



**Newark & Sherwood District Council**

**Matter 6:  
Employment Development**

**October 2024**

## Contents

### **Issue 1 – Whether the Plan makes Adequate Provision for Employment Development ..... 2**

Q6.1	Are the scenarios in the Nottingham Core HMA and Nottingham Outer HMA Employment Land Needs Study (the Employment Land Needs Study) soundly based and justified? .....	2
Q6.2	How do the conclusions on employment land demand/supply in the Employment Land Needs Study relate specifically to the allocations in Newark and Sherwood District? .....	2
Q6.3	Are the post Covid Experian September 2020 projections still sound? .....	2
Q6.4	Are the employment allocations based on a robust site selection methodology, positively prepared and will they be deliverable in accordance with the trajectory in Appendix C? .....	3
Q6.5	Site-Specific Summaries and Questions .....	6
	Newark Urban Area .....	7
	Collingham .....	12
	Southwell .....	13
	Ollerton and Boughton .....	14
	Bilsthorpe .....	15
	Rainworth .....	16
	Clipstone .....	18
	Blidworth .....	19
Q6.6	Is the provision of employment land sufficient for ‘big box’ schemes? .....	20
Q6.7	Is the phasing approach in Policy NUA/Ph/1 justified and will it be effective in bringing development forward at the right time? Are there any potential barriers to the phasing envisaged? .....	20

## **Issue 1 – Whether the Plan makes Adequate Provision for Employment Development**

### **Q6.1 Are the scenarios in the Nottingham Core HMA and Nottingham Outer HMA Employment Land Needs Study (the Employment Land Needs Study) soundly based and justified?**

A: The Employment Land Needs Study (ELNS, [EMP2](#)), produced by Lichfields in 2021, uses a robust methodology based on the requirements of the NPPF and Planning Practice Guidance (PPG). The study provides an understanding of future requirements for employment land, at both the Functional Economic Market Area (FEMA) and authority level, over the period to 2038 and makes recommendations about the quantity and quality of sites.

Please see the Briefing Note on Employment Land Needs (submitted as part of Newark & Sherwood District Council's response to the Inspector's MIQs) which sets out in detail why it is considered that the scenarios in the ELNS are soundly based and justified.

### **Q6.2 How do the conclusions on employment land demand/supply in the Employment Land Needs Study relate specifically to the allocations in Newark and Sherwood District?**

A: The level of need for employment land in the District is set in the Adopted Core Strategy (ACS) ([CD16](#)). The figures in the ACS are taken from the Nottingham Core HMA and Nottingham Outer HMA Employment Land Forecasting Study (ELFS) ([EMP 1](#)). This used a robust methodology to provide evidence on economic prospects and employment land forecasts.

The Employment Land Needs Study (ELNS) ([EMP 2](#)) takes account of the ELFS and provides more up-to date information. The assessment of employment land supply and demand is consistent with the ELFS and the ACS. The ELNS looks at different scenarios and concludes, in Paragraph 10.21, that regardless of which scenario is considered, *'the District already appears to have a substantial supply of committed and allocated employment land that would appear to meet the need in full.'*

The most recent Employment Land Availability Study (ELAS) ([EMP 4](#)) available shows that as of April 1<sup>st</sup> 2023, shows there was 103.52ha of employment land beyond the required 83.1ha provided in the District during the Plan period. This level of supply means that there are a wide range of different sites throughout the District in a variety of sizes and locations. This provides flexibility for developers.

### **Q6.3 Are the post Covid Experian September 2020 projections still sound?**

A: These projections reflect the time at which they were produced, and the growth in the logistics sector that has taken place is greater than predicted. Please see the Briefing Note on Employment Land Needs (submitted as part of Newark & Sherwood District Council's response to the Inspector's MIQs) which discusses the implications of this.

**Q6.4 Are the employment allocations based on a robust site selection methodology, positively prepared and will they be deliverable in accordance with the trajectory in Appendix C?**

A: The sites in the AADMDPD ([CD01a](#)) are carried forward from the Allocations & Development Management DPD (ADMDPD) (2013) ([CD17](#)). The methodology used to select the sites in the AADMDPD is set out in Appendix B of the ADMDPD (2013). The following table provides a summary of the methodology that was used by the Council to identify preferred site allocations:

**Table 6.1 - Site Selection Methodology**

STAGE 1 – Information Gathering	Identify sites from the following sources: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA)</li> <li>• Northern Sub-Regional Employment Land Review</li> <li>• Employment Land Availability Study</li> <li>• Other sites which have been put forward to the Council.</li> <li>• Other studies suggesting sites and boundaries (Retail and Town Centre Study, etc.)</li> </ul>
STAGE 2 – Selecting a “pool” of sites	Discount the following sites: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Sites which are not in or adjacent to the settlements where allocation will occur.</li> <li>2. Sites which are wholly within Flood Zone 2 and 3 (In Newark consideration will need to be given to riverside regeneration sites which may flood)</li> <li>3. Sites which have a significant negative impact on nationally and internationally important nature conservation sites (In Edwinstowe and other locations consideration will need to be given to the impact on the SAC)</li> <li>4. Sites that would have a significant negative effect on a national heritage asset.</li> <li>5. Sites below 0.3 hectares in size.</li> </ol>
STAGE 3 – Analysis of the “pool” of sites	Consider the sites against <b>Spatial Policy 9 of the Core Strategy</b> , “Selecting Appropriate Sites for Allocations” and any other relevant policies such as Spatial Policy 4A Extent of the Green Belt and SoAP1 Role of the Setting of Southwell.
STAGE 4 – Overall Settlement Analysis	Consider the overall impact of site selection on a settlement taking into account: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Infrastructure Impact</li> <li>2. Potential other users for sites</li> <li>3. Results of other studies</li> <li>4. Overall deliverability</li> </ol>
Results	The overall settlement analysis will provide the Council with the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sites forming a Preferred Approach</li> <li>• Alternative Sites</li> <li>• Sites Not Considered Suitable</li> </ul>

The SHLAA is now referred to as the SHELAA.

As shown in the table above, the site selection process employed by the District Council had four distinct stages. The initial stage of the process consisted of a period of information gathering in order to identify sites. These sites were identified from a range of sources, including evidence base documents and sites which have been put forward to the Council.

