approach to Southwell- easily seen by the Newark approach into Southwell.
  - Unfair to propose housing to generate income to fund the Veterinary Centre and the Jockey School. Each of these two business proposals should be able to fund themselves or obtain funding from banks as any other business would have to. If they were both viable proposals they would be greeted by banks for a business loan.
  - Is there a need for a new Jockey School- there is one already in Doncaster which is under-subscribed.
  - It is a late proposal, after everyone else has put forward their land, so why should it be allowed to be considered? What was the point of setting a deadline?
  - There are more applicable sites within Southwell that would fit in well with their surroundings.
- 

**Comment Reference:** ADM/AS/5

**Post Town:** Nottingham

**Company/Organisation:** Freeth Cartwright LLP Solicitors

**Agent Post Town:**

**Agent Company/Organisation:**

**Additional Site Number:** Site 4

## ***Land at Crew Lane/Fiskerton Road***

---

We write on behalf of our clients Mr and Mrs Maxey who have land interests in the Southwell area in response to the above consultation and specifically in response to the additional site for land at Crewe Lane/Viscerton Road Southwell.

Our clients object to the proposed additional site for the following reasons

1. It is noted in paragraph 3.2 of the consultation that the proposal is intended to help facilitate a new veterinary and equine facility at Southwell Racecourse, otherwise known as the Southwell and East Midlands Animal Centre (SEMAC). Whatever the merits of that particular proposal it is wholly inappropriate for the planning process to allocate land to meet housing and employment needs on the basis of facilitating and in this case we presume cross-subsidising other development that is unrelated to the proposal other than as an enabling development with no physical or land using planning link. We consider therefore that the development proposed should be considered on its merits and without reference to the SEMAC as a justification for it.

2. We wholly agree with the council's assessment of the alternative site and comment additionally.

(i) The site is severely restricted on access grounds notwithstanding the possibility of future access from a bypass to Southwell should one ever be built. Given that the Southwell bypass currently has only limited status, has not been subject to any planning application, is not funded (nor likely to achieve funding within the plan period) or in our submission necessary, we do not think it likely that such a bypass will be built in the foreseeable future. Even if despite how unlikely the bypass is to come forward, were it do so it would be several years and at best towards the very end of the plan period before it would be constructed and available to serve the development. Even in that unlikely scenario therefore the sites development potential is severely constrained in terms of timing and unlikely to deliver either housing or employment during the plan period to any significant degree.

(ii) The site is poorly located from a sustainability point of view beyond the existing edge of the town at a point furthest from crucial facilities such as schools, other social infrastructure and the town centre. Residents would have to traverse the new bypass, and Easthorpe which would remain a main road even in the event of the bypass being constructed before reaching the north eastern boundary of the town from which it would still be some distance to the community facilities available to serve the residents of a new development. It would therefore effectively necessitate and encourage use of the private car and would not therefore constitute sustainable development. The site would perform poorly by reference to other development opportunities already identified in the earlier consultations.

(iii) No information is available to determine whether existing infrastructure could be provided or improved to meet the need that would arise from this development. In particular no assessment has been made of surface water or foul water drainage capacity.

In conclusion therefore we would submit that this is a wholly inappropriate location for residential and the justification for it fatally flawed being reliant on other development to which therefore is no proper planning relationship.

Given the above, we trust this site will not be considered any further allocation.

---

## ***Land at Crew Lane/Fiskerton Road***

---

**Comment Reference:** ADM/AS/6

**Post Town:** Southwell

**Company/Organisation:**

**Agent Post Town:**

**Agent Company/Organisation:**

**Additional Site Number:** Site 4

Thank you for your e mail advising of this additional site and inviting my comments.

In general I support the provision of additional residential development in the area to the east and to the south west of Crewe Lane for the following reasons:-

