



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

MATTER 5 – SITE SPECIFIC ISSUES

Newark Area

(Issues: 15 to 18)

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

November 2012

Issue 15: Do the policies include adequate and appropriate safeguards with regard to the potential effects of development on the historic environment, flooding and local services? Has satisfactory provision been made in respect of transport and other infrastructure requirements?

15.1 The selection of sites for allocation within the Newark Area was informed by assessments of their effects on the historic environment, risk of flooding, and local services. Some sites were discounted during the process due to unresolvable conflict with these issues and where any did not prevent allocation but required addressing through the development of the site, they were made the subject of specific criteria of the policy to be addressed as part of planning applications.

Historic Environment

15.2 The impact of site allocations on Newark's historic environment was considered at the earliest stages of the process. Potential sites were checked against The Historic Environment Register as part of the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA)(EB8). English Heritage were consulted at this stage and the County Archaeologist commented on sites considered from the Options stage onwards. Where Heritage Assets did not prevent allocation but presented issues that required further consideration, these were identified as site specific criteria that require addressing as part of development proposals.

Flood Risk

15.3 Assessment of flood risk began with the Strategic flood Risk Assessment Level 1 of 2009 (EB32). All initial SHLAA sites and a range of those identified by officers were considered within this. The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 2 Phase 1 (EB33) considered the Strategic Sites allocated in the Core Strategy (CS)(LDF10). Whilst the sites include land within Flood Zones 2 and 3, the relevant policies state that housing and employment development will not be allowed within these areas unless exceptional unforeseen circumstances are identified. The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 2, Phase 2 (SFRA L2 Ph2)(EB34) dealt with the remainder of sites to be allocated through the Plan. In selecting sites for inclusion in the Plan, preference was given to locating new development in Flood Zone 1. However, in order to meet the growth requirements of the CS, it was necessary to identify some sites that are at risk of flooding. Utilising the SFRA L2 Ph2, 3 sites were sequentially selected in the Newark Area. The flood risk issues associated with each of these were identified as site specific criteria that require addressing as part of development proposals through the application of the exception test. Full details of the approach taken to flood risk are set out in the Allocations & Development Management Sequential Approach to flood risk (EB36).

- 15.4 The impact on local services of the level of development proposed in the Newark Area was taken into account in the formulation of the Core Strategy (LDF10) and Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP)(EB1 &2). The IDP sets out the various infrastructure requirements for the settlements within the Newark Area. There is however the flexibility to assess the impact of any given proposal on allocated or windfall sites in conjunction with the relevant service providers as part of the consideration of planning applications. Requirements of the IDP and any site specific criteria will be delivered through a combination of developer contributions, CIL and where appropriate funding assistance as set out in the Funding Statement (EB38).
- 15.5 The District Wide Transport Study (EB30) and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (EB1) were produced as part of the evidence base for the Core Strategy. Growth within the district needs to be supported by additional physical and social infrastructure to cater for an increased population and also to improve existing facilities.
- 15.6 Strategic improvements to the highway network which are required because of the growth of the district up to 2026, and which cannot be attributed to the development of any one site, and contributions to a secondary school where the location of growth requires additional secondary school provision, will be funded through the Community Infrastructure Levy which came into effect on 1st December 2011. Local infrastructure requirements which arise as a result of growth in the Newark Area will be met through Developer Contributions, and where appropriate, through funding assistance as set out in the Funding Statement (EB38).
- 15.7 The District Council is therefore satisfied that appropriate provision has been made for the identified transport and infrastructure requirements of the Newark Area.

Issue 16: Would the mixed use allocations (NUA/MU/1) prejudice development of other allocated sites?

- 16.1 In allocating sites in and around Newark Urban Area, the District Council has considered current provision of employment land against the requirements of the Core Strategy. As part of this the Council considered the mixed use proposals put forward on the site which became NUA/MU/1. This mixed use proposal will include employment land to help meet the requirements for the Newark Urban Area (10.88 hectares).
- 16.2 We note Coddington Parish Council's objection [Representor 234] but we do not agree with their conclusion that this allocation will prejudice the aims of NUA/SPA/1. In fact the two policies are linked and wider management of the site is part of the whole concept of the development. The masterplan for NUA/MU/1 can still be developed taking into account the existing and proposed land uses.

Issue 17: The Plan relies on one site (NUA/MU/3) for most of its new retail floor space to be provided towards the latter part of the Plan period. What happens if it cannot be delivered - is the plan flexible enough to cope with this? Is this the best approach to deliver retail development in the area? Is the boundary of the site appropriate? Is there sufficient clarity in the wording of the policy to guide future development within the suggested timescale? Is there a better, more readily available site which would give greater certainty to the delivery of retail floor space?

