



*Castle House
Great North Road
Newark
NG24 1BY*

Tel: 01636 650000
www.newark-sherwooddc.gov.uk

Monday, 1 November 2021

Dear Member,

Please find enclosed the Schedule of Communications, to be considered at tomorrow's Planning Committee.

Yours Sincerely

Catharine Saxton
Democratic Services Officer

PLANNING COMMITTEE – 2 November 2021

Schedule of Communication Received after Printing of Agenda

Item	Correspondent	Date	Points Raised (Summary)	Officer's Response
5 20/014 52/OU TM	Fieldsend Associates on behalf of Tritax and Simons Developments	29.10.2021	Submission of 'Briefing Note: The Planning Balance' – please see Appendix 1 for full document.	Noted.
5 20/014 52/OU TM	NSDC Planning Policy	01.11.2021	Submission of comments on planning application - please see Appendix 2 for full document.	Noted.
5 20/014 52/OU TM	Cllr Dales	01.11.2021	Submission of comments on planning application - please see Appendix 3 for full document.	Noted.
Agenda Page 2 11/015 3/RM TM	Agent	26.10.2021	<p>Revised boundary plan received to remove the need for condition 9 and suggested amendments to other conditions.</p> <p>Condition 1 – Update boundary plan reference and remove reference to landscape masterplan due to duplication with condition 2.</p> <p>Condition 2 – completion refers to 'dwelling to which is relates' rather than</p>	<p>The changes are considered acceptable. Condition 2 has been carefully considered but the landscaping outside of residential curtilages would be controlled through the landscaping specification secured through the legal agreement. Officers have however added a line in to the condition to make it clear when ancillary areas of open space adjacent to dwellings shall be implemented.</p> <p>Officers recommended the conditions are revised as follows:</p> <p><u>Condition 1:</u></p>

Schedule of Communication Received after Printing of Agenda

Item	Correspondent	Date	Points Raised (Summary)	Officer's Response
Agenda Page 3			<p>development, reference to 'and within the highway visibility splay' after Plot 122</p> <p>Condition 3 - reference to 'and within the highway visibility splay' after Plot 122</p> <p>Condition 8 – removal of 'save for Plots 105; 106 and 109' given submission of updated boundary plan</p> <p>Condition 9 – removal, no longer needed</p> <p>Condition 10 – renumbering to condition 9</p>	<p>01</p> <p>The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the following approved plans and documents reference:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Location Plan Dwg.No. 556-003; • Proposed Site Layout, Dwg.No. 556-001 E; • Materials Plan, Dwg.No. 556-005 A; • Boundary Treatments and External Materials Plan, Dwg.No. 556-006 B; • Sales Area Signage and Access, Dwg.No. 556-201 A; • Edlingham Buff Brick (Floor Plans), Dwg.No. PD.04.03; • Edlingham Buff Brick (Elevations), Dwg.No. PD.04.04; • Harrington Red Brick, Dwg.No. PD.09.01; • Porchester Red Brick, (Floor Plans). Dwg.No. PD.10.01; • Porchester Red Brick, (Elevations). Dwg.No. PD.10.02; • Bamburgh Red Brick, Dwg.No. PD.100.01; • Hadleigh Buff Brick, Dwg.No. PD.101.02; • Salcombe V1 Buff Brick, (Floor Plans) Dwg.No. PD.14.03; • Salcombe V1 Buff Brick, (Elevations) Dwg.No. PD.14.04; • Sutton Red Brick, Dwg.No. PD.151.01; • Settle V1 Buff Brick, (Floor Plans) Dwg.No. PD.53.03; • Settle V1 Buff Brick, (Elevations) Dwg.No. PD.53.04; • Windsor Red Brick, Dwg.No. PD.55.01; • Alderton Red Brick, Dwg.No. PD.70.01;