Once this initial list of sites had been generated, the Council created a 'pool' of potential sites by discounting those sites that were below a certain size, subject to an over-riding constraint or which were not in or adjacent to a settlement where allocations will occur.

Each of the sites in this 'pool' was then analysed by the Council in order to ensure that the sites selected are the most appropriate and sustainable. Specifically, each potential site was analysed against the criteria in Spatial Policy 9 of the Core Strategy (2011) which set out the guiding principles that were used to make allocations to meet development needs within the District. This policy stated that:

Sites allocated for housing, employment, and community facilities as part of the A&DM DPD will:

1. Be in, or adjacent to, the existing settlement;
2. Be accessible and well related to existing facilities;
3. Be accessible by public transport, or demonstrate that the provision of such services could be viably provided;
4. Be the most sustainable in terms of impact on existing infrastructure, or demonstrate that infrastructure can be provided to address sustainability issues;
5. Not impact adversely on the special character of the area; including not impacting on important open spaces and views, all designated heritage assets including listed buildings or locally important buildings, especially those identified in Conservation Area Appraisals;
6. Appropriately address the findings of the Landscape Character Assessment and the conservation and enhancement actions of the particular landscape policy zone / zones affected;
7. Not lead to the loss, or adverse impact on, important nature conservation or biodiversity sites;
8. Not lead to the loss of locally important open space or, in the case of housing and employment, other locally important community facilities (unless adequately replaced); and
9. Not be located in areas of flood risk or contribute to flood risk on neighbouring sites.

Each potential development site was assessed against these criteria in order to ensure that all reasonable alternatives were considered by the District Council. This assessment drew upon information in the SHLAA, the Northern Sub Region Employment Land Study and other evidence base studies as well as the knowledge and judgement of Planning Officers.

The final stage in the site selection process was an analysis of the overall impact of site selection on a settlement. This analysis took into account a range of issues, including the impact of the allocations on the infrastructure of the settlement and the findings of other assessments. This final stage of the process provided the Council with a series of sites that were considered to form a Preferred Approach, a number of Alternative Sites and Sites which are not considered to be suitable. Whilst this document did identify the Council's preferred sites for site allocations in each settlement, it was recognised that consultation on this document may reveal other issues which could

affect that view. A number of potential alternative sites, together with sites which the Council did not consider to be suitable, were therefore also included within the Options Report to enable comments to be submitted on these.

Following the receipt of consultation responses, a number of sites were reassessed against the original criteria. This included in some instances the assessment of small parts of a site formerly assessed as unsuitable in their entirety.

The employment allocations are positively prepared in that they provide a strategy to meet the District's objectively assessed employment needs. Newark & Sherwood District Council and the other LPAs in the same Functional Economic Market Area (FEMA) are in agreement that each authority can and will meet its own employment land needs.

The District Council believes that the employment allocations are deliverable in accordance with the trajectory in Appendix C. The ELNS ([EMP 2](#)), in paragraph 9.97, refers to the '*consistently high levels of delivery [of employment land] Newark & Sherwood has experienced over the past 11 years or more*'. Two large employment schemes (20/01452/OUTM and 21/02408/FULM) are currently under construction, indicating Newark & Sherwood District remains an attractive location for such developments. When the Southern Link Road is completed, which is expected to be in the first quarter of 2026, the 50ha of employment land at Land South of Newark will be available for development.

## **Q6.5 Site-Specific Summaries and Questions**

**Note** – the following question applies to each of the proposed employment site allocations. The Council is requested to respond to all of the questions put. Representors should respond with relevance to the representations they made at Regulation 19 consultation stage.

### **Question 6.5**

- a. **Is the proposed scale of employment development justified, having regard to any constraints and the provision of necessary infrastructure?**
- b. **Is the allocation consistent with the development strategy in the Core Strategy?**
- c. **What is the likely impact of the proposed development on the following factors:**
  - **Settlement separation and identity and landscape character;**
  - **The strategic and local highway network;**
  - **Air and water quality, noise pollution, land stability and flood risk.**
- d. **Are the development requirements clear and deliverable and are any further safeguards or mitigation measures necessary to achieve an acceptable form of development? Are any main modifications necessary for soundness?**
- e. **Have any further permissions been granted since the Plan was submitted for Examination?**

**For clarity and ease of reference, some material from the District Council response to questions from Matter 2 is reproduced here as employment uses are considered appropriate in these areas.**

## Newark Urban Area

### SHELAA Settlement Summaries for [Balderton](#), [Newark](#) and [Winthorpe](#)

#### NUA/E/2 – Newark Employment Site 2 – Stephenson Way

**Is the proposed scale of employment development justified, having regard to any constraints and the provision of necessary infrastructure?**

Yes, it is considered that the scale of employment development is justified. The Spatial Strategy set out in the Amended Core Strategy (ACS) ([CD16](#)) identifies Newark as a Sub-Regional Centre. The ACS was considered sound on Examination. In the ACS, an appropriate level of development of all types is apportioned to Newark. This site is within the Newark Industrial Estate Policy Area (Policy NUA/E/1) where new employment development is encouraged. Consideration of infrastructure provision was undertaken as part of the production of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) which supports the ACS.

**Is the allocation consistent with the development strategy in the Core Strategy?**

Yes, the allocation is consistent with the development strategy in the Core Strategy. Newark Industrial Estate Policy Area is identified in the ACS as the Current Major Employment Site. As Newark is a Sub-Regional Centre, it is an appropriate settlement to direct employment development to, in line with Core Policy 6 of the ACS.

**What is the likely impact of the proposed development on the following factors:**

- **Settlement separation and identity and landscape character;**
- **The strategic and local highway network;**
- **Air and water quality, noise pollution, land stability and flood risk.**

Due to the site's location, there is unlikely to be any significant impact on settlement separation. The allocation is within an existing industrial area where further employment development will have little impact on settlement identity. The two parcels of land are currently open green spaces potentially visible from the A1. Policy NUA/E/2 requires that any proposal includes an appropriate landscaping scheme providing screening of the site from the A1, and this should ensure that any impacts on landscape character are minimal.