- 17.1 Retail requirements for the NUA are based on additional expenditure which will result from population growth related to the Growth Point status of the Sub Regional Centre. This expenditure is likely to come on-line during the later part of the plan period (post 2019). NUA/MU/3 is currently a key employment site within the area, containing the town's main employer, NSK. Capita Symonds on behalf of NSK [Representor 72] have throughout the various stages of production of the LDF made representations setting out their proposals to secure the long term future of the business in new purpose-built accommodation elsewhere in the town.
- 17.2 The location and size of the site, at the southern entrance to the town's major industrial estate and accessed from one of the main routes into the town from the A1, means that it is viewed by the District Council as one of the major regeneration sites included in the Plan. The transformative effects of the regeneration of the site links into the wider proposals contained within the Bridge Ward Neighbourhood Study, which have been translated into a number of allocations and policies in the Plan (See Appendix 1 for related policies). The study aims to transform the fortunes of this area of Newark over the plan period. NUA/MU/3 is an important piece of the jigsaw in delivering these aims.
- 17.3 With regards to the representations of Representor 72, relating to the retail figure for NUA/MU/3, it is derived from the retail advice of Alyn Nichols Associates (EB19) which calculates that there is a 15% lower level of additional comparison retail provision from that envisaged in the earlier GVA Grimley report (EB18). Taking into account commitments and completions this leaves circa 10,000 sqm of new requirements for comparison shopping in the post 2019 period (see Appendix 2 for more details).
- 17.4 In terms of site boundaries, the District Council agree with the representations of Representor 72 and indeed the Publication DPD policies map includes the Abbots Boiler's site. Whilst the current proposal does not include the Beacon Hill Retail Park, wording within NUA/MU/3 does provide for "additional land outside the allocation ... be incorporated"
- 17.5 With regards to the representations of Representor 72, regarding demonstration of no harm to the viability and vitality of the town centre, this is not a general requirement

of the policy, but one that is in place to ensure that earlier delivery of the retail does not negatively impact on the town centre. This approach is in line with the NPPF which entreats local authorities in terms of town centres to “pursue policies to support their viability and vitality”. Therefore given that additional need is related to future population growth envisaged in the post 2019 period it is reasonable to ensure that pre 2019, if retail development is proposed on the site, consideration is given to its impact on the Town Centre.

- 17.6 The Council notes the representation of Roger Tym & Partners [Representor 184]; however the District Council does not believe that additional site 3 is the most appropriate given the long term regenerative benefits of NUA/MU/3. Given the long term nature of the requirement, short term availability or certainty is not of primary importance. Furthermore the District Council does not believe that allocating both additional site 3 and NUA/MU/3 would be appropriate because there is not enough capacity, both in retail and commercial terms, for both sites to come forward. Only the long term certainty of allocation of the one site can provide the basis for the regeneration of NUA/MU/3 at the level of development which the District Council is planning for.

Issue 18 Is the location and size of the Main Open Areas appropriate and is it justified? Would the policies provide sufficient protection from future development in these areas?

- 18.1 The location and size of the Main Open Areas (MOAs) is appropriate and justified. Policy NA/MOA provides the necessary degree of protection from future development in these areas. The Newark & Sherwood Main Open Area Review (EB23) of July 2011 provides confirmation that many of the areas that are currently classified as MOAs deserve to be so, and those MOAs not covered in this review have been assessed in the same way.
- 18.2 MOAs were designated on the basis of the contribution that the open space made to the character of the settlement. The approach taken in EB23 was to consider whether the designation was still relevant in terms of defining the settlement form and structure. The review also sought to remove any MOA designations which were unnecessary because the space was protected under another policy, and to assess whether there was public access or the potential for the public to overlook the site. EB23 resulted from a rigorous and objective process which removed the MOA designation from 18 pieces of land. This provides a solid basis for the assertion that the locations and sizes of the remaining MOAs are appropriate and justified.
- 18.3 In the case of Sutton-on-Trent, EB23 found that the western part of the land south of High Street and east of Hemplands Lane was of low value in terms of the contribution that it makes to the character of the settlement. It was therefore considered that it

was not appropriate to retain the MOA designation for this land. It was considered that mixed use development would be a preferable land use, and it was allocated accordingly. The eastern part of this land is of higher value, and it is proposed that this retains its MOA status. Despite this, Policy ST/MOA allows for some development that would improve public access to the MOA or contribute to community facilities on site ST/MU/1. It is intended that this will allow necessary development while still fulfilling the purposes of designating land as an MOA.

- 18.4 Representor 191 argues that the retention of MOA status for the land to the north of Swinderby Road in Collingham is unjustified and renders the Plan unsound. The Representor contrasts the retention of MOA status for this site with the removal of the designation from the land to the north of Dykes End, arguing that the two sites are similar and the difference in the status of the two results from an arbitrary and unfair process. The key reason for the difference, as EB23 makes clear, is that the land north of Dykes End is outside the village envelope and therefore protected from development for that reason, so the MOA classification is unnecessary. The Council regards EB23 as providing a reasonable basis on which to assess whether land previously designated an MOA should remain so, and as this document recommends that the land to the north of Swinderby Road retains its status, the Council has acted accordingly. Representor 211 argues that the eastern portion of the site, referred to as Co/AS/2 on the Proposals Map in the Allocations & Development Management Options Report (ADM16) should not retain its MOA status, and should be released for housing development. It is not considered that either of the Representors referred to in this paragraph has made a compelling case that this site does not fulfil the purposes of an MOA and that this classification should be reconsidered. It should be noted that the western portion of the site discussed here, referred to as X11(Co) in ADM16, is erroneously referred to as X12 in the report on Collingham Alternative Sites (Residential) on page 58 of ADM16.
- 18.5 Representor 234 advocates the inclusion of an additional area of Coddington as an MOA. While this area may contribute to character of the settlement in its present condition, the Council has not found that it is necessary to designate it as an MOA. It is considered that any proposal for development in this area would be dealt with appropriately without the MOA classification. Representor 62 is opposed to the retention of the area designated as an MOA in South Muskham, arguing that it would be better to use this land to provide housing and a larger play area. EB23 maintains that there is a strong case for recommending retention of MOA status, and it is not considered that there is a counter argument sufficiently compelling for the Council to go against this recommendation.
- 18.6 Policy NA/MOA has been designed to provide protection from future inappropriate development in MOAs. The policy is strengthened by a degree of flexibility, allowing