Schedule of Communication Received after Printing of Agenda

Item	Correspondent	Date	Points Raised (Summary)	Officer's Response
<p>Agenda Page 4</p>				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thorpe Red Brick Dwg No. 556.TP.01; • Hambleton Red Brick Dwg No. 556.HM.01; • Nidderdale Red Brick, Dwg.No. PD.54.01; • Settle V0 Red Brick (Floor Plans) Dwg No. PD.56.01; • Settle V0 Red Brick (Elevations) Dwg No. PD.56.02; • Shelford Red Brick (Floor Plans) Dwg No. 556.SF.01; • Shelford Red Brick (Elevations) Dwg No. 556.SF.02; • Salcombe V0 Red Brick (Floor Plans) Dwg No. PD.06.01; • Salcombe V0 Red Brick (Elevations) Dwg No. PD.06.02; • Banbury Red Brick (Floor Plans) Dwg No. 556.BN.01; • Banbury Red Brick (Elevations) Dwg No. 556.BN.02; • Double Garage Buff Brick, Dwg.No. PD.G1.02; <p>Reason: So as to define this permission.</p> <p><u>Condition 2</u></p> <p>The landscaping details shown on the following plan references:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Detailed Planting Plan Dwg No. DR-5224-02.01 – Layout 1 Rev. D; • Detailed Planting Plan Dwg No. DR-5224-02.02 – Layout 2 Rev. D; • Detailed Planting Plan Dwg No. DR-5224-02.03 – Layout 3 Rev. D; <p>shall be completed during the first planting season following</p>

Schedule of Communication Received after Printing of Agenda

Item	Correspondent	Date	Points Raised (Summary)	Officer's Response
<p>Agenda Page 5</p>				<p>the first occupation of the dwelling to which it relates and thereafter be maintained in accordance with the details set out within the Planting Specification Dwg No. DR-5224-02.02 Rev. D with the exception of the ornamental planting area shown in the curtilage of Plot 122 and within the highway visibility splay. For the avoidance of doubt this shall include any ancillary areas of landscaping adjacent to the associated dwelling in the public domain which are not part of the main areas of public open space. Any trees/shrubs which, within a period of five years of being planted die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species.</p> <p>Reason: To enhance and protect the landscape value and biodiversity of the site.</p> <p><u>Condition 3</u></p> <p>The area of ornamental planting shown on Detailed Planting Plan Dwg No. DR-5224-02.02 – Layout 2 Rev. D within the curtilage of Plot 122 and within the highway visibility splay shall not exceed 600m in height.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure that highways visibility is maintained.</p> <p><u>Condition 8</u></p> <p>Prior to the occupation of each plot the boundary details and electric vehicular charging point for that plot shall be</p>

PLANNING COMMITTEE – 2 November 2021

Schedule of Communication Received after Printing of Agenda

Item	Correspondent	Date	Points Raised (Summary)	Officer's Response
				<p>implemented in full in accordance with the details shown on Boundary Treatments and External Materials Plan, Dwg.No. 556-006 B.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of residential amenity and sustainability.</p> <p><u>Condition 9</u> should be removed altogether and <u>Condition 10</u> renumbered to reflect.</p>
9 21/019 00/FUL	Applicants	20.10.2021	List of plots numbers, names of occupiers and children and associated health issues on 4 of the plots, 3 different single names are stated for the remaining 8 plots, many of them identified as currently empty plots.	Noted.
9 21/019 00/FUL	Agent	27.10.2021	An amended Site Plan showing visibility splays and additional Swept Path Plan has been submitted.	NCC Highway Authority re-consulted.
9 21/019 00/FUL	NCC - Highway Authority	28.10.2021	<p>Amended and additional plans submitted demonstrate that a safe and suitable means of access can be accommodated on Tolney Lane. Should the LPA be minded to approve the application, the following conditions should be imposed:-</p> <p>1) No part of the development hereby permitted shall be brought into use until the access to the site has been completed and surfaced in a bound material in accordance</p>	Noted. On this basis, officers <u>amend the recommendation</u> that is currently set out on the Agenda before Members and delete Reason for Refusal 2.