Policy NUA/E/1 states that The Bridge Ward Neighbourhood Study identified key concerns with traffic flow and parking within the Policy Area. Policy DM2 requires that proposals on allocated sites should be accompanied by transport, flood risk and other appropriate assessments sufficient to address the site-specific issues identified in the AADMDPD. Also, Newark & Sherwood District Council's Planning Application Local Validation Checklist requires that development on all allocated sites should be supported by a Transport Statement or Transport Assessment. Potential impacts on the strategic and local highway network would therefore be considered as part of any planning application.

Policy DM10 requires that development proposals involving the potential for pollution should take account of and address their potential impacts in terms of health, the natural environment and general amenity on, among other things: neighbouring land uses; the wider population; ground and surface water, water courses and water quality; and air quality. Noise pollution would be addressed under 'neighbouring land uses' and 'the wider population,' and air and water quality are referred to directly. Where land stability is an issue, this is addressed by Policy DM5(b), as is flood risk. Beyond this, Policy NUA/E/2 requires the submission of a Site-Specific Flood Risk Assessment and details of measures to mitigate the potential for on-site surface water flooding risk, management of run-off and ensure that flood risk is not increased elsewhere.

**Are the development requirements clear and deliverable and are any further safeguards or mitigation measures necessary to achieve an acceptable form of development? Are any main modifications necessary for soundness?**

Yes, it is considered that the development requirements are clear and deliverable. Site specific requirements reflect information gained from consultation and in the Evidence Base. All safeguards and necessary mitigation measures are set out in the wider Plan. There is nothing to indicate that there is a need for change requiring main modifications.

**Have any further permissions been granted since the Plan was submitted for Examination?**

No

#### NUA/E/3 Newark Employment Site 3 – Telford Drive

**Is the proposed scale of employment development justified, having regard to any constraints and the provision of necessary infrastructure?**

Planning permission has been granted for effectively all of this site. A small area does not have permission, but it is too small to be meaningfully developed so the site is now regarded as having 0ha left available.



**Is the allocation consistent with the development strategy in the Core Strategy?**

Yes, the allocation is consistent with the development strategy in the Core Strategy. Newark Industrial Estate Policy Area is identified in the ACS as the Current Main Employment Site. As Newark is a Sub-Regional Centre, it is an appropriate settlement to direct employment development to, in line with Core Policy 6 of the ACS.

**What is the likely impact of the proposed development on the following factors:**

- **Settlement separation and identity and landscape character;**
- **The strategic and local highway network;**
- **Air and water quality, noise pollution, land stability and flood risk.**

These issues, where relevant, would have been addressed at the planning application stage.

**Are the development requirements clear and deliverable and are any further safeguards or mitigation measures necessary to achieve an acceptable form of development? Are any main modifications necessary for soundness?**

As this site is now covered by planning permissions in line with the policy, it is considered that acceptable forms of development have been achieved here.

**Have any further permissions been granted since the Plan was submitted for Examination?**

No, but 22/01304/FUL was granted permission on 4<sup>th</sup> April 2023.

**NUA/E/4 Newark Employment Site 4 – Former Highways Depot, Great North Road**

**Is the proposed scale of employment development justified, having regard to any constraints and the provision of necessary infrastructure?**

Yes, it is considered that the scale of employment development is justified. The Spatial Strategy set out in the Amended Core Strategy (ACS) identifies Newark as a Sub-Regional Centre. The ACS was considered sound on Examination. In the ACS, an appropriate level of development of all types is apportioned to Newark. This site was a depot for Nottinghamshire County Council and as such was an established location for employment uses before being allocated. Consideration of infrastructure provision was undertaken as part of the production of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) which supports the ACS.

**Is the allocation consistent with the development strategy in the Core Strategy?**

Yes, the allocation is consistent with the development strategy in the Core Strategy. As Newark is a Sub-Regional Centre, it is an appropriate settlement to direct employment development to, in line with Core Policy 6 of the ACS.

**What is the likely impact of the proposed development on the following factors:**

- **Settlement separation and identity and landscape character;**
- **The strategic and local highway network;**
- **Air and water quality, noise pollution, land stability and flood risk.**

Due to the site's location, there is unlikely to be any impact on settlement separation. As the site is an established location for employment uses, if it is brought back into such use, there will be no impact on settlement identity. Policy NUA/E/4 requires appropriate design which addresses the site's gateway location and manages the transition into Newark Urban Area including retention and enhancement of existing boundary planting on the Great North Road/Kelham Road boundary. This means any impacts on landscape character are likely to be beneficial.

Newark & Sherwood District Council's Planning Application Local Validation Checklist requires that development on all allocated sites should be supported by a Transport Statement or Transport Assessment. Potential impacts on the strategic and local highway network would therefore be considered as part of any planning application.

Policy DM10 requires that development proposals involving the potential for pollution should take account of and address their potential impacts in terms of health, the natural environment and general amenity on, among other things: neighbouring land uses; the wider population; ground and surface water, water courses and water quality; and air quality. Noise pollution would be addressed under 'neighbouring land uses' and 'the wider population,' and air and water quality are referred to directly. Where land stability is an issue, this is addressed by Policy DM5(b), as is flood risk. Beyond this, Policy NUA/E/4 requires the submission of a Site-Specific Flood Risk Assessment, and details of measures to mitigate on-site flooding risk and ensure that flood risk is not increased elsewhere.

**Are the development requirements clear and deliverable and are any further safeguards or mitigation measures necessary to achieve an acceptable form of development? Are any main modifications necessary for soundness?**

Yes, it is considered that the development requirements are clear and deliverable. Site specific requirements reflect information gained from consultation and in the Evidence Base. All safeguards and necessary mitigation measures are set out in the wider Plan. There is nothing to indicate that there is a need for change requiring main modifications.

**Have any further permissions been granted since the Plan was submitted for Examination?**

No, but there is a pending application for temporary use of the site (up to 2029) in the form of a Draft Development Consent Order. This is for the site to be used as a depot for National Highways while work is undertaken on the A46.

**NUA/SPA/1 – Newark Showground Policy Area**

**Please note that this section responds to part c of Question 2.10, of Issue 3 of Matter 2 and Question 6.5 of Matter 6.**

**What is the likely impact of the proposed development on the following factors:**

- Settlement separation and identity and landscape character;
- Biodiversity, green infrastructure, including public rights of way and agricultural land quality;
- Heritage assets;
- The strategic and local highway network and other infrastructure including health facilities, education, and open space;
- Air and water quality, noise pollution, land stability and flood risk

The A46 and the presence of the Open Break will prevent the sense of separation from Winthorpe being undermined. There have been uses related to the Showground in this location for many years so there will be little impact on settlement identity. Policy NUA/SPA/1 requires that development proposals must address the need to achieve high quality sustainable building design and comprehensive integrated landscaping so any impacts should be beneficial, although as this type of development is familiar in this location the effects landscape character should be minimal. The Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA) concluded that there would be no direct impacts on the 'landscape and land use' IIA objective.