for the possibility of granting permission for development under exceptional circumstances, such as those that may apply in Sutton-on-Trent. This means that the policy is not too rigid to be workable while being robust enough to serve the purpose of guarding against unacceptable development.

Outstanding issues in the Newark Urban Area

- i) We note the comments of Representor 138 regarding NUA/E/4; however, whilst a wider mix of uses has been suggested none has been proposed beyond “mixed use.” on this site. No evidence has been proposed setting out what this would be and how this would be achieved. In the absence of evidence of how alternative proposals could work the District Council has included cross reference to consideration of other uses under Core Policy 6.

- ii) We note the comments of Representor 205 regarding the Urban Boundary on Barnby Road, however the District Council does not agree for two reasons;
 - The East Coast Main Line represents a natural boundary between the Urban Area and the countryside at this point. Whilst there are houses east of Barnby Road level crossings these are frontage development and inclusion within the Urban Boundary would facilitate back land development in this location
 - During the Examination Hearings into the Core Strategy, much discussion was undertaken regarding the Land East of Newark Strategic Site covering the entire area formed by the triangle of land defined by the East Coast Main Line, the A1 and the Beacon Heights estate. The principal objection to this approach was that Network Rail did not wish to see any further development being accessed from Barnby Road/Barnby Lane via the Barnby Road Rail Crossing because of the dangers associated with this crossing (see Paragraph 3.4.16 of the Transport Study (EB30). Inclusion of this land within the Urban Boundary would facilitate further development which would need to use Barnby Road crossing – something that Network Rail is opposed to.

- iii) We note the comments of Representor 250, Newark Town Council, regarding the proposed boundaries of Newark Town Centre and the Newark Urban Area. Following on from the Town Council’s earlier comments submitted as part of the Options Consultation the District Council made amendments to the Town Centre Boundary; however we did not include three areas which were not appropriate for inclusion namely the Castle and Wharf areas, the area south of Queen’s Road and the area south of Beaumont Cross. It remains the view of the District Council there these are edge of centre locations, which whilst they do contain some retail and other town centre uses are not for the purposes of NPPF and Core Strategy town centre locations. In terms of the Urban Boundary, following Newark Town Council’s Options Report comments, the District Council agreed to include all of Fernwood within the Urban

Boundary; however we felt that the area to the south of Balderton, which is within the strategic site but has not been identified for development within this Plan Period, should remain outside the Urban Boundary for the current time.

- iv) We note the comments by Representor 8 regarding their site known as G Park. The proposals map will be amended to reflect its change in status (FPM2).

Outstanding Issues in Collingham

- v) Representor 131 argues that the development allocated to Co/MU/1 should instead be allocated to the site referred to as Co/AS/1 in the Options Report (ADM16), which should be included within the village envelope. The Representor states that this would be more sustainable, with better connections, and is neither in a Conservation Area or designated as a MOA. Co/MU/1 is described as being on the extreme eastern end of the village, and therefore potentially increasing reliance upon cars. While Co/AS/1 was considered as an alternative location for development, Co/MU/1 is considered by the Council to be preferable. The Options Report (ADM16) states that access would limit Co/AS/1 to a maximum of 25 dwellings. There are Tree Preservation Orders on the northern and southern boundaries of the site that would potentially be a constraint upon development. Furthermore, the Main Open Area Review (EB23) and ADM16 make clear that the reason for the removal of the MOA designation from this site is that it is not necessary, due to its location outside the village envelope.
- vi) Representor 177, writing on behalf of the Braemer Farm Development Co. Ltd., argues that Policy Co/Ph/1 is unnecessary and could inhibit the delivery of housing. The Council does not agree with this - this policy is intended to ensure that housing and other uses are delivered in a timely and appropriate manner. The details of this would be negotiated through the Development Management process.
- vii) Representor 129 expresses concern about the alteration of the village envelope to incorporate CO/MU/1. As stated in the Options Report (ADM16), no preferred residential sites were identified within the settlement boundary, and when assessed against Spatial Policy 9 there are no significant issues about the use of this land for the purposes for which it has been allocated. Concerns that are also expressed by this Representor about the need for a station car park are addressed in the amended Policy Co/MU/1.
- viii) Collingham Parish Council, Representor 188, writes that they do not consider that a road through a housing development should be used by farm vehicles, and that they are worried about more traffic being generated. The District Council does not agree - it is the intention that a new road would ease traffic flow, and should be suitable for

farm vehicles in order to facilitate the removal of the level crossing on Cross Lane, should that take place in the future.