Schedule of Communication Received after Printing of Agenda

Item	Correspondent	Date	Points Raised (Summary)	Officer's Response
Agenda Page 7			<p>with approved plan reference SF-21-P01revC.</p> <p>Reason: - To enable vehicles to enter and leave the public highway in a slow and controlled manner and in the interests of general Highway safety</p> <p>2) No part of the development hereby permitted shall be brought into use until the visibility splays shown on drawing no. SF-21-P01revC are provided. The area within the visibility splays referred to in this condition shall thereafter for the life of the development be kept free of all obstructions, structures or erections exceeding 0.6 metres in height</p> <p>Reason: - To afford adequate visibility at the access to cater for the expected volume of traffic joining the existing highway network and in the interests of general Highway safety.</p> <p>Note to Applicant: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The development makes it necessary to construct a vehicular crossing over the public highway. These works shall be constructed to the satisfaction of the 	

PLANNING COMMITTEE – 2 November 2021

Schedule of Communication Received after Printing of Agenda

Item	Correspondent	Date	Points Raised (Summary)	Officer's Response
			<p>Highway Authority. You are, therefore, required to contact VIA, in partnership with Nottinghamshire County Council tel: 0300 500 8080 to arrange for these works to be carried out.</p>	
<p>9 21/019 00/FUL</p> <p style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);">Agenda Page 8</p>	<p>Agent</p>	<p>28.10.2021</p>	<p>A Flood Warning and Evacuation Plan has been submitted which states that the occupants should sign up to flood warnings upon occupation of a pitch so that they will be notified of any future flood warnings from the Environment Agency in good time.</p> <p>It goes on to state if the occupiers receive a "Flood Alert" they must prepare to evacuate.</p> <p>Within 8 hours of receiving a "Flood Alert" all residents will evacuate the site. The evacuation includes the removal of all touring caravans and vehicles from the site. If the warning code is increased to "Flood Warning" evacuation must begin immediately.</p> <p>Within 10 hours of receiving a "Flood Alert", or within 2 hours of receiving a "Flood Warning", the evacuation of the site will be complete and this will be confirmed to the Newark & Sherwood District Council. Occupants of the site must initially undertake a visual check of any floodwater</p>	<p>Noted. This information does not overcome the in principle objection set out in the first reason for refusal. The Emergency Planner comments are contained within the Committee report. The Emergency Planning Guidance produced by the Nottingham and Nottinghamshire Local Resilience Forum sets out an Evacuation Plan where occupiers of Tolney Lane evacuate to the Cattle Market site. However this was put in place in response to a flood event in the year 2000 as a compensatory response to assist the then existing occupiers of Tolney Lane. Members will have to consider whether this represents an acceptable mitigation strategy for the creation of new pitches at Tolney Lane. The more recent grant of temporary permissions at Tolney Lane have been subject to a detailed flood risk condition that require details of all occupiers, contact details, identification of flood wardens and occupiers to state where they would evacuate to (other than the Cattle Market which is also subject to flooding) in a flood event.</p>

Schedule of Communication Received after Printing of Agenda

Item	Correspondent	Date	Points Raised (Summary)	Officer's Response
Agenda Page 9			<p>to satisfy themselves that evacuation is safe.</p> <p>Evacuation of the site would be to the Cattle Market on the eastern side of the B6326 Great North Road. The Cattle Market is within Flood Zone 2 and therefore if advised by the Local Planning Authority or the Environment Agency evacuation should be to an area outside of the Trent valley.</p> <p>Once the flood event has passed, Environment Agency flood information, local news and media should be monitored in order to determine when it is safe to access the site again if it has been evacuated. Flood conditions should be assessed by the Council and emergency services prior to any attempt at reoccupation. There should also be cooperation with representatives from the utilities companies to ensure that there are no unacceptable risks.</p> <p>The monitoring and maintenance of this plan will be undertaken by Mr A Coverdale and Mr J Coverdale who are resident on site within Plots 2 and 3 respectively.</p>	
9	Applicants	28.10.2021	Letters have been submitted from 5 occupants that currently live on 5 of the	The information submitted is acceptable to confirm status on 5 of the plots. Of the remaining 8 plots, none are currently