The IIA concluded that Policy NUA/SPA/1 had no direct impact on the 'biodiversity' IIA objective. Any matters regarding biodiversity and green infrastructure will be addressed at the planning application stage. Newark & Sherwood District Council's Planning Application Local Validation Checklist requires an Ecological Appraisal and Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment for most developments<sup>1</sup> which will identify where a site is likely to support protected or priority species and identify the habitats present. Public rights of way and agricultural land will be unaffected by Policy NUA/SPA/1.

The IIA concluded that Policy NUA/SPA/1 conflicts with the 'historic environment and cultural assets' IIA objective and may have adverse impacts. It states that there is 'potential conflict with this IIA objective arising from increasing the extent of the area allocated for employment or leisure/visitor economy uses, relative to the site's proximity to Winthorpe Conservation Area. It is, however, expected that any potentially harmful impacts could be mitigated as part of any future development proposals.' Impacts should therefore be minimal. Additionally, Policy NUA/SPA/1 requires 'the investigation of potential archaeology on the site and any necessary post-determination mitigation measures secured by condition on any planning consent reflecting the high archaeological potential of the site'.

Policy NUA/SPA/1 requires development proposals in this area to deal with the need to address access constraints relating to the A1/A46/A17 junctions, including the A46 Newark Northern Bypass dualling identified in the Road Investment Strategy 2. Policy NUA/MU/1 states that until appropriate improvements have been made to the A1/A46/A17 Junction, any proposed development will need to demonstrate that it will not generate significant a.m. and p.m. peak traffic as part of any planning application. Additionally, Newark & Sherwood District Council's Planning Application Local Validation Checklist requires that development on all allocated sites should be supported by a Transport Statement or Transport Assessment. Potential impacts on the strategic and local highway network will be considered as part of any planning application. All impacts on other infrastructure including health facilities, education and open space would be dealt with at the planning application stage by way of S106 or CIL.

Policy DM10 requires development proposals involving the potential for pollution should take account of and address their potential impacts in terms of health, the natural environment and general amenity on, among other things: neighbouring land uses; the wider population; ground and surface water, water courses and water quality; and air quality. Noise pollution would be addressed under 'neighbouring land uses' and 'the wider population,' and air and water quality are referred to directly. Where land stability is an issue, this is addressed by Policy DM5(b), as is flood risk. Additionally, Policy NUA/SPA/1 requires that developments in this area address any issues arising from the proposals which may adversely affect nearby residents, which will also ensure that these issues are appropriately considered.

**Site-Specific Questions from Matter 2**

<sup>1</sup> Subject to some specific exemptions

**How will engagement with the County Council, National Highways, parish councils and landowners take place and how will a masterplan for the policy area be agreed upon? Will it be deliverable?**

A: Whilst no official master planning for the wider Showground Policy Area has been undertaken detailed discussions amongst the various landowners and the District Council have been ongoing for some time. This is reflected in the proposed main modifications (MM1 and 17) put forward by the Council in response to the representations of various landowners (s [067/NUA/MU/1/T2/0186](#) and [075/NUA/MU/1/T2/0209](#)). Whilst development has occurred at NUA/MU/1 (Overfield Park), one of the key factors regarding a policy area master plan has been the ongoing process of developing the A46 Bypass proposals. which are key to understanding the opportunities and future constraints that will influence the development of the policy area. Now this process is completed the District Council will work with the various landowners and other interested parties named in the policy to progress a masterplan.

**What is the timescale for improvements being made to the A1/A46/A17 junction and is there funding in place for those improvements?**

A: The improvements to the A1/A46/A17 junction forms part of the A46 scheme being taken forward by National Highways. The scheme is currently awaiting DCO approval, which commenced in May 2024 and is due for completion by Spring 2025. It is anticipated that the scheme will commence in early 2026 and will be delivered by [National Highways](#) with Government funding.

**Does the reference to the Highways Agency require updating?**

A: Yes, it should be updated to National Highways. An additional Clarification Modification will be proposed to address this.

**NUA/MU/1 Newark Mixed Use Site 1 – Land north of A17**

Please note that this section responds to part c of Question 2.10, of Issue 3 of Matter 2 and Question 6.5 of Matter 6.

**Is the proposed scale of employment development justified, having regard to any constraints and the provision of necessary infrastructure?**

Yes, it is considered that the scale of employment development is justified. The Spatial Strategy set out in the Amended Core Strategy (ACS) identifies Newark as a Sub-Regional Centre. The ACS was considered sound on Examination. In the ACS, an appropriate level of development of all types is apportioned to Newark. Although this site is outside Newark's Urban Boundary, it is within the Newark Showground Policy Area where certain types of development are considered appropriate. Consideration of infrastructure provision was undertaken as part of the production of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) which supports the ACS.

Main Modifications 1 ([MM1](#)) is being proposed to address representations made on behalf of Newark & Nottinghamshire Agricultural Society ([067/NUA/MU/1/T2/0186](#)) and Lindum Developments (Ref [075/NUA/MU/1/T2/0209](#)) that a hotel and conference facility is no longer going to be delivered on this site.

Main Modification 17 ([MM17](#)) is being proposed for this site in response to representations made on behalf of Newark & Nottinghamshire Agricultural Society (Ref [67/NUA/MU/1/T2/00186](#)) and Lindum Developments (Ref [75/NUA/MU/1/T2/0209](#)). It is considered appropriate to make this modification to facilitate the development of the site and reflect the landholdings of the two organisations.

**Is the allocation consistent with the development strategy in the Core Strategy?**

Yes, the allocation is consistent with the development strategy in the Core Strategy. As Newark is a Sub-Regional Centre, it is an appropriate settlement to direct employment development to, in line with Core Policy 6 of the ACS. Although this site is outside Newark's Urban Boundary, it is close enough to contribute to meeting Newark's development requirements.