- ix) Concerns are raised about the potential future allocation of the reserved site Co/RL/1 for C2 accommodation. Both Representors 129 and 167 feel that if this development took place, it could lead to a disproportionate number of older people within the Village. The Council has allocated this site in response to communication with Braemer Farm Development Co. Ltd.. The Council is committed under Core Policy 3 to the provision of a mix of housing types to meet local need, which this reserve land allocation reflects.
- x) As discussed in paragraph 18.4, Representors 191 and 211 argue that the northernmost MOA in Collingham should have the designation removed from part of the area to allow for development. The reasons that the Council has chosen to retain the MOA status and allocate development elsewhere are set out in this paragraph.

Outstanding Issues in Sutton on Trent

- xii) Representor 174 is concerned that there may be limited flexibility for additional levels of development on site ST/MU/1. Policy ST/MU/1 allows for justified expansion development into the adjacent MOA and the Council consider that this strikes an appropriate balance between flexibility and preserving the MOA.
- xiii) Representor 174 has also argued that there is no justification for phasing policy ST/Ph/1 in connection with site ST/MU/1. The phasing policy is necessary to ensure an appropriate balance between the different uses. The Council consider that the specific policy wording which states that the phasing, ‘..should not be unviable for the developer to implement’ demonstrates its reasonableness.
- xiv) A further concern has been raised by Representor 174, who writes that Local Centre designation in Sutton on Trent suggests the potential for a number of different retail outlets which may not be commercially viable. Whilst the local preference for this site so far may have been for a single store, the Local Centre designation does not implicitly favour any particular type of retail development but provides the initial justification for any type.
- xv) Arguing that site ST/MU/1 is unsound, Representor 142 requests that a site to the north of the village is allocated instead. The Council considers that the site area combined with the provision to extend this into the MOA if necessary is sufficient to accommodate the level of growth proposed. The promoters of the site who confirm

an interest do not object due to inadequate site area. In common with many other allocations the site has constraints which need to be addressed through its development but these do not make it unsuitable for development.

The proposed alternative site is outside the village envelope and therefore contrary to the Site Selection Methodology of the Plan. As a viable and deliverable site has been identified within the envelope there is no need to consider this site.

- xvi) Representor 196 argues that site ST/MU/1 is an inappropriate allocation due to inadequate access, increased use of private vehicles, there being no requirement for additional parking for the doctors surgery and increased flood risk. The Highway Authority are satisfied with the access arrangements and the central location of ST/MU/1 would be more likely to promote sustainable modes of transport than increase reliance on the private car. The doctors surgery has welcomed the provision of additional parking at the Options stage consultation. The Environment Agency and Severn Trent water have not objected to the sites allocation. Localised flood issues are recognised within site specific criteria of the policy and could be addressed through development.
- xvii) Sutton-on-Trent Parish Council, Representor 34, request that community facilities referred to in Policy ST/MU/1 be defined as a village hall and that the existing library is relocated. The policy as submitted could facilitate these provisions as it stands and there is the provision for the community to negotiate with potential developers over this. To make this a requirement of the policy would potentially compromise the viability and delivery of the site.
- xviii) Representor 15 writes that site ST/MU/1 is inappropriate due to inadequate consideration of other sites, in particular land to the north between village envelope and sports ground, a lack of a phase 1 habitat survey on MU1, more local support for a site near the sports ground and because it is undeliverable and unrealistic. The Representor argues that the MOA should be preserved and new development follow the traditional expansive form of the village, and that we should consider under provision here in favour of overprovision elsewhere.

Other sites were considered at options stage but this site was not put forward at that time. Its extent and deliverability are not confirmed now. There has been no reason for the Council to consider reduced provision in Sutton on Trent as a suitable and deliverable site has been identified. The loss of part of the MOA is justified by the MOA review. This along with all other allocated sites was checked with the Nottinghamshire Biological and Geological Record Centre (NBGRC) at SHLAA stage and no harm to habitats or species was identified. The SA however identified the

potential for a net increase in bio diversity on the site. The level of support for site ST/MU/1 and an unspecified site to the north of the village was approximately equal. Traffic and deliverability issues are dealt with elsewhere.

- xxiv) Notwithstanding objection set out above, Representor 15 requests that the wording of Policy ST/MU/1 be amended if adopted. The Council consider that the requested changes relating to design and landscaping can be adequately addressed through DM Policies.

Appendix 1 Allocations & Policies related to the Bridge Ward Neighbourhood Study

Policies and Proposals related to the Bridge Ward Neighbourhood Study;

- NUA/E/1 – Newark Urban Area – Newark Industrial Estate Policy Area
- NUA/E/2 – Newark Urban Area – Employment Site 2
- NUA/E/3 – Newark Urban Area – Employment Site 3
- NUA/Ho/2 – Newark Urban Area – Housing Site 2
- NUA/Ho/4 – Newark Urban Area – Housing Site 4 – Yorke Drive Policy Area
- NUA/Tr/1 – Northgate Station Policy Area

Appendix 2 Retail Capacity Requirements for Newark Urban Area

GVA Grimley conducted a Retail and Town Centre Study (published 2010), that provided the Council's position up to 2010. The attached 'amended Retail Monitoring Summary' details an updated position at 1st April 2012.

