


Gedling Borough Council

Site Selection Document – Addendum 3

Consideration of Additional Housing Allocations



September 2017

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1. This document has been prepared in order to explain the approach taken to the allocation of additional sites in response to the Inspector's Letter to the Council on Housing Land Supply and Housing Allocation H8 (Killisick Lane) dated 16th June 2017 (**EX/122**).
- 1.2. Section 2 of this document seeks to determine the additional number of homes that now need to be accommodated on housing allocations in the Local Planning Document in light of this letter. The number of homes is dependent on the alignment of the revised northern boundary of the Killisick Lane site (with implications for the capacity of the site) and also the implications for the Council's five year land supply arising from the associated delay to the adoption of the Local Planning Document.
- 1.3. Once the additional number of homes that are required has been identified, Section 3 then identifies a shortlist of reserve sites for consideration and reassesses each of these sites on the basis of current information. This shortlist of reserve sites has been drawn from the Site Selection Document (**LPD/GRO/05-14**) and evidence submitted throughout the examination process.
- 1.4. Section 4 sets out the conclusions in relation to the additional sites proposed for allocation and considers the distribution of the new sites in relation to the spatial strategy set by the adopted Aligned Core Strategy.
- 1.5. The reserve sites are listed at Appendix B and plans of the shortlisted reserve sites are provided at Appendix C.

2.0 Extent of Shortfall

- 2.1. The five year housing supply has been updated in the Housing Background Paper Addendum 2 (HBP2). The housing requirement for the five year period (2017 to 2022) plus a 20% buffer is 3,737 homes. Table 4A of the HBP2 calculates the housing supply without additional housing supply as 3,562 which is a shortfall of 175. The shortfall that now needs to be addressed comes from two sources, in order to compensate for any homes not being provided on the Killisick Lane (H8) in the five year period (2017 – 2022) site plus the number of homes that will no longer come forward within the five year period (2017-2022) due to the delay in the adoption of the Local Planning Document. These two elements are now considered in turn.

Killisick Lane (H8)

- 2.2. At the Hearing session on 1st March 2017 discussions took place on the allocation of land at Killisick Lane (H8) for housing. The site is included in the Local Planning Document Publication Draft for the construction of 215 homes. At the hearing session, evidence was heard from representatives of the owners of this site (Pegasus Group and Heaton Planning on behalf of Gedling Borough Council, Mr N Foster and the Trustees of Constable's Field Foundation), the Borough Council, Nottinghamshire County Council, as Minerals Authority, and Ibstock Group Limited, along with other interested parties.
- 2.3. A further parcel of land to the north of H8 was put forward by Pegasus Group for an additional 15 homes during the Hearing as being in the control of the same joint landowners. This enlarged site for 230 homes (200 being within the 5 year housing land supply period 1 April 2017 to 31 March 2022) was supported by the Council as a housing allocation within the Plan going forward.
- 2.4. On the basis of the evidence presented at the hearing session, however, the Inspector has raised significant concerns about the soundness of this allocation, in its entirety, given its close proximity to the adjacent minerals site at Dorket Head Brickworks and quarry. She has therefore requested that the Council gives some consideration to either reducing the size of this allocation (to ensure that its northern boundary reflects that of the existing residential development on the northern side of Brechin Close, to the east of Killisick Lane) and identifying an additional site or sites elsewhere to make up the shortfall, or deleting the allocation in its entirety and identifying an alternative site or sites elsewhere.

- 2.5. Since the publication of the Inspector's Letter to the Council on Housing Land Supply and Housing Allocation H8 (Killisick Lane) dated 16th June 2017 (**EX/122**), further discussions have taken place with Ibstock which have confirmed that the housing site can in fact be developed in full in tandem with clay extraction and restoration, such that there is no need to reduce the area of land allocated in the Local Planning Document.
- 2.6. Notwithstanding the level of agreement that has now been reached with Ibstock, consideration has been given to the options put forward by the Inspector in order to present the implications of proceeding with either of these options.

Option 1 - Delete the site in its entirety;

- 2.7. The deletion of the entire site is not justified on grounds of impact on the adjoining minerals site. Discussion at the hearing sessions demonstrated that the impact of any future minerals extraction would be on the northern part of the site only. The existence of existing residential development to the east and west of the H8 housing allocation means that part of the site can still be developed without extending the built up area of Arnold towards the Dorket Head facility.
- 2.8. The deletion of the site in its entirety would have a more significant impact on the Council's five year land supply. As shown in the Further Revised Housing Background Paper Addendum (**EX/104A**), 200 of the 230 dwellings proposed previously contributed to the five year supply. The Council do not consider this option to be acceptable as the deletion of the entire site would therefore require more land to be allocated for housing, both to contribute to the Council's overall housing supply but primarily within the first five years.