**What is the likely impact of the proposed development on the following factors:**

- Settlement separation and identity and landscape character;
- Biodiversity, green infrastructure, including public rights of way and agricultural land quality;
- Heritage assets;
- The strategic and local highway network and other infrastructure including health facilities, education, and open space;
- Air and water quality, noise pollution, land stability and flood risk

The A46 and the presence of the Open Break will prevent the sense of separation from Winthorpe being undermined. NUA/MU/1 is within the Newark Showground Policy Area where there is already employment development and uses related to the Showground so there will be little impact on settlement identity. Policy NUA/SPA/1 requires that development proposals must address the need to achieve high quality sustainable building design and comprehensive integrated landscaping so any impacts should be beneficial, although as this type of development is familiar in this location the effects on and landscape character should be minimal. The Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA) concluded that there would be no direct impacts on the 'landscape and land use' IIA objective.

The IIA concluded that Policy NUA/MU/1 had no direct impact on the 'biodiversity' IIA objective. Any matters regarding biodiversity and green infrastructure will be addressed at the planning application stage. Newark & Sherwood District Council's Planning Application Local Validation Checklist requires an Ecological Appraisal and Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment for most developments<sup>2</sup> which will identify where a site is likely to support protected or priority species and identify the habitats present. Public rights of way and agricultural land will be unaffected by Policy NUA/MU/1.

NUA/MU/1 is not in a Conservation Area and the IIA concluded NUA/MU/1 has no direct impact on the historic environment objective. Therefore, there are no likely impacts anticipated of the proposed development on heritage assets. Additionally, Policy NUA/SPA/1 requires 'the investigation of potential archaeology on the site and any necessary post-determination mitigation measures secured by condition on any planning consent reflecting the high archaeological potential of the site'.

Policy NUA/SPA/1 requires development proposals in this area to deal with the need to address access constraints relating to the A1/A46/A17 junctions, including the A46 Newark Northern Bypass dualling identified in the Road Investment Strategy 2. Policy NUA/MU/1 (as amended) states that until appropriate improvements have been made to the A1/A46/A17 Junction, any proposed development will need to demonstrate that it will not generate significant a.m. and p.m. peak traffic as part of any planning application. Additionally, Newark & Sherwood District Council's Planning Application Local Validation Checklist requires that development on all allocated sites should be supported by a Transport Statement or Transport Assessment. Potential impacts on the strategic and local highway network will be considered as part of any planning application. All impacts on other infrastructure including health facilities, education and open space would be dealt with at the planning application stage by way of S106 or CIL.

Policy DM10 requires development proposals involving the potential for pollution should take account of and address their potential impacts in terms of health, the natural environment and general amenity on, among other things: neighbouring land uses; the wider population; ground and surface water, water courses and water quality; and air quality. Noise pollution would be addressed under 'neighbouring land uses' and 'the wider population,' and air and water quality are referred to directly. Where land stability is an issue, this is addressed by Policy DM5(b), as is flood risk. Additionally, Policy NUA/SPA/1 requires that developments in this area address any issues arising from the proposals which may adversely affect nearby residents, which will also ensure that these issues are appropriately considered.

**Are the development requirements clear and deliverable and are any further safeguards or mitigation measures necessary to achieve an acceptable form of development? Are any main modifications necessary for soundness?**

Subject to the main modifications set out above it is considered that the development requirements clear and deliverable. Site specific requirements reflect information gained from consultation and in the Evidence Base. All safeguards and necessary mitigation measures are set out in the wider Plan.

**Have any further permissions been granted since the Plan was submitted for Examination?**

No, but at the time of writing, two proposals (23/01283/OUTM and 23/02281/OUTM) are pending consideration.

---

<sup>2</sup> Subject to some specific exemptions

## **Collingham**

### **CO/MU/1 Collingham Mixed Use Site 1 – Swinderby Road**

**Is the proposed scale of employment development justified, having regard to any constraints and the provision of necessary infrastructure?**

The employment element of this allocation has been fully developed.

**Have any further permissions been granted since the Plan was submitted for Examination?**

There is no remaining employment land on CO/MU/1.

## **Southwell**

### **SHELAA Settlement Summary for Southwell**

#### **SO/E/2 Southwell - Land to the east of Crew Lane**

**Is the proposed scale of employment development justified, having regard to any constraints and the provision of necessary infrastructure?**

Yes, it is considered that the scale of employment development is justified. The Spatial Strategy set out in the Amended Core Strategy (ACS) identifies Southwell as a Service Centre. The ACS was considered sound on Examination. In the ACS, an appropriate level of development of all types is apportioned to Southwell. This site is within the Crew Lane Industrial Estate Policy Area (Policy So/E/1) where new employment development is encouraged. Consideration of infrastructure provision was undertaken as part of the production of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) which supports the ACS. The boundaries of this allocation have been amended to take account of flood risk.

**Is the allocation consistent with the development strategy in the Core Strategy?**

Yes, the allocation is consistent with the development strategy in the Core Strategy. As Southwell is a Service Centre, it is an appropriate settlement to direct employment development to, in line with Core Policy 6 of the ACS.

**What is the likely impact of the proposed development on the following factors:**

- **Settlement separation and identity and landscape character;**
- **The strategic and local highway network;**
- **Air and water quality, noise pollution, land stability and flood risk.**

Due to the site's location, there is unlikely to be any impact on settlement separation. While the development of this site would extend the built-up area onto what was formerly open countryside, Southwell's distance from other settlements in this direction means that the sense of separation will be maintained. When this site is developed, it will extend an area of existing employment development and so should have little impact on settlement identity. The site is within the Urban Boundary and the impacts on landscape character of its development were considered at the stage of site selection. The IIA judged that the allocation of this site would have no impact or a neutral effect on landscape and land use.

Policy So/E/1 provides protection from negative impacts on landscape character affecting Thurgarton Hundred Workhouse, which adjoins the Policy Area. This policy states that those proposals which have the potential to negatively impact on the setting of the Workhouse will not normally be acceptable. It requires development proposals to demonstrate an appropriate design, layout and scale which respects and enhances the immediate surroundings of the Workhouse taking account of the need for suitable height and massing and the provision of appropriate mitigating measures such as landscape screening.