PLANNING COMMITTEE – 2 November 2021

Schedule of Communication Received after Printing of Agenda

Item	Correspondent	Date	Points Raised (Summary)	Officer's Response
21/019 00/FUL			plots giving information about their gypsy and traveller status, stating that they have moved from other sites on Tolney Lane. They already have strong established medical, education and family connections in Newark. They have nowhere else to go and wish to have a settled base.	occupied. Notwithstanding this, the first reason for refusal currently before Members remains unaltered. The agent has requested that if Members require further information on status in order to support the application (either on a permanent or temporary basis), that the application be deferred to allow this to be obtained and submitted.
10 21/021 76/FUL	Newark Town Council	28.10.2021	No objection raised.	Noted.

Briefing Note:

The Planning Balance

29 October 2021

*This Briefing Note on **The Planning Balance** supports application 20/01452/OUTM: Land east of Newlink Business Park, Newark. It highlights two important considerations which members may like to bear in mind in considering the Planning Balance.*

Newark Open for Business?

over
520
NEWARK
jobs

1. In assessing the planning balance it helps to understand the weight of the economic development argument. The application not only brings over 500 jobs of a range and skill level Newark seeks but also sends a clear message into the most vibrant of commercial markets, that Newark is indeed open for business. And the converse applies.

Logistics sector moves fast

2. The logistics sector, even pre-pandemic, was one of the most dynamic of all property sectors. Now, with the benefit of strong tailwinds from the dramatic surge in online retail and the need for storage space, it is surpassing even itself.

But what does this mean for Newark?

3. Firstly, Newark must take the employment opportunities when they arise. Don't wait. The problem with waiting until the land is allocated, through the local plan process, is that this simply takes too long and the logistics opportunities, and the hundreds - possibly thousands - of jobs it would bring, will have moved on and other areas such as Doncaster and Grantham for example. (There is currently another application before South Kesteven District Council for 800,000 sqft of B8 just off the A1.)
4. Secondly, it explains the apparent anomaly whereby, in the logistics market, tenants do not sign up until they can see that the site has planning permission. The reason for this is simple and relates, again, to speed: they need to act very quickly from the moment they select a site to the point where it begins trading. Typically this has to be within a couple of years, or as fast as possible.

£1.1m
in
business
rates

Issued on behalf of Tritax and Simons Developments
by

Fieldsend Associates

POLITICAL, COMMUNITY STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT

Planning Policy Comments

Ref: 20/01452/OUTM

Address: Land east of Newlink Business Park, Newark

Proposal: Development of site for distribution uses (Use Class B8) including ancillary offices and associated works including vehicular and pedestrian access, car parking and landscaping.

Comments

The following comments take account of the Employment Land Needs Study (ELNS) (May 2021), the Fisher German advice to the District Council on the application and the most recent correspondence from the applicant.

In terms of compliance with Core Policy 6, the proposal would align with the desire to strengthen and broaden the District's economy and to provide a diverse range of employment opportunities. Logistics and distribution is also a priority business sector which the policy seeks to encourage the development of. Nevertheless by virtue of its location I remain of the view that the proposal is inconsistent with the Spatial Strategy, and represents an inappropriate use in the open countryside. Whilst the proposed development could accommodate an expansion of the existing Dixons- Carphone Warehouse operation, adjacent to the application site, this is by no means certain. Indeed the applicant has acknowledged that they would seek an alternative occupier were this to not be the case, and has confidence the unit would be quickly taken up. In any case even were the proposal able to be considered an expansion of an existing use then this is potentially moot, as Policy DM8 would require it to be 'proportionate' - a threshold I'm not necessarily convinced that this proposal would meet given its scale. Though it is accepted that there would be a case around continuing to support a significant existing local employer.