Option 2 - Northern boundary to align with Brechin Close

- 2.9. The second option suggested by the Inspector is to amend the northern boundary of the housing allocation so that it reflects that of the existing residential development on the northern side of Brechin Close. In order to ensure that the northern boundary followed robust defensible boundaries that are clearly visible on the ground, it is considered that this option would result in the allocation of the two southernmost fields only. See plan attached as **Appendix A**. The area of land remaining as allocated for development is 2.69ha and applying the density policy as set out in Policy LPD 33 (30 dwellings per hectare results in a capacity of 80 dwellings).

- 2.10. Ibstock continues to have no concerns regarding this level of development and have confirmed that the number of dwellings could be delivered in full within the five year period. This option allows development to take place in this sustainable location (as set out in the Site Selection Document and Housing Background paper), but the level of development would make a reduced contribution to the Council's overall housing supply (80 rather than 230 dwellings) and, importantly, to the five year land supply (80 rather than 200 dwellings). In considering whether a smaller site area is appropriate, the key issue would be whether the extent of site proposed would remain deliverable, viable and attractive to a developer. Whilst this option is preferable to option 1 above, changes in circumstances have provided the Council with the opportunity to reconsider the issue which is set out below.
- 2.11. Since the adjournment of the hearings Ibstock has written to the Council (EX/123) proposing that the minerals to the south of the existing quarry workings within Ibstock's ownership could be worked out within three years and that with suitable phasing and through working in partnership the full 230 homes on site H8 could be delivered over 5 years. The Council welcomes this cooperation from Ibstock and gives an undertaking to work in partnership with this company and the County Minerals Planning Authority to deliver the minerals extraction and the housing development in a coordinated way. Changes are therefore proposed to the text of LPD 65 to reflect the need for a suitable phasing mechanism for the housing development to deliver it concurrently with the mineral extraction to the south of the existing quarry workings. The changes to LPD 65 are set out in the supporting text and will be part of the forthcoming consultation. The phasing would be designed to allow housing on H8 to be developed on the southern part of the site initially (up to 2019) and then housing development would be progressed northwards with housing closest to the northern boundary then delivered during the planned completion of the mineral working and its progressive restoration. The housing trajectory has therefore been changed to reflect this. It is considered that whilst the whole of the housing on H8 (230 homes) could be delivered within 5 years a more cautious approach to delivery is warranted. To reduce risk of non-delivery it is assumed therefore that 120 homes will be delivered on this H8 site within the first five years of the Plan with the remainder by the end of Plan period.

Five Year Land Supply

- 2.12. In preparing the Local Planning Document, there is a need for sufficient land to be allocated for housing in order to meet the overall housing requirement as set out in the Aligned Core Strategy plus a need to demonstrate that the plan will deliver a five year land supply for housing as required by paragraph 47 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 2.13. The Further Revised Housing Background Paper Addendum (**EX/104A**) was prepared in May 2017 to demonstrate a five year land supply, assuming adoption of the LPD later in 2017. This document has been revisited and replaced by Housing Background Paper 2 to reflect the delay to the adoption of the Local Planning Document by around 6 months.
- 2.14. The Local Planning Document allocates 24 sites for housing and 13 of these are sites that are currently within the Green Belt (and have not yet been granted planning permission). As such, the delivery of these sites is reliant on the adoption of the Local Planning Document, so that the current delay to the plan preparation process reduces the contribution that these sites can make to the Council's five year land supply.
- 2.15. The need for the allocation of additional housing sites is, in part, a consequence of the delay to the adoption of the Local Planning Document and also because of the need to phase site H8 so that only 120 homes contribute to the first five years as opposed to the full 230 homes being delivered. The shortfall is approximately 180 homes and it is important to note that the additional sites allocated may deliver homes within but also beyond the five year period and this has been an important factor in assessing the suitability of available sites.

3.0 Consideration of 'reserve' sites

3.1. The site selection process that informed the preparation of the Local Planning Document was a two stage process that looked at all identified reasonable alternatives in order to determine, firstly, whether a site could be allocated and, secondly, whether a site should be allocated. The Site Selection Document (**LPD/GRO/05**) and Addendum 2 to this document (**EX/98**) explain the methodology in more detail.

3.2. In order to identify which sites should now be allocated for development it is necessary to revisit the list of reasonable alternative sites and the conclusions previously reached. The format used in the Site Selection Document Addendum 2 has been used as a starting point and revisited as follows:-

Stage 1

3.3. The original site selection process considered firstly whether a site could be considered for allocation. This stage ruled out only the most unsuitable sites that could not be developed as a result of either their location within the Borough or due to an over-riding technical constraint.

3.4. Where it had been concluded that a site could not be allocated, this decision has now been revisited to assess if clear evidence has subsequently become available to demonstrate that this is no longer the case and the site can now be considered for allocation.

Stage 2

3.5. The original site selection process then considered whether a site should be considered for allocation. This resulted in a pool of sites, some of which were suitable for allocation but others of which were considered but then rejected for a range of reasons.