Newark & Sherwood District Council's Planning Application Local Validation Checklist requires that development on all allocated sites should be supported by a Transport Statement or Transport Assessment. Potential impacts on the strategic and local highway network would therefore be considered as part of any planning application.

Policy DM10 requires development proposals involving the potential for pollution should take account of and address their potential impacts in terms of health, the natural environment and general amenity on, among other things: neighbouring land uses; the wider population; ground and surface water, water courses and water quality; and air quality. Noise pollution would be addressed under 'neighbouring land uses' and 'the wider population,' and air and water quality are referred to directly. Where land stability is an issue, this is addressed by Policy DM5(b), as is flood risk. Beyond this, Policy So/E/2 requires the submission of a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment and provision of a site layout which is based on a sequential approach to site design and details of measures to mitigate on-site flooding risk and ensure that flood risk is not increased elsewhere.

**Are the development requirements clear and deliverable and are any further safeguards or mitigation measures necessary to achieve an acceptable form of development? Are any main modifications necessary for soundness?**

Yes, it is considered that the development requirements are clear and deliverable. Site specific requirements reflect information gained from consultation and in the Evidence Base. All safeguards and necessary mitigation measures are set out in the wider Plan. There is nothing to indicate that there is a need for change requiring main modifications.

**Have any further permissions been granted since the Plan was submitted for Examination?**

No

## Ollerton and Boughton

### SHELAA Settlement Summary for [Ollerton & Boughton](#)

#### **OB/E/3 Ollerton & Boughton Employment Site 3 – Boughton Industrial Estate**

**Is the proposed scale of employment development justified, having regard to any constraints and the provision of necessary infrastructure?**

Yes, it is considered that the scale of employment development is justified. The Spatial Strategy set out in the Amended Core Strategy (ACS) identifies Ollerton & Boughton as a Service Centre. The ACS was considered sound on Examination. In the ACS, an appropriate level of development of all types is apportioned to Ollerton & Boughton. Consideration of infrastructure provision was undertaken as part of the production of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) which supports the ACS.

**Is the allocation consistent with the development strategy in the Core Strategy?**

Yes, the allocation is consistent with the development strategy in the Core Strategy. As Ollerton & Boughton is a Service Centre, it is an appropriate settlement to direct employment development to, in line with Core Policy 6 of the ACS.

**What is the likely impact of the proposed development on the following factors:**

- **Settlement separation and identity and landscape character;**
- **The strategic and local highway network;**
- **Air and water quality, noise pollution, land stability and flood risk.**

Due to the site's location, there is unlikely to be any impact on settlement separation. When this site is developed, it will effectively extend an area of existing employment development and so should have little impact on settlement identity. The site is within the Urban Boundary and adjoins two areas of existing employment development. On the other boundaries, mature trees provide screening. The IIA concluded that Policy OB/E/3 would have no direct impact on the landscape and land use IIA objective.

Newark & Sherwood District Council's Planning Application Local Validation Checklist requires that development on all allocated sites should be supported by a Transport Statement or Transport Assessment. Potential impacts on the strategic and local highway network would therefore be considered as part of any planning application.

Policy DM10 requires that development proposals involving the potential for pollution should take account of and address their potential impacts in terms of health, the natural environment and general amenity on, among other things: neighbouring land uses; the wider population; ground and surface water, water courses and water quality; and air quality. Noise pollution would be addressed under 'neighbouring land uses' and 'the wider population,' and air and water quality are referred to directly. Where land stability is an issue, this is addressed by Policy DM5(b), as is flood risk. Beyond this, Policy OB/E/3 states that a Site Specific Flood Risk Assessment will be required and that no flood sensitive development should take place in areas identified as being within Flood Zones 2 and 3.

**Are the development requirements clear and deliverable and are any further safeguards or mitigation measures necessary to achieve an acceptable form of development? Are any main modifications necessary for soundness?**

Yes, it is considered that the development requirements are clear and deliverable. Site specific requirements reflect information gained from consultation and in the Evidence Base. All safeguards and necessary mitigation measures are set out in the wider Plan. There is nothing to indicate that there is a need for change requiring main modifications.

**Have any further permissions been granted since the Plan was submitted for Examination?**

No

## **Bilsthorpe**

### **SHELAA Settlement Summary for Bilsthorpe**

#### **Bi/E/1 Bilsthorpe Employment Site 1 – South of Brailwood Road**

**Is the proposed scale of employment development justified, having regard to any constraints and the provision of necessary infrastructure?**

Yes, it is considered that the scale of employment development is justified. The Spatial Strategy set out in the Amended Core Strategy (ACS) identifies Bilsthorpe as a Principal Village. The ACS was considered sound on Examination. In the ACS, an appropriate level of development is apportioned to Bilsthorpe. Consideration of infrastructure provision was undertaken as part of the production of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) which supports the ACS.

**Is the allocation consistent with the development strategy in the Core Strategy?**

Yes, the allocation is consistent with the development strategy in the Core Strategy. As Bilsthorpe is a Principal Village, it is an appropriate settlement to direct employment development to, in line with Core Policy 6 of the ACS.

**What is the likely impact of the proposed development on the following factors:**

- **Settlement separation and identity and landscape character;**
- **The strategic and local highway network;**
- **Air and water quality, noise pollution, land stability and flood risk.**

Due to the site's location, there will be no impact on settlement separation. As the site is within the Village Envelope and surrounded by employment development there will be little impact on settlement identity and landscape character.

Newark & Sherwood District Council's Planning Application Local Validation Checklist requires that development on all allocated sites should be supported by a Transport Statement or Transport Assessment. Potential impacts on the strategic and local highway network would therefore be considered as part of any planning application.

Policy DM10 requires that development proposals involving the potential for pollution should take account of and address their potential impacts in terms of health, the natural environment and general amenity on, among other things: neighbouring land uses; the wider population; ground and surface water, water courses and water quality; and air quality. Noise pollution would be addressed under 'neighbouring land uses' and 'the wider population,' and air and water quality are referred to directly. Where land stability is an issue, this is addressed by Policy DM5(b), as is flood risk.

**Are the development requirements clear and deliverable and are any further safeguards or mitigation measures necessary to achieve an acceptable form of development? Are any main modifications necessary for soundness?**

The development requirement set out are clear and deliverable, but it is necessary to include a Main Modification concerning flood risk:

In order to address the surface water flood risk associated with the site a detailed site-specific Flood Risk Assessment will be required, informing the design and layout of development for which a sequential approach towards the location of uses should be followed and appropriate drainage measures provided. These drainage measures should apply the drainage hierarchy in first prioritising the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems and ensure that flood risk can be managed and not increased elsewhere.

