



**NEWARK &
SHERWOOD**
DISTRICT COUNCIL

**NEWARK & SHERWOOD ALLOCATIONS &
DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT DPD**

**MATTER 4 – RETAIL/EMPLOYMENT/MIXED
USE**

(Issues: 12 to 14)

**Statement on behalf of Newark &
Sherwood District Council**

November 2012

Issue 12: Are the detailed requirements for each of the allocations clear and justified and will they ensure delivery within the planned timescale? Have site constraints, viability considerations been adequately addressed? Are the boundaries and extent of the sites correctly defined?

- 12.1 Following a review of the language used in the Publication DPD (ADM2) (prompted by our Inspector visit) the Council has proposed amendments to make clear the responsibility for the various requirements set out in the Allocations and Development Management Policies. The Council has steered a tight line between providing unnecessary or quickly dating requirements and setting appropriate context for determining development proposals. Constraints and, where appropriate, methods for dealing with them, have been set out in policies. Viability has been addressed in Matter 2 and in the Funding Statement (EB38).
- 12.2 Site boundaries were in the first instance identified based on owner submission, existing planning information and officer identification. Throughout the process we have received comments regarding such boundaries, suggesting alternative boundaries to include extra land or that the proposed boundaries are incorrect. We have investigated these and where appropriate made amendments however a number were rejected because they relied on land where we had no evidence of availability (e.g. no landowner involvement) or the boundaries were found to be correct. Individual boundary issues will be addressed in Matter 5 where appropriate.

Issue 13 Are the amounts of land allocated for different uses clearly justified? Is there a reasonable prospect of the safeguarded land being used for that purpose within the life of the Plan?

- 13.1 The amounts of land identified for the various land uses are related to the requirements of the Core Strategy (CS) (LDF10). With regard to retail: the overall quantum of retail development was included within the CS at paragraph 5.31 and was based on the findings of the 2009 Newark & Sherwood Retail Assessment (EB18). Following consultation on the Options Report (ADM16) and the emergence of an additional site the District Council commissioned additional retail advice from Alyn Nichols Associates. The results of this study (EB19) were that elements of the retail capacity were not as great as assumed by the GVA Grimley (EB18) study. This adjustment reduced the additional comparison goods requirement by 15%. Where additional retail need has been identified, the Council has sought to identify new sites in and on the edge of recognised centres. Whilst this has been possible in a number of locations, this has not always been the case because of the availability of land. In these instances the Council has sought locations which bring the most benefits in terms of regeneration.
- 13.2 In terms of employment land provision, the overall guideline allocation was included within Spatial Policy 2 of the CS. A proportion (53 hectares) of this total was allocated as part of the Strategic Sites around Newark Urban Area. The remaining requirements for the various Areas of the District have been allocated to locations in and around the settlements central to the delivery of the spatial strategy. The figures

have been allocated broadly in line with residential growth in each Area of the District. The Employment Land Availability Study (EB17) Figure 2 identifies that overall an appropriate level of land has been allocated in line with the CS requirements.

- 13.3 A number of existing employment areas have been identified as Employment Policy Areas where the District Council felt it was necessary to set out more detailed policy approaches for the management of new development. In some cases this is because the sites are major employment sites (e.g. NUA/E/1) or because particular constraints apply to the management of the site (e.g. ST/EA/1). These policies encourage particular uses but do not themselves preclude other uses and applications for other uses will be determined in line with the policies of the CS and the DM Policies.
- 13.4 It should be noted that as part of the formulation of guideline employment requirements, assumptions regarding loss of employment land have been made. Therefore suggestions that further employment land should be allocated to take into account loss would result in double counting.
- 13.5 The allocation of mixed use sites generally represents a marrying of onsite opportunities with the strategic requirements of the plan. Such mix of uses generally relate to either housing and another use such as employment (Farnsfield Fa/MU/1) or strategic open space (OB/MU/1 and OB/MU/2) or employment and other conforming uses such as hotels and retail (e.g. NUA/MU/1 and Bi/MU/1). There are also a number of such sites which have large regeneration potential such as NUA/MU/3 or Cl/MU/1. These sites contribute to the various overall targets included in the CS.

Issue 14 Are the locations identified the most appropriate when considered against all reasonable alternatives?

- 14.1 In terms of meeting the Vision and Strategic Objectives of the Adopted CS potential alternatives are not considered to be the most appropriate sustainable solution. Further detail on individual sites will be provided in the appropriate areas of Matter 5.
- 14.2 As detailed in Matter 2, Issue 4, the Plan has been founded on the outcome of the Sustainability Appraisal (ADM6) and Habitat Regulations Assessment (ADM15A) processes, a proportionate, robust and sound evidence base and taking account of stakeholder consultation input. Specifically in terms of the site selection process this has followed a robust methodology, as detailed in Appendix B of the Plan, which has drawn upon available evidence in order to identify the sites that are the most appropriate and sustainable for meeting the needs of the District to 2026 and beyond. A crucial element of the Plans preparation has therefore been the appropriate assessment and testing of the proposed approach and potential alternatives to this. As a result it is considered that the Plan represents the most appropriate strategy when considered against reasonable alternatives.