3.6. Where it had been concluded that a site was suitable for allocation but the site was not subsequently allocated, this site has been revisited to determine whether the site should be considered further on the basis of any updated evidence. The Site

Selection Document considered 117 reasonable alternative sites. 30 reasonable alternative sites (in whole or in part) have already been selected for allocation based on reaching a balanced judgement on a range of site selection information. Some of these 30 reasonable alternative sites were allocated in conjunction with adjoining sites, resulting in a total of 24 (not 30) housing allocations. A further 30 sites were considered suitable for allocation but were then not allocated. For some of the sites the decision was finely balanced or more sustainable sites were available in that location, but for 16 sites there was a clear reason why the site could not be allocated, as follows:-

Reason site could not be allocated	Site Reference
Site is already included in supply (in 'sites under the threshold')	6/479, 6/477
Site has been removed from the Green Belt which will allow development to come forward.	A1
Site is located in a village that has been washed over by the Green Belt and allocation would be inappropriate	A3
Site is not accessible as it relies on adjacent sites which are not considered suitable for allocation.	6/874, 6/875, 6/876, 6/636, 6/833, 6/832
Site lies beyond a strong defensible boundary and other more sustainable sites are available.	6/588, 6/772, 6/834, 6/587, 6/659
Site does not adjoin the urban area or other settlement.	6/767

3.7. **Appendix B** to this document revisits all the reasonable alternative sites to identify where an assessment should now be changed in light of updated information and to identify sites that should now be considered further for allocation. These sites comprise the shortlist of reasonable alternative sites and are listed below. Plans of each site are provided in **Appendix C**. It is from this shortlist that the additional allocations will be made:-

Site Reference	Name of Site	Comment	Consider for allocation?
A2	Lodge Farm Lane Phase 2 (150 dwellings)	<p>Key issues considered:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) It is understood that this site would contribute in full to the five year land supply. 2) The site can be accessed through the recently developed Stockings Farm development (Wansbeck Close and Longhirst) which has capacity to serve up to 390 homes (280 have been built). 3) The site is located within the Minerals Safeguarding Area. Parts of the site are located within 100 m of the operational brickworks and it is understood that Ibstock would have concerns regarding the allocation of this site and mitigation in the form of planting would be required as a minimum. In addition, the County Council as minerals planning authority have indicated that the site's proximity to the operational brickworks and the areas of the quarry being used for landfill would mean that a housing allocation in this area would be to the detriment of prospective occupiers and operators of Ibstock brickworks and Dorket Head Quarry and Landfill. 4) The site was not previously allocated due to the lack of a defensible northern boundary. The land rises to the north and east towards the Dorket Head Ridge (approximately at the 130m contour). 	<p>While it is acknowledged that the site is adjacent to the urban area and accords with the strategy of urban concentration set out in Policy 2 of the Aligned Core Strategy, it is not proposed to amend the Local Planning Document to allocate the site at the present time.</p> <p>The extent of this site would need to be amended to reflect the recommendations of the Landscape and Visual analysis evidence, limiting the capacity of the site to 80 dwellings.</p> <p>The shape of the remaining site is such that the site would not form a natural extension to the existing built up area and a contour would form a significant proportion of the site boundary.</p> <p>Conclusion – unsuitable for allocation</p>

		Contours were used to determine Green Belt boundaries for some edge of urban sites in the adopted GBRLP but their use has been resisted through the preparation of the LPD. The use of contours in this location, in particular, would result in a long narrow site with the contour forming a significant proportion of the site boundary. See plan attached at Appendix B .	
6/479	Metallifactory	<p>Key issues considered:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Planning permission (2011/1055) lapsed in November 2014 and a further proposal for 72 dwellings was granted planning permission on 30th August 2017 subject to the signing of the S106 agreement. 2) The site is previously developed land within the Arnold urban area in a highly sustainable location. 3) Whilst the site was last used for employment purposes it has not provided jobs for a number of years and is not protected for employment use. 4) The Site Selection Document confirms that the key reason that this site was not allocated for development was because the anticipated capacity of the site at the time was below the threshold for allocation. The current planning application for 72 dwellings exceeds this threshold. 	<p>The site is located within the main urban area and accords with the strategy of urban concentration set out in Policy 2 of the Aligned Core Strategy.</p> <p>The site is previously developed land formerly in employment use by the Metallifactory. The remaining land is suitable and available for residential use and will bring this vacant site back into use along the important A60 corridor.</p> <p>Planning permission for 72 dwellings was granted on 30th August 2017 subject to S106.</p> <p>Conclusion – allocate for 70 dwellings.</p>
6/778	Land to the west of	Key issues considered:-	The site lies adjacent to the urban

