

EAST STAFFORDSHIRE LOCAL PLAN INQUIRY**ROUND TABLE SESSION – EMPLOYMENT LAND DEMAND AND SUPPLY****ISSUES AND QUESTIONS****Employment Land Requirement**

1. What is the basis of the Structure Plan's Employment Land Requirement?
2. According to Structure Plan para 6.13, it appears to be based upon past land development rates. The Structure Plan quotes a figure of 25 ha for the period 1996 – 1999; a rate of 8.3 ha per annum. The Revised Deposit Local Plan (RDLP) states that 95.5 ha have been completed from 1996 to 2003, a higher rate of 13.6 ha per annum. This is still below the required rate of 16.6 ha per annum for 1996 – 2011, but is increasing.
3. What are the factors behind the lower rates of employment development so far and what initiatives are in place to increase the development rate to meet Structure Plan requirements?
4. What are the implications of any failure to attain the Structure Plan required rate?
5. The intention of SP Policy appears to meet the employment land demands of firms wishing to establish, relocate and expand (off site?) within the Plan area. Is this the case? It does not appear to seek any particular level of employment. In this case, where does the RDLP derive the objective of seeking to maximise employment opportunities (para 13)?
6. Does the re-development of land previously in employment use count towards meeting the Structure Plan employment land requirement? If not, did the calculation of past development rates exclude redevelopment of previous employment sites?

Employment Retention

7. What is para 13 of the Revised LP seeking? Is it seeking to retain existing employment sites and premises for employment purposes, whatever their circumstances and whatever the market demand?
8. Is there a potential loss of employment land/premises to housing developments, if so what is the scale of such losses and what problems arise?

Employment Land Provision

9. The predominance of previously undeveloped employment land allocations is justified in para 5 of the RDLP on grounds of their early availability compared to long lead in times for redevelopment sites as well as the need to attract inward investment with large level sites accessible to transport corridors.
10. What is regarded as inward investment and what proportion has this formed of past development? What is the definition of large sites and what proportion of past

development have occupied such sites? What is the definition of accessibility to transport corridors?

11. What are the lead in times for employment development on redevelopment sites? Do they differ from lead in times for housing on redevelopment sites? How do they compare with lead in times for greenfield developments and what are the reasons for any differences. Do employment developments require low in lead times, if so why?
12. How does the preference for greenfield allocations in the RDLP sit with the requirement in Structure Plan para 6.16 that the release of land on the edge of towns should be accompanied by evidence that all other opportunities have been considered? How does this sit with the provisions of SP Policies E3, E7 (particularly c) and E8 and the government's policy favouring the development of brownfield above greenfield land?
13. Are there any brownfield land opportunities for employment development that are not realised in the Plan, given the comments in para 6.7 of CD/A27?
14. What review of existing employment land commitments were undertaken in the Local Plan to comply with SP Paras 6.12 and 6.16? Particularly in view of the scale of employment land commitments in East Staffs.
15. Why does the RDLP provide for 14 ha less employment land than the Structure Plan requirement? Is the SP Panel's recommendation adequate reason? Given the concern about lead in times for some employment sites, will this underprovision help or hinder in achieving 250 ha of employment development, rather than allocated land, before 2011? Is it consistent with an overprovision of housing land?
16. Given a shortfall of 14 ha, what is the basis for holding back the extra provision of 15 ha west of Uttoxeter. If the allocation of 10 ha is unlikely to justify the high infrastructure costs, how does a tentative possible future allocation assist the funding of the initial development? How will the failure to meet the Structure Plan requirement be judged. What is the meaning of the last part of Policy E4 and is it consistent with the first sentence. How does this further possible development amounting in total to a regional investment site, accord with regional strategy (Policy PA7) and the views of the WMRA and WMRO?
17. The Employment Topic Paper suggests that para 8.3 justifies the west of Uttoxeter allocation and the deletion of allocations at Spath and Lawns Farm, but there is no para 8.3?
18. Is the allocation of 40 ha, south of Branston, additional to the 20 ha which was committed in the 1st Draft LP? What are the employment factors justifying an increase in scale? The review of the former housing allocation on greenfield land may provide the opportunity, but does it provide the justification?
19. A review of Burton's sub regional role appears to be justified (CD/A26 para 4.6) in part by the brownfield opportunities in neighbouring South Derbyshire. Does an employment allocation of 40/60 ha on greenfield land at Branston sit with this concept? Does such an allocation assist the redevelopment of brownfield land at Drakelow? What reasons were advanced to delete the Drakelow site? Does a larger allocation at Branston help to overcome such reasons? Why was the Branston site

classified as brownfield land? Why do the WMRA believe that the site is committed? Why do the WMRO object to this allocation (CD/A26)?

20. As well as overall scale, does the Plan provide for a satisfactory range of sites and a suitable mix of employment uses?

Rural Employment

21. Do Plan Policies (E18, E19 and E20) make suitable provision for rural employment and farm diversification? Are unemployment rates high in remote rural areas?
22. Are there any rural areas without good access to employment opportunities?
23. The reference in para 8.2 of the Employment Topic Paper to para 10.4 appears to be wrong.

Uses for former Employment Sites

24. If former employment sites are not redeveloped for employment uses, to what future uses are they to be put, bearing in mind the provisions of Policy H2 and the comments in para 6.7 of CD/A27? What criteria do the Council adopt in evaluating brownfield sites (CD/A27 para 6.7) and where can these be found?

Design

25. Are there any major design issues related to new employment development (ESBC)?

WJB – 26/11/04