Employment Land Requirements

Fundamental to the case presented is that the employment land requirements within the Amended Core Strategy, do not adequately take account of the 'Big Box' market and the rise of e-commerce. These requirements flow from the Employment Land Forecasting Study published in August 2015, and so it should be noted that the District Council has recently participated in the Employment Land Needs Study (ELNS) for the Nottingham Core and Outer Housing Market Areas- with the final document being published in May. As part of this more recent work employment land needs to cover the period 2018-38 were modelled under a variety of scenarios. The econometric and labour supply models suggest a level of need, of up to 55.69 ha, whilst the scenario based on 'past take-up rates' was much higher with a need for almost 100 ha of industrial /distribution land, plus a further 80,180 sqm of office floorspace (around 20 ha, if a 40% plot ratio is applied). This higher requirement would exceed the 83.1ha requirement within the Amended Core Strategy (ACS), albeit that the ACS only covers the period up to 2033.

Ultimately which employment land requirement scenario the Authority should follow is a strategic decision it will need to take, including determining whether maintaining the current very high rates of completions –necessitating the amendment of the ACS requirement- is a desirable policy outcome. It is also the case that the requirements within the ACS are only part of the picture, and when considered against the substantial supply of committed and allocated employment land (160.19 ha) it would appear likely that even a continuation of past take up rates could be serviced without the need for additional land.

The ELNS represents a general assessment of employment land needs, and given the scale and specific needs of the Big Box logistics sector it has made the recommendation that a further strategic study be undertaken - focusing exclusively on this development type. This would seek to quantify the scale of strategic B8 logistics need across the Core/Outer HMA and beyond, and consider the appropriate locations to meet this need. Consultants are now in the process of being appointed and the District Council has committed to the work.

It is clear however that this additional work is necessary to fully understand whether the employment land requirements within the ACS reflect the demand for Big Box development within the District, and whether additional sites are necessary to service this. It remains conceivable that it is current market trends which are driving this proposal, and that were those trends to change or the supply of land in primary locations to increase that the present attractiveness of secondary locations such as Newark for Big Box development could recede. The work will also allow the District Council to think more strategically around this matter, and reach conclusions over how Big Box logistics fits into its economic development agenda, beyond this specific application. Contributing towards resolving fundamental questions over whether this is a direction it wishes to follow, to what degree and where. Consequently I do not agree with the line advanced by the applicant over the employment land requirements within the ACS, and consider that they remain fit for purpose at this moment in time. It is also the case that the Development Plan has made land available, capable of accommodating this form of development through the Middlebeck urban extension – with the Levelling-up Fund announcement having closed the funding gap for the Southern Link Road.

Current Big Box Market Trends

There is a consistent market picture between the case presented by the applicant, the advice the Authority has received and the wider evidence from sources such as the Savills Big Shed Briefing. This is one of an acute lack of land supply for this form of logistics development, with levels of demand continuing to remain extremely high. Through the ELNS it is reported that in almost all parts of the study area the supply of prime sites is almost non-existent. With agents having indicated a clear need for sites to be brought forward in the very short term to meet demand and help the economy adjust to and recover from the Covid recession. Whilst over the medium/longer term their view was that very significant areas of land would need to be identified to meet the ongoing needs of the logistics sector.

The work from Avison Young, supporting the ELNS, tallies with this and over the medium-long term they expect to see a continued increase in demand for B8 space, particularly focused in prime locations (such as the M1 J24/28 area) due to the impact of Covid-19 on consumers' behaviour and the rise of e-commerce; the renewed importance of building up stock contingency; the progression of technology and the reshoring of some production (increasing the for additional warehousing and distribution).

On the eastern side of Nottingham, demand is significantly weaker, although it is considered a reasonable prospect at present due to the widespread shortage of sites. Historically the comparatively poor east-west road linkages, and also the increasingly sparse population centres the further one moves eastwards away from the conurbation were identified as issues. Agents also saw the A1 Corridor as being more of a risk as it would likely be the first to see rising vacancies throughout an economic downturn. Units without easy access to the M1 are said to achieve rents of £1 to £1.50 per sq. ft below what could be achieved near the M1. Reflecting on this it may be that the general concerns around east-west connectivity along the A1 corridor could be less of an issue at Newark, given the presence of the A46.