	<p>the A60 Redhill (150 dwellings)</p>	<p>1) The Site Selection Document (LPD/GRO/06) confirmed that the key reason that this site was not allocated previously was due to uncertainties around access. The accessibility of this site is dependent on the adjoining Metallifacure site (6/479). A legal agreement is in place between the owners of the site and the adjacent site for full access to be provided through the Metallifacure site. Planning permission for this site was granted on 30th August 2017 subject to the signing of the S106 and it is understood that the S106 heads of terms are now almost finalised. The approval of this application provides confirmation that the site can be accessed. The location of both sites is shown on the plan attached at Appendix B.</p> <p>2) It has been confirmed that the site could contribute 150 dwellings to the Council's housing supply, all within the 5 year period, based on the following milestones (and assuming adoption of the LPD in Summer 2018):- Submission of Detailed Planning Application by Barwood Homes for site 6/778 - May 2018 Planning Permission Granted/s106 completed - September 2018 Construction to commence –Spring 2019 Delivery of homes: 2019/20 - 50 2020/21 - 50 2021/22 - 50</p> <p>3) The County Council as minerals planning authority have confirmed that the site is a sufficient distance</p>	<p>area and accords with the strategy of urban concentration set out in Policy 2 of the Aligned Core Strategy.</p> <p>Given that planning permission has now been granted (subject to S106) on the adjoining Metallifacure site, it is considered that there is now sufficient certainty that access to the land to the west can be achieved.</p> <p>Conclusion – allocate for 150 dwellings.</p>
--	--	---	--

		from the brickworks, quarry and landfill. However the site could have potential for prior extraction of clay.	
-	North of Bestwood Lodge Drive, Arnold (250 dwellings)	<p>Key issues considered:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The impact of the development of the site in terms of flooding and (less so) landscape and heritage assets would need to be mitigated. 2) In terms of highways, Bestwood Lodge Drive is marginal in terms of visibility for the scale of development proposed and would need to be widened to allow footways along both sides. The initial transport assessment has not considered the impact on key junctions including Oxclose Lane/Queen Bower road which may require mitigation work. 3) The proposed density of the site is lower than required by the Council's density policy which suggests that a larger number of homes could be possible on site. 4) Importantly, the site is not being actively promoted by the City Council. 	<p>While it is acknowledged that the site is adjacent to the urban area and accords with the strategy of urban concentration set out in Policy 2 of the Aligned Core Strategy, it is not proposed to amend the Local Planning Document to allocate the site at the present time. The site is not being actively promoted and it has not been established whether the site can be accessed satisfactorily.</p> <p>Conclusion – unsuitable for allocation</p>
6/477	Daybrook Laundry, Arnold	<p>Key issues considered:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The signalised junction with the A60 to serve the new food store was constructed to allow additional development on the remainder of the Daybrook Laundry site. 	<p>The site is located within the main urban area and accords with the strategy of urban concentration set out in Policy 2 of the Aligned Core Strategy.</p>

		<p>2) Pre-application discussions indicate that the site has a capacity for around 50 dwellings thereby meeting the threshold for the allocation of urban sites.</p> <p>3) The site is previously developed land within the Arnold urban area in a highly sustainable location.</p> <p>4) The site is located within the A60 AQMA and will require assessment against the Air Quality Emissions Guidance and the provision of mitigation measures within the development design.</p> <p>5) In terms of flood risk, the site is not in flood zones 2 or 3 but is adjacent to flood zone 2. Surface water flooding on site is not identified as an issue but the adjacent A60 is shown as a surface flow route. The site will need to include appropriate sustainable drainage measures.</p>	<p>The site is previously developed land formerly in employment use by the Daybrook Laundry Company. Part of the former employment site has been developed as a retail food store. The remaining land is suitable and available for residential use and will bring this vacant site back into use along the important A60 corridor.</p> <p>Pre-application discussions are currently taking place about proposals for 50 homes.</p> <p>Conclusion – allocate for 50 dwellings.</p>
6/540	Land to the South of Crookdole Lane, Calverton (95 dwellings)	<p>Key issues considered:-</p> <p>1) In terms of defensible boundaries, the eastern boundary is the weakest. It is part hedge with gaps and post and wire fencing is visible in places. The northern and southern boundaries are stronger and appear satisfactory. The eastern boundary could be reinforced and would then be satisfactory.</p> <p>2) The parish council have noted that there is no public support for this option.</p>	<p>The site lies within one of the three key settlements for growth. However, the site is not being actively promoted and is considered unsuitable for allocation on grounds of flooding and landscape in particular. Also mindful of the lack of support for this site from the local community as expressed through the emerging Calverton</p>

		<p>3) However, the site has not been proactively promoted through the SHLAA since 2011 and the site has not been promoted through the LPD examination.</p> <p>4) The site is proposed as Local Green Space in the emerging Calverton Neighbourhood Plan and is described as previously being a play area. However, the site is not publicly accessible and is currently used as grazing land for cattle.</p> <p>5) The SA indicates that the site has a considerable amount of surface water flooding. There is a ditch running parallel with Crookdole Lane which overtops following heavy rain.</p>	<p>Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Conclusion – unsuitable for allocation.</p>
6/37	Long Acre Lodge, Calverton (80 dwellings)	<p>Key issues considered:-</p> <p>1) In terms of landscape, the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) (LPD/NAT/01 and 02) indicates that the development of the site would result in an adverse impact on long range views to the north if the northern end of the site was developed. The LVIA recommends the northern part of the site north of the junction between Flatts Lane and James Drive should be left as an open buffer. This would leave approximately 2.37 ha for development, with a capacity of 60 homes.</p> <p>2) It is understood that this site would contribute in full to the five year land supply.</p>	<p>This site lies on the northern edge of the key settlement of Calverton on land currently proposed as safeguarded land. The Site Selection Document concludes that the only reason that the site was not allocated was that there was no need for the additional dwellings as other more sustainable sites were available.</p> <p>This site would be preferred to an extension to the Park Road housing allocation as there are clear defensible boundaries to the</p>