With this modification it is considered that there are no further safeguards or mitigation measures necessary to achieve an acceptable form of development.

**Have any further permissions been granted since the Plan was submitted for Examination?**

No



## **Rainworth**

### **SHELAA Settlement Summary for [Rainworth](#)**

#### **Ra/E/1 Rainworth Employment Site 1 – West of Colliery Lane**

##### **Is the proposed scale of employment development justified, having regard to any constraints and the provision of necessary infrastructure?**

Yes, it is considered that the scale of employment development is justified. The Spatial Strategy set out in the Amended Core Strategy (ACS) identifies Rainworth as a Service Centre. The ACS was considered sound on Examination. In the ACS, an appropriate level of development is apportioned to Rainworth. Consideration of infrastructure provision was undertaken as part of the production of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) which supports the ACS.

##### **Is the allocation consistent with the development strategy in the Core Strategy?**

Yes, the allocation is consistent with the development strategy in the Core Strategy. As Rainworth is a Service Centre, it is an appropriate settlement to direct employment development to, in line with Core Policy 6 of the ACS.

##### **What is the likely impact of the proposed development on the following factors:**

- **Settlement separation and identity and landscape character;**
- **The strategic and local highway network;**
- **Air and water quality, noise pollution, land stability and flood risk.**

Due to the site's location, there will be no impact on settlement separation. The site is within the Village Envelope, and to some extent separate from the rest of the settlement. As a Service Centre, Rainworth can sustain the level of development envisaged in Policy Ra/E/1 without negative impacts on its identity. The IIA concluded that Policy Ra/E/1 would have no direct impact on the landscape and land use IIA objective. Additionally, Policy Ra/E/1 (as amended) requires the incorporation of satisfactory buffer landscaping to minimise the impact of development on Local Wildlife Sites which are located both within and adjoining the site. Any impact on landscape character will be minimal.

Newark & Sherwood District Council's Planning Application Local Validation Checklist requires that development on all allocated sites should be supported by a Transport Statement or Transport Assessment. Potential impacts on the strategic and local highway network would therefore be considered as part of any planning application.

Policy DM10 requires development proposals involving the potential for pollution should take account of and address their potential impacts in terms of health, the natural environment and general amenity on, among other things: neighbouring land uses; the wider population; ground and surface water, water courses and water quality; and air quality. Noise pollution would be addressed under 'neighbouring land uses' and 'the wider population,' and air and water quality are referred to directly. Where land stability is an issue, this is addressed by Policy DM5(b), as is flood risk.

Beyond the policies referred to above, Policy Ra/E/1 states that a Site Specific Flood Risk Assessment will be required and that no flood sensitive development should take place in areas identified as being within Flood Zones 2 and 3. Also, the policy requires the provision of a drainage strategy as part of any planning application to ensure that the development does not flood during low annual probability rainfall events or exacerbate the flood risk off-site. As well as this, proposals on this site must include positive management of surface water through the design and layout of development to ensure that there is no detrimental impact in run-off into surrounding residential areas or the existing drainage regime. Policy Ra/E/1 also requires the investigation of the potential impact arising from the legacy of former coal mining activities within Rainworth and the implementation of any necessary mitigation measures.

##### **Are the development requirements clear and deliverable and are any further safeguards or mitigation measures necessary to achieve an acceptable form of development? Are any main modifications necessary for soundness?**

While the development requirements are clear, it is not certain that they are deliverable. A planning application (21/00996/OUTM) has been submitted to the District Council, which is for residential development of up to 95 dwellings on this site. This application was approved by Planning Committee on 5<sup>th</sup> October 2023, although the Section 106 agreement has not yet been completed.

Until such time as the residential Planning permission is issued and development commences, it is considered prudent to retain the employment allocation to provide maximum opportunity for the site to come forward for employment uses if an application is forthcoming.

This application was accompanied by marketing reports which indicated limited interest in the site for employment uses apart from enquiries from 2 local companies looking to store materials on the site in relation to their trade activities. In March 2022, the marketing report confirms the site has remained live on a number of suitable marketing platforms on an 'all enquiries' basis since this time.

Until such time as the residential Planning permission is issued and development commences, it is considered prudent to retain the employment allocation to provide maximum opportunity for the site to come forward for employment uses if an application is forthcoming.

In their Report on 21/00996/OUTM, the case officer concluded that 'it is clear that there is no need resist the loss of the site to employment purposes on grounds of employment land availability within the District.'

**Have any further permissions been granted since the Plan was submitted for Examination?**

Please see above.

## Clipstone

### SHELAA Settlement Summary for [Clipstone](#)

#### CI/MU/1 Clipstone Mixed Use Site 1 – Clipstone Colliery

**Is the proposed scale of employment development justified, having regard to any constraints and the provision of necessary infrastructure?**

Yes, it is considered that the scale of employment development is justified. The Spatial Strategy set out in the Amended Core Strategy (ACS) identifies Clipstone as a Service Centre. The ACS was considered sound on Examination. As a former colliery site, the principle of employment use in this location is well established. In the ACS, an appropriate level of development is apportioned to Clipstone. Consideration of infrastructure provision was undertaken as part of the production of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) which supports the ACS.

**Is the allocation consistent with the development strategy in the Core Strategy?**

Yes, the allocation is consistent with the development strategy in the Core Strategy. As Clipstone is a Service Centre, it is an appropriate settlement to direct employment development to, in line with Core Policy 6 of the ACS.

**What is the likely impact of the proposed development on the following factors:**

- **Settlement separation and identity and landscape character;**
- **The strategic and local highway network;**
- **Air and water quality, noise pollution, land stability and flood risk.**

Due to the site's location, there will be no impact on settlement separation. As a mixed use allocation, Policy CI/MU/1 seeks to bring forward housing, retail and enhanced Public Open Space as well as employment development. This is likely to have a positive impact on settlement identity through making better use of the land.