- a) The Upton Road approach to Southwell is the least attractive, with a car showroom/repair shops (Sherwood Restorations), BP filling station and Crewe Lane Industrial Estate. Development here would take pressure off considering additional sites on Nottingham Road, Lower Kirklington Road and Halam Road (past Allenby Road) which all have a more attractive visual (particularly the Nottingham Road Minster view) worthy of preservation.
- b) I would condition my support on the redrawing of the preserved line of the (forever proposed) bypass. I do not see why the current line is viewed with papal infallibility. Currently it runs through the end of the Easthorpe conservation area and really spoils the final approach to the Easthorpe corner; it also cuts off the cottages on Fiskerton Road.
- c) I attach a plan with an approx. alternative route lined in blue such a revision would provide the following benefits:-
  - i) The total housing requirements for Southwell for the next twenty years could be accommodated in the area, incorporating a full range of housing needs, from affordable to family homes. (But hopefully released smoothly over that timescale).
  - ii) At a stroke the interminable debate in Southwell over which window box can be allocated for an additional plot would be ended.
  - iii) The infrastructure levy on such an area would fund any additional costs of the slightly longer by pass route.
  - iv) A truly forward looking council reserve the old council depot at the end of Fiskerton Road to provide a badly needed additional infants/junior school to serve both the new housing here plus the surrounding existing area which has seen development in recent years, and again fund some or possibly the whole cost from the infrastructure levy on this newly released area, Not only would this take pressure off Lowes Wong, it would be much more conveniently distanced for the young children of Easthorpe/Newark Road as well as the new area.
- d) The provision of Equine etc facilities and the employment prospects it would general appears a logical commercial use along the Racecourse Road edge of the area where housing may be considered inappropriate.

Following my lengthy comments in the original consultation concerning surface water issues on this site I now attach a recent photograph of the surface water flooding on Halloughton Road, emanating largely from this site together with a new spring (a la Springfield) that has appeared at my gatepost a couple of weeks ago.

## ***Land at Crew Lane/Fiskerton Road***

---

Additional Information attached

---

**Comment Reference:** ADM/AS/7

**Post Town:** Southwell

**Company/Organisation:**

**Agent Post Town:**

**Agent Company/Organisation:**

**Additional Site Number:** Site 4

I DO NOT AGREE WITH THE COUNCIL'S ASSESSMENT ON ALTERNATIVE SITE 4 FOR THE FOLLOWING REASONS:-

- a) The only employment development envisaged for the site by the owner is a veterinary surgery for small animals with an associated hospital facility.
- b) The equine hospital is proposed to be located on a separate site at Brackenhurst college and should not therefore be included in the consideration for Alternative Site 4.
- c) The jockey teaching and training facilities are anticipated to be located at the racecourse and should not be part of the consideration for Alternative Site 4.
- d) The built part of the development is not proposed to extend fully from Crew Lane to Fiskerton Road. The highest point for development on this area has been determined so that no buildings will be seen from the workhouse upper windows.
- e) The upper part of the site, adjacent to Fiskerton Road, is anticipated to remain as agricultural land or open space so that development will not be seen readily from motor vehicles on this route.
- f) It is evident from a site visit that neither existing proposed sites So/E/1 and So/E/2 nor the larger part of Alternative Site 4, impact on the views towards or from the workhouse.

Assurance that these site will continue to be screened could be given by protecting and perhaps improving the existing trees and hedges along the old railway line in the manner proposed for sites So/Ho/2 and So/Ho/4. The same provision could be made at the proposed limit to building on the land running up towards Fiskerton Road if there are concerns about visibility from the southwest.

In the earlier round of consultation, before this additional submission, I suggested part of Alternative Site 4 for development.



## ***Land at Crew Lane/Fiskerton Road***

---

I BELIEVE THE SPECIFIC PROPOSALS FOR ALTERNATIVE SITE 4 BY THE OWNER SHOULD BE TREATED AS A SIDE ISSUE AND THE SITE SHOULD BE ASSESSED SOLELY ON IT GENERIC MERIT FOR DEVELOPMENT NOT ON A SUBMISSION WHICH IS MORE APPROPRIATE TO A FULL PLANNING APPLICATION.

THE EXACT AREA FOR THE SITE SHOULD BE SUGGESTED BY OFFICIALS TAKING ACCOUNT OF THE "VIEWS" ISSUES OR THE ARA PROPOSED BY THE OWNER FOR BUILDING LAND ONLY.

Consideration should also be given to the proposal from Southwell Civic Society for the change in designation of Site So/E/2 to housing, to link with So/As/3 and the existing housing in Easthorpe. The area lost to employment from this change could be recouped by use of Alternative Site 4 between Crew Lane and the old railway line. This would allow for incremental growth of separate housing and employment land use in the area.