		<p>3) In terms of heritage, the Assessment of the Impact of LPD Development Sites on Scheduled Monuments (EX/43 and also EX/89) comments that further built development to the north and east of H16 towards Oxton Road and Flatts Lane is likely to encroach on the open rural setting of the Roman Fort Scheduled Monument. However, the Long Acre Lodge site is a relatively narrow parcel of land that relates well to the existing settlement mirroring recent residential development on the opposite side of the road. It is considered that in view of its overall location this site could be developed without harming the Roman Camps Scheduled Monument at Whinsall Lane.</p> <p>4) In identifying the site within the proposed safeguarded land, the previous site selection work recognised there was a need for a buffer to the north for landscape, flooding and heritage reasons but concluded that some of the land was considered suitable for development.</p>	<p>site, the site would comprise a separate site that could deliver new homes early in the plan period (thereby contributing to the Council's five year land supply) and would not result in a significant impact on environmental and heritage assets. With regard to the latter the Heritage Assessment (EX/43), this confirms in paragraph 8.6 that this site could be developed without harming the Roman Camps Scheduled Ancient Monument. However in view of the proximity of the Scheduled Monument a full programme of archaeological investigation through a range of evaluation techniques will be required as well as an extensive programme of mitigation work.</p> <p>Conclusion – allocate for 60 dwellings.</p>
6/36	Lampwood Close, Calverton (103 dwellings)	<p>Key issues considered:-</p> <p>1) The Site Selection Document (LPD/GRO/08) notes that the development of this site would result in a major impact on the Conservation Area.</p>	<p>The site lies within one of the three key settlements for growth and is well connected to the settlement. The impact of the development of the site would</p>

		<p>2) In terms of the impact on Scheduled Monuments, (EX/43) has reviewed the potential impact of all 117 reasonable alternative sites on the setting of Scheduled Monuments and has concluded that this site would have no impact.</p> <p>3) The site lies within the Southern Ridge Area as designated in the emerging Calverton Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>4) It is noted that no significant landscape or visual impacts would arise from the development of this site.</p>	<p>primarily be on the Conservation Area.</p> <p>The site is considered unsuitable for allocation as more suitable sites are available within Calverton. Also mindful of the lack of support for this site from the local community as expressed through the emerging Calverton Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Conclusion – unsuitable for allocation.</p>
6/33	Hollinwood Lane/ Long West Croft, Calverton (136 dwellings)	<p>An extension to housing allocation H15 has been proposed by the landowner/developer and the additional land forms part of SHLAA site 6/33. This SHLAA site is therefore considered here in relation to that part of the site which forms an extension to H15 only. (The site is considered in its entirety below). Key issues considered:-</p> <p>1) The Report of Responses (LPD/REG/04) notes that the site identified for allocation has clear defensible boundaries to all sides but the area proposed for extension is not considered to have a defensible boundary to the east where it widens out into a larger field.</p> <p>2) It is noted that the extension lies within the Southern Ridge Area as defined in the emerging Calverton Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	<p>The site lies within one of the three key settlements for growth and would form an extension to an existing housing allocation.</p> <p>The site is considered unsuitable for allocation only because of the lack of defensible boundary to the east. Also mindful of the lack of support for this site from the local community as expressed through the emerging Calverton Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Conclusion – unsuitable for allocation.</p>

		<p>3) The area of the proposed extension is 0.89 ha and applying the density policy results in a capacity of 22 dwellings, although the site is proposed by the developer/landowner for 15 dwellings.</p> <p>4) It is understood that the extended site would contribute in full to the five year land supply.</p>	
6/33	Hollinwood Lane/ Long West Croft, Calverton (136 dwellings)	<p>Part of this site has also been considered as an extension to housing allocation H15 (above). The Site Selection Document concluded that this site could only be considered in conjunction with 6/544 (which has been allocated as housing site H15) or 6/45. Key issues considered:-</p> <p>1) It is noted that the extension lies within the Southern Ridge Area as defined in the emerging Calverton Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>2) Development to the south of Calverton (including this site) was opposed by Calverton Parish Council and many local residents through a number of public consultations.</p> <p>3) It is noted that no significant landscape or visual impacts would arise from the development of this site.</p> <p>4) The site nestles close to the settlement but forms part of a larger area which is open and has Green Belt value.</p>	<p>The site lies within one of the three key settlements for growth. The site is considered unsuitable for allocation as more suitable sites are available within Calverton. Also mindful of the lack of support for this site from the local community as expressed through the emerging Calverton Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Conclusion – unsuitable for allocation.</p>