As part of the production of the Allocations and Development Management DPD the Council commissioned a review of retail requirements for comparison shopping. This update referred to more recent information on expenditure growth and non-store retail spending (essentially internet shopping), and it concluded that using this more recent information that the comparison floorspace requirement for the District was now 15% lower than originally estimated and set out in Paragraph 5.31 (p, 49) of the Adopted Core Strategy DPD. However, updated information on commitments and completions was not available at that time and therefore the review did not take account of changes in this regard.

Table 1 below calculates the updated net floorspace capacity requirement for Newark Urban Area at 1st April 2012. The calculation is based upon figures derived from the GVA Grimley Study estimates an additional requirement of 5661sqm net convenience floor space; and 15690sqm net comparison floorspace (as explained above). It is anticipated that the majority of additional comparison floorspace provided will be in the Newark Urban Area; as such the full requirement arising within the district of 15690sqm has been assumed in Table 1.

Table 1: Retail Summary Newark Urban Area

Row		Sqm
A	Capacity Requirement in Newark Urban Area (5661sqm convenience; assuming 15690.15 Comparison)	21351.00
B	Accounted for in Retail Study	8864.00
C	A+B	30215.00
D	Completions 2010 to 2012	10506.76
E	A1 Commitments at 01/04/2012	7090.45
F	Sites where the principal of development has been accepted excluding NSK(NAP2B and NAP2C)	5000.00
G	C-D-E-F	7617.79
H	Losses 2010 to 2012	839.10
I	G+I	8456.89
J	Residual Requirement =	8456.89

In simple terms, the updated capacity position is lower than that estimated by GVA Grimley because:

- More recent data indicates that per capita expenditure will be lower (see comment above);
- Completions since 2010 and current commitments at 1st April 2012 are greater than the level of committed development taken into account by GVA Grimley; and

In addition the sites where the principal of development has been accepted excluding NSK (NAP2B and NAP2C), are included as commitments (because they are policy commitments within the Core Strategy)

In respect of Table 1 above:

Row A calculates the total Capacity and Convenience requirements for Newark urban Area (5,661sqm + 15,690sqm = Total Requirement 21,351sqm)

When calculating the capacity requirements for Newark Urban Area, The GVA Grimley Retail and Town Centre Study (Published 2010) accounted for net floorspace on large sites that had extant planning permission at the time of the study. Sites and net floorspace are detailed in Table 2. Total floor space accounted for in the Retail Study was 8864sqm (**Row B**).

Table 2: Commitments included in the GVA Grimley Retail Study (net floorspace)

Site	SQM net
Potterdyke -Asda	3718
Co-op Barnby Gate	250
Fernwood (07/00549/ful)	564
Aldi Northgate Extension	160
Potterdyke - Other Units	4045
Big W Sub Division	127
Total Floorspace Accounted for	8864

Row C of Table 1 calculates that the total net capacity taking consideration of the GVA Grimley Study is 30215.00sqm.

Retail monitoring has been carried out for the period 1st April 2010 to 31st March 2012, to identify completion (**Row D**) and commitment rates. For this period completions of retail floorspace amounting to 10506.76sqm (net) were recorded; this figure includes completions for all retail use classes. It is therefore important to note that the completion rate would be lower if only A1 completions were considered in this calculation.

At 31st March 2012 commitments for retail development (class A1 only) stand at 7,090sqm (net) (**Row E**).

Row F of Table 1 calculates sites where the principal of development has been accepted. Sites included are the strategic sites (NAP2B and NAP2C) as identified in Adopted Core Strategy. A total of 5000sqm has been estimated for the two sites. Site: NUA/MU/3 NSK Factory, Northern Road, Newark, identified in the Allocations and Development Management DPD as a mixed use site with an allocation of 10,000sqm of net retail floorspace; has been excluded for the purpose of this calculation.

After calculating rows C to F of Table 1, **Row G** demonstrates a retail capacity requirement of 7617sqm. Monitoring carried out for the period 1st April 2010 to 31st March 2012 records retail losses at 839sqm (Row H) leaving a residual requirement of 8456sqm for the Newark Urban Area to 2026.

Assuming 15% of the completions recorded between 2010 and 2012 were for uses other than A1, an additional retail capacity of 1576sqm would be required making the total requirement (8456 + 1576.00) equating to a residual requirement of **10032sqm**, demonstrating the need for the allocated site: NUA/MU/3 NSK Factory, Northern Road, Newark, to include 10,000sqm of retail capacity.

Notes

Please note a revised copy of the 2012 Retail Monitoring Report (Summary) has been provided due to an error in Figures 3 and 6 identifying a commitment of 6900sqm of retail floorspace for Land South of Newark NAP2A; the correct figure is actually 3900sqm as shown in the amended report.

Figures 3 and 9 have also been revised to include the Retail allocations in Mansfield Fringe, at Rainworth and Clipstone allowing for a total of 500sqm.