The Fisher German advice on this application largely reflects the ELNS, with the appeal of Newark as a secondary logistics location having been seen to increase. Whilst they consider that locations along the M1 corridor will remain the preference for Big Box development, Newark does in their opinion enjoy many of the same positive attributes as other locations on the A1 corridor, such as Peterborough or Corby – which have seen recent take up of land for this form of logistics. As the industrial and logistics market has continued to perform strongly, especially in the East Midlands, the demand and take-up of premises in secondary locations has improved. This has been driven, primarily, by a lack of supply and rising land values in prime locations meaning developers and investors have been seeking land opportunities within secondary locations which still benefit from good transport links. It is perhaps over the medium-long-term where the Fisher German advice is slightly more positive – in comparison to the slight concerns raised by agents in the ELNS, with the very strong Big Box market deemed as likely to continue for the foreseeable future. Whilst, the Covid-19 pandemic has accelerated the Big Box market, the trajectory was already on the up prior to the pandemic and they do not see this changing.

Availability of Alternative Sites

In the applicants view the lack of development in Newark is due to the absence of suitable sites, with other similar areas that have seen Big Box logistics being pointed to (Peterborough and Corby). The advice from Fisher German takes the line that the lack of development is partly attributable to this shortage, and in my view the historic disadvantages of the location when compared to the M1 corridor must surely also have been a factor. The fact that current market conditions are driving take-up in previous secondary location is however acknowledged, as outlined above.

Fisher German conclude the only realistic alternative site for Big Box development in and around the Newark Urban Area is the outline consented employment land at the Middlebeck urban extension, aligning with my previous views on this. The applicant has dismissed this potential location on the basis that it relies on the Southern Link Road (SLR) being completed, the likely timescales for delivery of the link road and the existence of a funding gap were also been pointed to. In this respect, the successful bid which has secured sufficient funding to complete the SLR through the Levelling-up Fund addresses these concerns in part. Our position has previously been that assuming funding was committed by the end of the calendar year, then it is possible that the road could be open by June 2023 (the employment land earlier, by late 2022 if required). The applicant disagreed with these timescales viewing 5 years as a minimum as more likely. However, in my view completion of the section of the SLR to the east would likely suffice to unlock the employment land for Big Box logistics over the short term, as this would provide direct access to the A1. Urban & Civic are currently working on the design of the roundabout at the A1 end of the SLR, with the intention to progress with the technical design and approval over the remainder of this calendar year – and so it being in place by late 2022 does not seem unreasonable.

This would appear to me to represent the kind of timeframe over which the land can be considered as a reasonably available potential location for Big Box development. Furthermore the timescales involved in development at the two locations would not seem that different to me. Fisher German have provided a useful indicative appraisal of this. In terms of Land South of Newark, were the SLR funding approved by the end of 2021, SLR construction to commence in Q1 of 2022, and detailed permission for the Big Box logistics sought in Q1 or Q2 of the same year – then implementation of the permission could occur once sufficient progress had been made on the SLR construction – say Q4 2022 or Q1 2023. With occupation of the Unit and completion of the SLR to follow in Q4 2023 or Q1 2024.

Under their best case scenario for the application site Fisher German indicate occupation of the development could occur by Q1/Q2 2023 – however this would be based on outline consent being granted in Q3/4 2021, detailed application being submitted before the end of 2021 and approved in Q1 2022. With the unit being speculatively built and completed by Q1/Q2 2023. Under the alternative scenario the site would be offered on a design and build basis – whereby it would go to market for between 6-12 months with knock on effects from then subsequently seeking detailed planning consent and construction resulting in occupation in Q3 of 2024 or later.

The final reason for dismissal of the land by the applicant revolves around viability issues arising from abnormal costs totalling £12.5 million associated with the need for piling foundations on the former gypsum workings. However confidence over the deliverability of the employment land remains strong and I do not consider this is sufficient to contribute towards the discounting of the land.