6/35	Mansfield Lane (Flatts Hill), Calverton (223 dwellings)	<p>Key issues considered:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) In terms of landscape, the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) (LPD/NAT/01 and 02) indicates that there would be an adverse impact on long range views to the north if the northern end of the site was developed. The LVIA recommends the northern third of the site should be left as an open buffer. The capacity of the remaining 5 ha is 125 homes. 2) In terms of flood risk, the northern part of the site is in flood risk zone 2 but if this area is left open it would not be located within the development area. The area of land within flood risk zone 2 is significantly smaller than the area of land that would be kept open as mitigation on landscape grounds. 3) In terms of heritage, the Assessment of the Impact of LPD Development Sites on Scheduled Monuments (EX/43) comments that further built development to the north and east of housing allocation H16 towards Oxton Road and Flatts Lane is likely to encroach on the open rural setting of the Roman Camp Scheduled Monument. In addition, the Impact of Possible Development Sites on Heritage Assets in Gedling Borough Council (LPD/HIS/01) notes the potential for harm on the setting of the Grade II listed Lodge Farm. 	<p>This site lies on the northern edge of the key settlement of Calverton on land currently proposed safeguarded land. The Site Selection Document concludes that the only reason that the site was not allocated was that there was no need for the additional dwellings as other more sustainable sites were available. This site would be preferred to an extension to the Park Road housing allocation as there are clear defensible boundaries to the site, the site would comprise a separate site that could deliver new homes early in the plan period (thereby contributing to the Council's five year land supply). However in view of the findings of the Heritage Assessment (paragraph 8.7 EX/43) it is considered the impact on the Scheduled Monuments would be unacceptably detrimental to the open rural setting of the Roman Camp Scheduled Monument.</p> <p>Conclusion – unsuitable for</p>

		4) Mitigations measures may be required to help avoid the likelihood of a significant effect on the pSPA.	allocation.
6/47	Park Road, Hollinwood Lane, Calverton	<p>These sites have been considered together as parts of the two sites are already allocated for development as part of the Park Road site H16, and the remainder is designated as Safeguarded Land. As such, further development of the two SHLAA sites raise similar issues in that both sites would form an extension to the existing allocation at Park Road (H16). Key issues considered:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) In terms of landscape, the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) (LPD/NAT/01) indicates that the sites have a high landscape sensitivity. Visually they are very open and form a key part of the landscape setting of the village such that they are considered to have medium visual sensitivity to development. 2) In terms of flood risk, the northern part of the site is in flood risk zone 2 but if this area is left open it would not be located within the development area. The area of land within flood risk zone 2 is significantly smaller than the area of land that would be kept open as mitigation on landscape grounds. 3) In terms of heritage, the Assessment of the Impact of LPD Development Sites on Scheduled Monuments (EX/43) comments at paragraph 8.7 that further built development on this Safeguarded Land would significantly reduce the present open and rural edge of Calverton and encroach upon the 	<p>These sites lie on the northern edge of the key settlement of Calverton on land currently proposed safeguarded land. The Site Selection Document notes that not all of the remainder of the sites would be suitable for allocation on landscape, heritage and flooding grounds. Whilst it is likely that additional land will come forward in the future, the further allocation of land at this time is not necessary as it would not contribute to the Council's Five Year Land Supply.</p> <p>Conclusion – part of sites are already allocated as H16. Unsuitable for increased allocation.</p>
6/665	Warren Place, Calverton		

		<p>more remote rural setting of the Roman Camps Scheduled Monument at Whinsall Lane, having a moderate to high impact on the Monument's setting that would be difficult to mitigate against.</p> <p>4) The County Council as minerals planning authority have noted that site 6/47 adjoins the existing industrial uses at Calverton Colliery.</p> <p>5) Those areas of the two SHLAA sites that have not been allocated are identified as safeguarded land. Paragraph 3.4 of the Site Selection Document Appendix confirms that some but not all of the land designated as safeguarded land is considered suitable for development in the longer term as some of the land will be left open to act as a landscape buffer, protect the setting of heritage assets and avoid areas at risk of flooding.</p> <p>6) Mitigations measures may be required to help avoid the likelihood of a significant effect on the pSPA.</p> <p>7) Given that the further development of the two SHLAA sites would comprise an extension to housing site H16, a further allocation in this location would not assist the Council's Five Year Land Supply as any development would be delivered once the existing allocation has been built out i.e. beyond the end of the five year period.</p>	
6/669	Kighill Lane (18),	This group of sites lie to the south of the settlement of	Consideration has been given as

