

CALVERTON NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN (CNP)

ISSUES FOR DISCUSSION AT THE PUBLIC HEARING

TUESDAY, 11TH JULY 2017

STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND

1. In response to a request from me, Calverton Parish Council, Gedling Borough Council and Nottinghamshire County Council have produced a statement of common ground. This is a very useful document which appears to narrow down the differences between these parties in relation to Policy NE4 and the Southern Ridge Area (SRA) notation. Is that correct?
2. Does this mean that there is no substantial disagreement between these parties on matters such as Policy G1 (Comprehensive Development), Policy NE1 (Local Green Space), Policy NE2 (Open Space), Policy BE5 (Heritage Assets) or the accuracy of the 'Retention of Employment' boundary shown on the Policies Map?
3. We will then run briefly through the modifications proposed in the statement of common ground.

POLICY NE4. SOUTHERN RIDGE AREA

Background

1. The CNP does not seek to allocate housing sites. The broad amount of housing growth considered appropriate for Calverton is set out in the Aligned Core Strategy (ACS) which in Policy 2 indicates that up to 1,055 new dwellings will be located in the village. Details of the amount and location of housing in Calverton will be determined through the emerging local plan (the Gedling Local Planning Document).
2. The Parish Council considers that all new housing should be located on one site to the north west of the village. The emerging local plan proposes to allocate an additional two sites (H14 and H15) on lower ground to the south of the village within the proposed SRA. The forum for discussion of such disagreements is the examination into objections to the emerging local plan and it is for the Inspector conducting that examination to reach a conclusion on this matter. It is not part of my remit to comment on this matter and I will not do so.
3. My role is, amongst other things, to determine whether the CNP has regard to The Framework, whether it is in general conformity with strategic policies in the development plan, which in this instance are the policies in the ACS and whether it makes a contribution to sustainable development. There is no legal requirement for the CNP to be consistent with strategic policies in the emerging local plan but there is an expectation that the two plans will complement each other and differences between them will be minimised. It is, therefore, relevant to ask a number of questions about the emerging local plan.
4. Has it yet been determined which policies in the emerging local plan are strategic?
5. Are sites in the proposed SRA (other than H14 and H15) being promoted for housing through the examination into the emerging local plan?
6. The emerging local plan is proposing less housing growth in Calverton than the maximum figure in the ACS. Is this being challenged through the examination into the emerging local plan?

SRA

1. It is stated that the proposed SRA is not a landscape designation. What sort of designation is it and what is its purpose?
2. Does the SRA undermine the Spatial Strategy set out in the ACS?
3. There is a suggestion in the representations that the proposed SRA designation is specifically designed to challenge the emerging local plan by providing blanket protection for an area which includes sites being proposed for housing in that plan. Is this correct?
4. In part, the proposed SRA would overlay the Green Belt. Are there examples in the emerging local plan of other similar designations overlaying the Green Belt?
5. What is the difference between the proposed SRA and Green Belt? What would the former achieve that the latter cannot or would the former simply duplicate the latter?
6. The proposed SRA includes part of the built-up area of Calverton. What is the justification for this and how consistent is this with the presumption in favour of sustainable development?
7. How robust is the evidence underpinning the proposed SRA designation?
8. What is the purpose of including the Dark Lane site within the SRA when that site has planning permission for housing?

POLICY NE1 LOCAL GREEN SPACE

1. What is the size of each of the proposed Local Green Spaces. Do any of these amount to extensive tracts of land?
2. Some of the proposed Local Green Spaces are in the Green Belt. What would the former designation achieve that the latter could not or would the former simply duplicate the latter?
3. Is Policy NE1 consistent with the policy for Green Belts?
4. A Local Green Space is proposed within the proposed North West Quadrant Urban Extension. Would such a designation complement or conflict with the comprehensive planning of this area?

POLICY NE2 OPEN SPACE

1. It is proposed to designate land west of Renals Way as Open Space. Is this land the subject of an extant planning permission for housing?

POLICY G1 COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT

1. Is Policy G1 too inflexible and too prescriptive?

POLICIES MAP

1. The boundary of the 'Existing Employment Area' shown on the Policy Map differs from the 'Retention of Employment Boundaries' shown on the emerging local plan's Policy Map. Why is this?

STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT(SEA) SCREENING STATEMENT & HABITAT REGULATIONS ASSESSMENT (HRA) NOVEMBER 2016

1. Does the SEA Screening Statement & HRA dated November 2016 relate to the Submission Version of the CNP also dated November 2016?
2. Can I have copies of the letters sent to the statutory consultees referred to in paragraph 18 of the SEA Screening Statement and HRA?