2012
Retail Monitoring Report (Amended Summary)
01/04/2010 to 31/03/2012



**NEWARK &
SHERWOOD**
DISTRICT COUNCIL

Content

Section		Page
Section 1.	Introduction	3
Section 2.	Retail Hierarchy and estimated Core Strategy requirements	4
Section 3.	Provision	5
	Commitments by Retail Hierarchy	6
	Sites in the Publication Allocations & Development Management DPD & Core Strategy Allocations	8
	Losses and Completions	9

Introduction

This document has been prepared by the Planning Policy Business Unit in accordance with Government guidance set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Paragraph 158 of the NPPF requires local authorities to “use a proportionate evidence base to ensure that the local plan is based on adequate up-to-date and relevant evidence about the economic, social and environmental characteristics and prospects of the area”

Paragraph 5.31 (p,49) of the Adopted Newark and Sherwood Local Development Framework, Core Strategy Development Plan Document (DPD) sets out the District’s requirements for additional convenience and comparison goods floor space capacity, for the remainder of the plan period up to 2026. The purpose of this report is to demonstrate the Council’s position at 31/03/2012 and to provide a summary of monitoring data of floor space delivery in all areas of the District.

A more detailed report will be available later in the year once survey’s have been carried out of areas within the retail hierarchy to identify the rate of vacant units, more detailed completion analysis and provision of other associated Leisure and Community facilities.

GVA Grimley conducted a Retail and Town Centre Study published 2010, that provided the Council’s position up to 2010. Retail floor space provision has been monitored for the period 1st April 2010—31st March 2012 to provide the position as at 31/03/2012.

As part of the production of the Allocations and Development Management DPD the Council commissioned a review of retail requirements. This update identified that given the current changes in the retail market the comparison floor space requirement for the District was now 15% lower than originally estimated. This reduction is reflected through this report.

Retail Hierarchy and Cores Strategy Requirements

Core Policy 8 of the Adopted Core Strategy DPD (March 2011) sets out the Retail Hierarchy to be applied in the development of policies for retail and town centre uses and the determination of planning applications within the District.

Figure 1: Retail Hierarchy

Designation	Role & Function	Location
Sub-Regional Centre/Town Centre	Principal focus of new and enhanced retail and other town centre activity in Newark and Sherwood	Newark Town Centre
District Centres	Primarily used for convenience shopping, with some comparison shopping and they also provide a range of other services for the settlement and the surrounding communities.	Edwinstowe Ollerton Rainworth Southwell
Local Centres	Concerned with the sale of food and other convenience goods to the local community in which they are located.	Balderton, Bilsthorpe, Blidworth, Boughton, Clipstone, Collingham, Farnsfield, Lowdham, Sutton-on-Trent, Land South of Newark (NAP 2A) Land East of Newark (NAP 2B) Land at Fernwood (NAP 2C)

Figure 2: Estimated additional requirements to be provided by 2026 as set out in Paragraph 5.31 (p,49) of the Adopted Newark and Sherwood Local Development Framework, Core Strategy Development Plan Document (DPD)

Capacity Type	Newark Urban Area	District	Newark Urban Area & District	Totals
Additional Floor space Capacity for Convenience Goods (Sqm)	5661	6707		12368
Additional Floor space Capacity for Comparison Goods (Sqm)			15690.15	15690.15
Total Estimated Requirement				28058.15

Figure 3: Retail Provision Status at 31/03/2012

	Sub - Regional Centre	District Centres				Local Centres	Core Strategy Local Centres			Sites outside of Retail Hierarchy	Totals
	Newark Town Centre	Edwinstowe	Ollerton	Rainworth	Southwell		Land South of Newark (NAP 2A)	Land East of Newark (NAP 2B)	Land at Fernwood (NAP 2C)		
Square Metres of Floorspace Provided											
01/04/10 - 31/03/11	255.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	867.00	1128.00	2250.00
01/04/11 - 31/03/12	6792.46	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2840.21	9632.67
Total Sqm of Floorspace Provided Between 01/04/2010 - 31/03/2012	7047.46	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	867.00	3968.21	11882.67
Sqm of floorspace with outline permission	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3900.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3900.00
Sqm of floorspace with detailed planning permission	2382.85	0.00	2894.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3751.20	9028.05
Sqm of floorspace under construction	447.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1144.50	1591.50
Sqm of floorspace with no start	1935.85	0.00	2894.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3900.00	0.00	0.00	2606.70	11336.55
Total Sqm of Floorspace with Extant Permission 01/04/10 - 31/03/12	2382.85	0.00	2894.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3900.00	0.00	0.00	3751.20	12928.05
Sqm Increase in floorspace under construction	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1916.00	1916.00
Sqm Increase in floorspace with no start	60.30	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	749.00	809.30
Total Sqm Increase in Floorspace 01/04/2010 to 31/03/2012	60.30	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2665.00	2725.30
Total Sqm of commitments at 01/04/2012	2443.15	0.00	2894.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3900.00	0.00	0.00	6416.20	15653.35
Sites where the principal of development has been accepted (Sites in the Publication Allocations & Development Management DPD) & Core Strategy Allocations	0.00	0.00	0.00	250.00	0.00	250.00	0.00	2500.00	2500.00	10710.00	16210.00
Loss of Floorspace (01/04/2010 to 31/03/2012)	216.40	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	788.63	1005.03
Total Sqm of Floorspace provided up to 2026 (Completed + Commitments + DPD Allocations - Losses)	9274.21	0.00	2894.00	250.00	0.00	250.00	3900.00	2500.00	3367.00	20305.78	42740.99
Total Sqm of Floorspace provided up to 2026 (by Retail Designation)	9274.21	3144.00				250.00	9767.00			20305.78	42740.99
Provision already included in 2010 Retail Study	7763.00	0.00				0.00	0.00	0.00	564.00	2539.00	10866.00
Total sqm of floorspace provided discounting provision accounted for in 2010 Retail Study	1511.21	3144.00				250.00	9203.00			17766.78	31874.99