	Ravenshead (6 dwellings)	Ravenshead to the north of Kighill Lane and have therefore been considered together. Key issues considered:- 1) Site 6/841 has recently been removed from the Local Wildlife Site boundary. This designation had been the only reason that this site had not been considered suitable for allocation. 2) The other sites were previously assessed as lying adjacent to the settlement but not making an important contribution to the purposes of the Green Belt. It was concluded that the sites could be considered further in combination with adjoining sites. They were not allocated as other more sustainable sites were available. 3) Adjoining landowners have been approached to confirm the extent of the site that can be considered for allocations. 4) It is understood that the sites would contribute in full to the five year land supply. 5) The sites are adjacent to the settlement but do not make an important contribution to the purposes of the Green Belt. The size and configuration of the sites are such that they can only be considered in combination for allocation. 6) It is noted that there is some local support for using Kighill Lane as a defensible Green Belt boundary to	to whether the site should be allocated specifically for self build/custom build.
6/841	Land at Kighill Lane (7 dwellings)		The site area is 1.24 ha and applying the density policy of 20 dph results in a capacity of 20 dwellings.
6/166	22 Kighill Lane, Ravenshead (8 dwellings)		Conclusion – allocate as a single site for 20 dwellings.

		the south of the settlement.	
6/845	28 Kighill Lane, site 1, Ravenshead (12 dwellings)	<p>This group of sites lie to the south of the settlement of Ravenshead to the north of Kighill Lane and have therefore been considered together. Key issues considered:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The sites were previously assessed as lying adjacent to the settlement but not making an important contribution to the purposes of the Green Belt. It was concluded that the sites could be considered further in combination with adjoining sites. They were not allocated as other more sustainable sites were available. 2) Adjoining landowners have been approached to confirm the extent of the site that can be considered for allocations. 3) It is understood that the sites would contribute in full to the five year land supply. 4) The sites are adjacent to the settlement but do not make an important contribution to the purposes of the Green Belt. The size and configuration of the sites are such that they can only be considered in combination for allocation. 5) It is noted that there is some local support for using Kighill Lane as a defensible Green Belt boundary to the south of the settlement. 	<p>Consideration has been given as to whether the site should be allocated specifically for self-build/custom build.</p> <p>The site area is 1.60 ha and applying the density policy of 20 dph results in a capacity of 30 dwellings.</p> <p>Conclusion – allocate as a single site for 30 dwellings.</p>
6/843	26 Kighill Lane, site 2 (land rear of), Ravenshead (21 dwellings)		
6/1046	30 Kighill Lane		
6/923	Orchard	Key issues considered:-	This site is located close to the

	Close/Hillside Drive (land to the north of), Burton Joyce (31 dwellings)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The site would form an extension to the Orchard Close allocation (H21). 2) Whilst County Highways have confirmed that access from Orchard Close would be technically feasible and the necessary gradients required possible, access would be convoluted and this would be exacerbated by the topography of the site. 3) There may be an issue in relation to accessibility by bin lorries, which require a gradient of less than 1 in 20. 4) The site is steep and development in this location would be overbearing and have a detrimental impact on the amenity of existing residents of Langham Drive as a result of overlooking, which would be difficult to address through design. 5) The site is on a steep slope and would require good sustainable drainage systems to prevent flood risk elsewhere from surface water runoff. 6) It is understood that the site (as an extension to the Orchard Close site) would contribute in full to the five year land supply. 	<p>centre of the settlement of Burton Joyce, which is the most sustainable 'other village' as defined in the ACS.</p> <p>The key concern regarding the site is topography which would have an impact on the accessibility of the site as well as the impact on existing residents, in particular on Langham Drive.</p> <p>Conclusion – unsuitable for allocation.</p>
6/31	Hillside Farm, Burton Joyce (75 dwellings)	<p>Key issues considered:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) This comprises a larger site incorporating the Orchard Close allocation (6/537) plus an extended 	<p>There are concerns regarding the suitability of this site for development, in particular on landscape grounds. Taking the</p>

		<p>area to the east (6/923) as well as a wider area to the north.</p> <p>2) Whilst County Highways have confirmed that access from Orchard Close would be technically possible (as up to 150 dwellings could be served, including existing dwellings), access would have to be through the allocation which would result in an oddly configured site.</p> <p>3) Impact on landscape character could be mitigated to an extent by including a landscape buffer in the northern part of the site which would significantly reduce capacity, such that the remaining site equates to 6/923.</p> <p>4) The site is steep and development in this location, in particular on the southern part of the site, would be overbearing and have a detrimental impact on the amenity of existing residents of Langham Drive.</p> <p>5) The site is on a steep slope and would require good sustainable drainage systems to prevent flood risk elsewhere from surface water runoff.</p>	<p>recommendations regarding mitigation into account reduces the size of the site (to equate to site 6/923).</p> <p>Conclusion – unsuitable for allocation.</p>
6/539	Glebe Farm, Burton Joyce	<p>Despite being ruled out at the first stage of the site selection process, this site is included here as it has been actively promoted through the hearing sessions. Key issues considered:-</p> <p>1) In terms of Green Belt, the site is bounded on three sides by Green Belt and its development would</p>	<p>There are concerns regarding the suitability of this site for development, in particular on Green Belt and highways grounds.</p> <p>Conclusion – unsuitable for</p>