Policy CI/MU/1 requires the incorporation of buffer landscaping as part of the design and layout of any planning application to minimise the impact of development on the Local Wildlife Sites (which are both within and adjacent to the site) and Vicar Water Country Park. The policy also requires Green Infrastructure provision through the partial restoration of the site and connections to the Sherwood Forest Pines Park, Vicar Water Country Park and Sustrans Route 6 through the design and layout of any planning application. Green Infrastructure and public open space shall be designed to reflect the need to provide Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANGS) to relieve recreational pressure on the Birklands & Billhaugh SAC in line with Policy DM7. Any impact on landscape character is likely to be positive, although the Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA) concluded that there would be no direct impacts on the 'landscape and land use' IIA objective.

**Are the development requirements clear and deliverable and are any further safeguards or mitigation measures necessary to achieve an acceptable form of development? Are any main modifications necessary for soundness?**

Yes, it is considered that the development requirements are clear and deliverable. Site specific requirements reflect information gained from consultation and in the Evidence Base. All safeguards and necessary mitigation measures are set out in the wider Plan. As discussed below, the District Council is proposing a Main Modification.

**Have any further permissions been granted since the Plan was submitted for Examination?**

A [detailed application](#) went to planning committee on 3<sup>rd</sup> October for 126 dwellings and was approved subject to the signing of a S106 agreement. The developer is progressing the development of the site in phases. The headstock, powerhouse and surrounding land has been disposed of to a commercial operator who is looking to re-use the various heritage assets as a leisure/commercial use.

The Council is currently considering a [detailed application](#) for the relocation and expansion of the Clipstone Miner's Welfare outdoor sports facilities. This application will see the outdoor sports provision brought together in one modernised and significantly enhanced facility. This is viewed by the Miners Welfare, the Council, and local sports clubs as a key strategic regeneration project. Whilst the allocation has always envisaged enhanced open space, the nature of the proposal and the impact on the developable area means that the Council is proposing a Main Modification (MM4) to provide flexibility by requiring "up to 12 hectares" of employment provision.

## **Blidworth**

### **SHELAA Settlement Summary for [Blidworth](#)**

#### **BI/E/1 Blidworth Employment Site 1 – Blidworth Industrial Park**

**Is the proposed scale of employment development justified, having regard to any constraints and the provision of necessary infrastructure?**

Yes, it is considered that the scale of employment development is justified. The Spatial Strategy set out in the Amended Core Strategy (ACS) identifies Blidworth as a Principal Village. The ACS was considered sound on Examination. In the ACS, an appropriate level of development is apportioned to Blidworth. Consideration of infrastructure provision was undertaken as part of the production of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) which supports the ACS.

**Is the allocation consistent with the development strategy in the Core Strategy?**

Yes, the allocation is consistent with the development strategy in the Core Strategy. As Blidworth is a Principal Village, it is an appropriate settlement to direct employment development to, in line with Core Policy 6 of the ACS.

**What is the likely impact of the proposed development on the following factors:**

- **Settlement separation and identity and landscape character;**
- **The strategic and local highway network;**
- **Air and water quality, noise pollution, land stability and flood risk.**

Due to the site's location, there will be no impact on settlement separation. As the site is small, within the Village Envelope and surrounded by employment development on an industrial estate there will be no impact on settlement identity and landscape character.

Newark & Sherwood District Council's Planning Application Local Validation Checklist requires that development on all allocated sites should be supported by a Transport Statement or Transport Assessment. Potential impacts on the strategic and local highway network would therefore be considered as part of any planning application.

Policy DM10 requires development proposals involving the potential for pollution should take account of and address their potential impacts in terms of health, the natural environment and general amenity on, among other things: neighbouring land uses; the wider population; ground and surface water, water courses and water quality; and air quality. Noise pollution would be addressed under 'neighbouring land uses' and 'the wider population,' and air and water quality are referred to directly. Where land stability is an issue, this is addressed by Policy DM5(b), as is flood risk.

**Are the development requirements clear and deliverable and are any further safeguards or mitigation measures necessary to achieve an acceptable form of development? Are any main modifications necessary for soundness?**

Yes, it is considered that the development requirements are clear and deliverable. Site specific requirements reflect information gained from consultation and in the Evidence Base. All safeguards and necessary mitigation measures are set out in the wider Plan. There is nothing to indicate that there is a need for change requiring main modifications.

**Have any further permissions been granted since the Plan was submitted for Examination?**

No

**Q6.6 Is the provision of employment land sufficient for ‘big box’ schemes?**

A: The District Council is confident that there is sufficient provision of employment land overall, although not all sites will be suitable for ‘big box’ schemes. Two such schemes (20/01452/OUTM and 21/02408/FULM) are currently under construction in the District, although it is acknowledged that these sites are smaller than recommended by the Nottinghamshire Core & Outer HMA Logistics Study (the Logistics Study) ([EMP3](#)).

With the completion of the Southern Link Road, which is expected to be in the first quarter of 2026, 50ha of employment land with good access to the strategic road network will become available. This is likely to be suitable for ‘big box’ schemes with Policy NAP 2A of the Amended Core Strategy ([CD16](#)) specifying B2 and B8 uses.

The Logistics Study ([EMP3](#)) assesses the issue of future demand for strategic warehousing and logistics facilities at a regional level. This is a regional issue, and Newark & Sherwood District is making a significant contribution to the provision of ‘big box’ sites. Of the five ‘Areas of Opportunity’ identified for this type of development, only one is in Newark & Sherwood District. It is considered that the level of provision for ‘big box’ schemes is sufficient for this stage of plan-making. When the District Council begins work on the next local plan it might be appropriate to consider making new employment allocations.

A representation has been received ([035 Omission Site T1 T2 T3 T4 0177](#)) that argues that there should be a new allocation for large scale logistics development in the Newark area. Whilst the nature of the representor’s site is recognised, the District Council is of the view that this is best approached holistically through the development of the new Local Plan, which will begin next year. As noted above, the completion of the Southern Link Road will facilitate access to the strategic road network for the employment allocation at ‘Land South of Newark’.

**Q6.7 Is the phasing approach in Policy NUA/Ph/1 justified and will it be effective in bringing development forward at the right time? Are there any potential barriers to the phasing envisaged?**

A: The policy aims to take a flexible approach to securing development on sites that have been identified as requiring phasing. This is to ensure that development does not take place in a piecemeal manner and ensures that constraints are dealt with appropriately and that necessary infrastructure is provided.