Figure 4: Newark Town Centre

STREET	GRID REF	TYPE	STATUS	LAND USE	TOTAL UNITS	FLOORSPACE (sq m.)	PLANNING REF	APP TYPE	DESCRIPTION
20 Middlegate	479783/353981	CU	UC	A1	1	112.00	07/01367	DET	CU FROM B2 TO A1
31A Lombard Street	479706/353741	CU	UC	A1,A2,A3	6	335.00	11/00567	DET	CHANGE OF USE AND REFURBISHMENT OF EXISTING BUILDINGS TO FORM FIVE INDIVIDUAL SHOPS A1,A2 ,A3 &A5 USE. DEMOLITION OF LEAN TO AND ERECTION OF UNIT A6 FOR A1,A2 AND A3 USES
19 Castle Gate	479739/354013	CU	NS	A1,A3 AND A4	6	473.00	11/01046	DET	CONVERSION OF FORMER HOTEL TO PROVIDE NEW BAR/RESTAURANT (CLASS A3/A4) AND 5 No RETAIL (CLASS A1) UNITS AT GROUND FLOOR LEVEL
31-33 Lombard Street	479686/353745	CU	NS	A1/A3/A4	4	282.15	11/01695	DET	PROPOSED ALTERATIONS AND CHANGE OF USE FROM B1 TO C1, A3, A4 AND A1 SHOP AND A1 KIOSK
LOMBARD STREET (Robin Hood Hotel) (Phase 2)	479662/353678	NB	NS	A1/A3/A4	4	1180.70	07/01460	DET	NEW RETAIL UNITS (INCLUDES 1 A3 USE)
TOTAL FLOORSPACE (SQM)						2382.85			

Figure 5: District Centres

STREET	GRID REF	TYPE	STATUS	LAND USE	TOTAL UNITS	FLOORSPACE (sq m.)	PLANNING REF	APP TYPE	DESCRIPTION
FOREST ROAD	466260/367863	CU	NS	A1	2	932.00	08/00594	DETAILED	CU FROM BINGO HALL TO RETAIL AND RESIDENTIAL
RUFFORD AVENUE	466325/367825	NB	NS	A1	4	1962.00	11/00469	DETAILED	ERECTION OF 4 RETAIL UNITS
TOTAL FLOORSPACE (SQM)						2894.00			

Key

CU: Change of use NS: No Start
 NS: No Start UC: Under construction

Figure 6: Local Centres

STREET	GRID REF	TYPE	STATUS	LAND USE	TOTAL UNITS	FLOORSPACE (sq m.)	PLANNING REF	APP TYPE	DESCRIPTION
BOWBRIDGE LANE	479873/351173	NB	N/S	A1 to A5		3900.00	10/01586	OUTLINE	TWO LOCAL CENTRES COM- PRISING A1 TO A5 UNITS
TOTAL FLOORSPACE (SQM)						3900.00			

Figure 7: Provision outside of Retail Hierarchy

STREET	GRID REF	TYPE	STATUS	LAND USE	TOTAL UNITS	FLOORSPACE (sq m.)	PLANNING REF	APP TYPE	DESCRIPTION
LINCOLN ROAD (Bridge Inn)	480758/355111	CU	UC	A1/A3/ A5	3	414.00	10/00987	DETAILED	RETAIL STORE
MANSFIELD ROAD (White Post Modern Farm)	462847/357113	NB	NS	A1	1	140.00	09/00366	DETAILED	GIFT AND PET SHOP
HOCKERTON ROAD (Brickfield Farm)	469458/357202	NB	UC	A1	1	96.00	08/01982	DETAILED	FARM SHOP
HOLME FARM, SWINDERBY ROAD	485380/362391	CU	NS	A1	1	28.00	11/00918	DETAILED	EQUESTRIAN HOP
83 APPLETON GATE	480422/354511	CU	NS	A1 AND A3	1	437.00	11/00754	DETAILED	CHANGE OF USE OF EXISTING BUILDINGS FROM USE CLASS D2 TO USE CLASS A1 (HARDWARE AND GARDEN FURNITURE STORE) AND A3 (CAFE) (RESUBMISSION)
DEVON ROAD	479640/352385	NB	NS	A1	1	95.00	11/01282	DETAILED	CONSTRUCTION OF RETAIL UNIT (CLASS A1)
ALBERT STREET	479653/353466	NB	NS	A1	1	359.00	11/01022	DETAILED	DEMOLITION OF EXISTING PETROL STATION KIOSK. CONSTRUCTION OF CONVENIENCE FOOD STORE TO INCLUDE NEW PETROL SALES AND PUMP CONTROLS
BOWBRIDGE ROAD	480111/353045	NB	NS	A1, A2 AND A5	3	372.00	11/01533	DETAILED	PROPOSED MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT TO INCLUDE A1, A2 AND A5 USES
MALTKILN LANE	480322/354839	NB	UC	A1	1	453.00	11/01229	DETAILED	PROPOSED NON-FOOD A1 RETAIL UNIT
ETON AVENUE	479632/352408	NB	NS	A1	1	84.50	12/00156	DETAILED	CONSTRUCTION OF RETAIL UNIT (CLASS A1)
MALTKILN LANE	480295/354789	NB	NS	A3	1	1012.00	10/00603	DETAILED	ERECTION OF A DRIVE THROUGH RESTAURANT
NORWOOD PARK	468932/354923	NB	UC	A1	1	181.5	11/00774	DETAILED	PRO SHOP FOR DRIVING RANGE
LYNDHURST AVENUE	459660/356307	NB	NS	A1	1	79.2	12/00113	DETAILED	EXTENSION TO RESIDENTIAL DWELLING FOR RETAIL USE
TOTAL FLOORSPACE (SQM)						3751.20			