Impact on Delivery of Land South of Newark

I have previously raised concerns over the impact that granting permission could have on the successful delivery of the outline consented employment land at Land South of Newark, which could accommodate this form of development. We need to remain mindful over the effect that an introduction of this scale of competing land could have, and there needs to be comfort that this would not result in the potential loss of a greater quantum and mixed form of employment development as part of the strategic site.

The Fisher German advice is helpful in this respect, and given their view on current market conditions in secondary locations they consider that there is sufficient demand to accommodate Big Box development at both the application site and on the employment land at Middlebeck. Were the two sites to be marketed at the same time then they expect that this would impact on take-up accordingly. But on my reading this would result in an extension to the time periods for delivery– rather than undermining it. Given there are likely to be slight differences in the timeframes for each site then it may also be unlikely that they would be simultaneously marketed, were Urban & Civic to be seeking a Big Box occupier for Middlebeck.

Benefits Analysis

Notwithstanding the conflict with the Development Plan there are a range of benefits associated with the proposed development. The applicant deems these to be as follows:

- Around 500 FTE jobs across all skills sectors
- £30 million direct capital investment
- £85 million total economic output
- £1.1 million business rates per annum

Clearly the Full Time Equivalent (FTE) jobs likely to be generated by the proposal are a key benefit – though given the uncertainty around end occupier there is again a lack of certainty here. The figure generated by the applicant is based on application of employment density ratio research from the then Homes and Communities Agency (now Homes England) published in 2015. Notwithstanding the source, given the rapid pace of change in this sector the use of figures dating from 2015 would appear to be at risk of having become dated. It would seem to me that the level of employment supported by Big Box logistics can vary significantly between operators – with the level of automation being a significant factor.

Fisher German undertook an analysis of the jobs created by recent Big Box developments – predominantly in the East Midlands but also looking further afield (extract below).

Occupier	Space (SqFt)	Employees	SqFt of Space / Employee	Location	Date
Mars	694,608	550	1,263	Leicester	2022
Appliance Direct	525,000	220	2,386	Leicester	2021
Hermes	100,000	100	1,000	Nottingham	2020
Clipper Logistics	600,000	1,200	500	Sheffield	2021
Amazon	150,000	700	214	Leicester	2021
Aldi	600,000	300	2,000	Nottingham	2020
Amazon	1,300,000	3,300	394	Nottingham	2019
Asos	1,100,000	4,000	275	Barnsley	2021
Morrisons	800,000	1,100	727	Somerset	2020

The jobs created within this sample ranged from 100 – 4,000, though it must be said that over half supported 700+ jobs. It is also the case that Hermes unit at 100,000 sqm – supporting the lowest number of jobs- is well below the floorspace being sought here (400,000 sq ft.). Although it should also be noted that the correlation between floorspace and number of jobs is not consistent. Newark's secondary location may also make it unlikely to attract occupiers in the same category as some of those listed above. What however is clear is that the proposed development has the potential to support a significant number of jobs – dependent upon the end occupier(s), and on balance the applicant appears to have been cautious in not seeking to over-estimate this benefit.

In terms of the quality of job offered and associated salary, Fisher German have helpfully provided the following information.

- Average warehouse Manager Salary (East Midlands) - £32,365
- Average warehouse employee Salary (East Midland) - £22,585 (£21,424 UK average)

Unfortunately the only figures from the Office for National Statistics (ONS) I've been able to access relate to median annual pay in the East Midlands, which as at 2020 was £24,111. The average warehouse employee salary would be below this – though it should also be noted that the figures from Fisher German show those within the region to be above the national sector average. The information provided by the applicant is also noted in this respect – which seeks to challenge the perception that the logistics sector only provides for low pay job opportunities. Pointing out that on the data they have presented median salaries in the sector are around £6,700 higher than the average for all sectors, at £31,600 compared to £24,900 and representing an increase from £28,000 in 2014. They also indicate that there are now a number of logistics sub-sectors where the average salary is above £35,000 a year. I would suggest that other colleagues are probably better placed to provide analysis of this type. I am however receptive to the argument that in addition to non-skilled jobs there will also be opportunities for more skilled roles – though one would presume these will be available at lesser numbers.