The perceived access problems for Alternative Site 4 can be overcome by a degree of lateral thinking depending on whether provision for a bypass is necessary, including:-

- a) Relocating some existing employment units in whole or in part to allow access to be built directly southeast from Crew Lane to the lower end of Alternative Site 4, between the present Squires depot and the garage.
- b) Repositioning the line of the bypass to allow sites presently designated So/E2 and So/AS/3 to be used for housing adjacent to development already built in Easthorpe.
- c) Allowing access to the proposed bypass at its crossover at Crew Lane.
- d) Constructing either a roundabout or traffic lights at the junction of Crew Lane and the A612 road.

GIVEN THE ABOVE, IT CAN BE DEMONSTRATED THAT ALTERNATIVE SITE 4 CAN MEET CRITERIA 1, 4, 5, 6, 7 AND 8 IN THE CORE STRATEGY SPATIAL POLICY 9.

THE SITE ALSO MEETS CRITERIA 2 AND 3 IN THAT IT IS CLOSE TO A LOCAL PETROL STATION/GENERAL STORE, PUBLIC HOUSE ETC. IT IS ALSO WITHIN WALKING DISTANCE OF PUBLIC TRANSPORT, THE PROVISION OF WHICH COULD BE ENHANCED BY MINOR ROUTE CHANGE.

THE SITE HAS DRAINAGE PROBLEMS ADJACENT TO THE OLD RAILWAY LINE BUT THESE CAN BE OVERCOME TO MEET CRITERION 9 BY EMPLOYING THE SAME TECHNIQUES USED TO ENABLE THE PRESENT EMPLOYMENT FACILITIES TO BE BUILT ON ADJACENT LAND.

---

**Comment Reference:** ADM/AS/8

## ***Land at Crew Lane/Fiskerton Road***

---

**Post Town:** Southwell

**Company/Organisation:** Southwell Civic Society

**Agent Post Town:**

**Agent Company/Organisation:**

**Additional Site Number:** Site 4

Southwell Civic Society agrees with some of the reasons for NSDC's rejection of the whole of Additional Site 4 for development, but the Society believes that the northern part of the site should be developed.

Reasons for rejection of Additional Site 4 proposal:

- a) The Civic Society believes that the site should be assessed solely on its generic merit and not on a submission which is more appropriate to a full planning application.
- b) The employment benefits claimed in the proposal are misleading. The only employment development envisaged for the site is a veterinary surgery for small animals with an associated hospital facility. The equine hospital is proposed to be located on a separate site at Brackenhurst College and the jockey teaching and training facilities are anticipated to be located at the racecourse. Therefore these should not be part of the consideration for Alternative Site 4.
- c) Development of the southern part of the site rising to Fiskerton Road would have an unacceptable landscape impact. However, Southwell Civic Society has already proposed housing development on the north-western part of this site, avoiding the most sensitive area. This proposal, shown on the attached map, was submitted with the Society's response to the previous stage of consultation in November 2011 and is submitted again.

Reasons for Southwell Civic Society proposal for Land on Crew Lane:

- a) Consideration should be given to the proposal from the Civic Society for the change in designation of Site So/E/2 to housing to link with So/As/3 and the existing housing in Easthorpe. The area lost to employment from this change could be recouped by extending So/E/1 eastwards between Crew Lane and the old railway line. This would allow for incremental growth of separate housing and employment land use in the area.
- b) It is evident from a site visit that neither sites So/E/1 or So/E2, nor their extension eastwards, as proposed by the Civic Society, would impact on the views towards, or from, the Workhouse. Assurance that these sites will continue to be screened could be given by protecting, and perhaps improving, the existing trees and hedges along the old railway line in the manner proposed for sites So/Ho/2 and So/Ho/4. The same provision could be made at the proposed limit to building on the land running up toward Fiskerton Road if there are concerns about visibility from the southwest.

## ***Land at Crew Lane/Fiskerton Road***

---

c) Access problems for the Civic Society proposal would be much less than perceived for the whole of Additional Site 4, and could be overcome.

Given the above, it can be demonstrated that development of that part of Additional Site 4 proposed by the Civic Society, and shown on the attached map, can meet criteria 1, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 of Core Strategy Spatial Policy 9. The site also meets criteria 2 and 3 in that it is close to a local petrol station/general store, public house etc. It is also within walking distance of public transport, the provision of which could be enhanced by minor route change. The site has drainage problems adjacent to the old railway line but these can be overcome to meet criterion 9 by employing the same techniques used to enable the present employment facilities to be built on adjacent land.

---