Figure 8: Increase in Floorspace

STREET	GRID REF	TYPE	STATUS	LAND USE	TOTAL UNITS	FLOORSPACE (sq m.)	PLANNING REF	APP TYPE	DESCRIPTION
LONDON ROAD (Netto)	479865/353481	NB	NS	A1	1	376.00	10/01366	DET	EXTENSION TO FOODSTORE
NORTHGATE RETAIL PARK (Currys)	480187/354728	NB	NS	A1	1	373.00	10/01461	DET	EXTENSION TO RETAIL SHOP
EDISON RISE (TESCO)	466328/367718	NB	UC	A1	1	1916.00	07/01138	DET	EXTENSION TO SUPERMARKET
11 -13 MIDDLEGATE	479814/353975	NB	NS	A1	1	60.30	11/00427	DET	FIRST FLOOR EXTENSION FOR WEB SALES
TOTAL FLOORSPACE (SQM)						2725.30			

Figure 9: Sites Allocated in the Publication Allocations & Development Management DPD

ALLOCATION REFERENCE	ALLOCATION TYPE	LOCATION	PLAN AREA	TOTAL SITE AREA (h/a)	TOTAL FLOOR-SPACE (SQM)	TIME LINE FOR IMPLEMENTATION (% expected to be delivered during each period)		
						0-5YRS (2012 - 2017)	5-10YRS (2017 - 2022)	10-14YRS (2022 -2026)
Bi/MU/1	MIXED USE	EAST OF KIRKLINGTON ROAD, BILSTHORPE	SHERWOOD AREA	3.95	**460.00	0%	60%	40%
Cl/MU/1	MIXED USE	LAND AT THE FORMERCLIPSTONE COLLIERY	MANSFIELD FRINGE	27.64	**250.00	100%	0%	0%
NUA/MU/3	MIXED USE	NSK FACTORY, NORTHERN ROAD, NEWARK	NEWARK & RURAL SOUTH (Sub Area 1)	10.11	10000.00	0%	20%	80%
OB/Re/1*	RETAIL	RUFFORD AVENUE, OLLERTON	SHERWOOD AREA	0.35	1962.00	100%	0%	0%
OB/Re/2*	RETAIL	FOREST ROAD, OLLERTON	SHERWOOD AREA	0.17	932.00	100%	0%	0%
Ra/MU/1	MIXED USE	Land At IRKLINGTON ROAD	MANSFIELD FRINGE	0.62	**250.00	100%	0%	0%
ST/MU/1	MIXED USE	EAST OF HEMPLANDS LANE, SUTTON ON TRENT	RURAL NORTH (Sub Area 3)	2.07	**250.00	40%	60%	0%

** Estimates have been made for floorspace provision

Figure 10 Lost Retail Capacity 01/04/2010 to 31/03/2012

RETAIL HIERARCHY	TOWN	STREET	TYPE	UNITS LOST	FLOOR SPACE (SQM)	PLANNING REF	DESCRIPTION
OUTSIDE	Clipstone	Lambs Penn Farm	CU	1	165.93	11/01360	CAFE TO DAY NURSERY
NEWARK TOWN CENTRE	Newark	3 Appleton Gate	CU	1	153	11/00824	RETAIL TO DWELLING
OUTSIDE	Newark	Northern Road	CU	3	551.1	11/01032	RETAIL TO B2 BUSINESS USE
OUTSIDE	Newark	29 Albert Street	CU	1	71.6	11/01751	RETAIL TO DWELLING
NEWARK TOWN CENTRE	Newark	11C Stodman Street	CU	1	63.4	10/00917	RETAIL TO B1
TOTAL LOSS OF SQM FLOORSPACE					1005.03		

Figure 11: Floorspace Provided by Retail Hierarchy 01/04/2010 to 31/03/2012

Square Metres of Floorspace Provided	Sub - Regional Centre	District Centres				Local Centres	Core Strategy Local Centres			Sites outside of Retail	Totals
	Newark Town Centre	Edwinstowe	Ollerton	Rainworth	Southwell	(See Figure 1)	Land South of Newark (NAP 2A)	Land East of Newark (NAP 2B)	Land at Fernwood (NAP 2C)		
01/04/10 - 31/03/11	255.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	867.00	1128.00	2250.00
01/04/11 - 31/03/12	6792.46	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2840.21	9632.67
Total Sqm of Floorspace Provided Between 01/04/2010 - 31/03/2012	7047.46	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	867.00	3968.21	11882.67