Conclusion

The current Big Box market conditions are accepted, and it is acknowledged that the proposal (if followed by an acceptable Reserved Matters stage and successfully implemented) would provide a boost to land supply over the short term. Nonetheless we operate within a plan-led system, whereby planning applications should be determined in line with the Development unless material consideration indicate otherwise. Given the overall inconsistency with the Development Plan it will therefore be necessary for other material considerations to be present, which outweigh the presumption against the granting of consent. In my view the potential to support a significant number of FTE jobs has the potential to meet this threshold, particularly at the scale which Big Box logistics

can offer. Whilst the exact number remains uncertain the figures provided by the applicant don't appear an over-estimate. It would appear that there is also the potential for a range of job roles to be supported, including smaller numbers of those of a more skilled nature.

The applicant is open to the granting of a short-term consent and is committed to an accelerated programme of investment and delivery. This is helpful and would assist in addressing some of the concern around whether the demand for this form of development in a secondary location, such as Newark is accurate. Logically, and to lay down a marker, this should then also apply to a subsequent reserved matters stage were permission to be granted. A shortened permission would also allow for issues around job number, quality and salary to be rapidly tested. Combined with the additional County-wide work around Big Box logistics this will allow the Authority to make strategic decisions moving forward over the extent to which it wishes to place Big Box logistics at the heart of its economic development strategy.

I am content that there are potentially significant positive material considerations associated with the proposed development. Providing you are satisfied that the detail of the proposal remains acceptable, then in my view these considerations have the potential to outweigh the conflict with the Development Plan – and warrant a departure from its provisions through the granting of outline consent. Understandably there may be some concern over the precedent that granting permission in an open countryside location could cause. However in terms of additional Big Box proposals, were this scheme to be granted then the extent to which it is advanced will allow market signals to be better understood. Taking account of the additional work referred to above this will help provide a firmer footing for further proposals to be considered. In terms of other forms of development, then I would view both the scale of this proposal and the extent of potential benefits associated with it to be exceptional and not easily replicated.

Signed: *Matthew Tubb*

Position: *Senior Planner (Policy)*

Date: *1st November 2021*

20/01452/OUTM Land Off A17 Coddington: Development of site for distribution uses (Use Class B8) including ancillary offices and associated works including vehicular and pedestrian access, car parking and landscaping.

In re-considering this application since the last planning committee I have again tried to determine what the need is to develop this unallocated site whilst there are other allocated sites available.

- Since the last planning committee, we have received confirmation that the purchase of land at G Park on Brunel Drive is complete with plans being developed for industrial and warehousing space which, if approved, would create between 625 and 925 new jobs
- We have received confirmation that the Levelling Up Fund application for the Southern Link Road will now go ahead which increase the prospects of the Middlebeck development coming forward
- Tritax have been unable to confirm that Dixons will be the occupier of any development on this site therefore, if developed, it could be any business that sets up here.

Therefore, on balance, I think that this proposal remains a speculative development on an unallocated site in open countryside

My original concerns about this application have not changed:

- This is open countryside, regularly cropped and cultivated agricultural land and recent events remind us of the need to conserve both.
- DM8 requires that development on the open countryside is small scale and requires a rural location and I don't consider that either of these apply in this case, certainly not when our own policies direct that new allocations of employment land should be on 'land south of Newark and land around Fernwood'
- This is a traffic hotspot. There are no plans currently in place to alleviate these and a further influx of 500+ employee vehicles will only exacerbate this.

This application is a departure from the Development Plan and I don't believe that there are any circumstances within it that would necessitate the overriding of that Plan when there are allocated sites available

Therefore, for the reasons outlined above, I cannot support it

Linda Dales

District Councillor for Collingham