		<p>form an unacceptable intrusion into the countryside, although it is noted that a protected woodland forms the western boundary to the site.</p> <p>2) Planning permission has been granted for 14 dwellings on the site, in part on the basis that there are existing farm buildings on site. Access to the site was a key issue considered through the determination of the planning application as the access from Glebe Drive was considered to be substandard.</p> <p>3) In terms of accessing the wider site for a further 35 dwellings, the access from Glebe Drive continues to be considered substandard notwithstanding improvements that have been made as a result of the current planning permission. Whilst access via Woodside Road may be acceptable in highway terms (only), this has not yet been agreed pending the submission of more detailed information. In any event, access via Woodside Road would not be acceptable in planning terms given that the use of the existing farm access would not integrate development with the existing settlement. The plan attached in Appendix C shows the orientation of the two accesses.</p>	allocation.
6/132	Newstead Sports Ground, Newstead (80 dwellings)	<p>Key issues considered:-</p> <p>1) The site was allocated for development in the emerging Local Planning Document with a capacity of 50 dwellings, but was not taken into account in</p>	This site has been revisited in light of the change in ownership. However, whilst the new owners are keen to bring the site forward, uncertainty remains regarding

		<p>the Council's housing supply due to uncertainties over delivery.</p> <p>2) Since the previous round of hearings, the site is now under new ownership and discussions are ongoing with the new owner regarding the development of the site.</p> <p>3) It is understood that the key difficulty with regards to progressing the site is access, given that the adjoining Station Road is currently unadopted and within the ownership of Network Rail.</p> <p>4)</p>	<p>how the site will be accessed.</p> <p>Conclusion – unsuitable for allocation.</p>
--	--	---	---

Summary

3.8. As a result of the above analysis, four additional housing allocations are now proposed, as set out in the table below.

3.9. In addition to these, a further two sites are now included as allocations but are not new sites and have previously been included in the Council's housing supply. Land at the former Daybrook Laundry site was previously included within the supply of sites below the threshold (see appendix E of the Further Revised Housing Background Addendum). However, the capacity of the site as promoted through a pre-application is 49 dwellings and this is only marginally below the threshold for allocation in the urban area. In response to comments received through recent consultation exercises, the site is now identified as an allocation (housing site X1). Similarly, land at Metallifacure was previously included in the supply of sites below the threshold. However, planning permission for 72 dwellings was granted (subject to S106) on 30th August 2017 and the site is now identified as an allocation (housing site X2) and referred to as West of A60 (A) given its links with the land to the rear (allocated as West of A60 (B)).

SHLAA site	Number of dwellings allocated	Contribution to Five Year Land Supply	Name of housing allocation
6/479 (Metallifecture)	70 dwellings	72 dwellings	West of A60 (A)
6/479 (Daybrook Laundry)	50 dwellings	49 dwellings	Daybrook Laundry
6/778 (Land to the west of the A60 Redhill)	150 dwellings	100 dwellings	West of A60 (B)
6/37 (Long Acre Lodge)	60 dwellings	60 dwellings	Flatts Lane, Calverton
6/669 Kighill Lane (18) 6/841 Land at Kighill Lane 6/166 22 Kighill Lane, Ravenshead	20 dwellings	20 dwellings	Kighill Lane, Ravenshead
6/843 26 Kighill Lane, site 2 (site rear of) 6/845 28 Kighill Lane, site 1 6/1046 30 Kighill Lane	30 dwellings	30 dwellings	Kighill Lane, Ravenshead

4.0 Conclusions

- 4.1. In terms of the distribution of the additional housing sites, it has been concluded that it should continue to accord with Policy 2 of the Aligned Core Strategy. This approach ensures that the new allocations would support the Spatial Strategy and minimise Green Belt release.
- 4.2. In allocating additional sites, the total number of dwellings proposed in each location (comprising both existing and additional allocations) should not exceed the 'up to' figures set by the Aligned Core Strategy. Consideration should also be given to the level of housing need for each of the 'other villages' as set out in the Local Housing Need document (**LPD/GRO/04**), although it is reiterated that this document is intended as a guide rather than a precise assessment of need. Account has been taken of the contribution that a site would make to the Council's Five Year Land Supply and sites that would not contribute to supply have not been considered further at this stage. The sites already allocated in the emerging Local Planning Document meet and exceed the overall housing requirement for the Borough of 7,250 and the need to allocate additional housing sites arises from a lack of Five Year Land Supply rather than overall supply over the plan period.
- 4.3. Taking account of the above factors, the allocation of the additional sites would result in the distribution set out in **Appendix D**.
- 4.4. The revised distribution is based on the following approach:-

Main Urban Area of Arnold and Carlton,

- 4.5. All suitable sites have been allocated in accordance with Policy 2 of the Aligned Core Strategy. This reflects the approach taken at submission but three additional sites are now proposed for allocation. The West of A60 (A) site and the Daybrook Laundry site were both previously included in the Council's housing supply but have now been allocated to reflect the capacity of the sites being above the threshold for allocation and to confirm the Council's support for the principle of development on the sites. The West of A60 (B) site was not allocated previously as access to the site was dependent on the grant of planning permission for housing development on the adjoining land fronting the A60 Mansfield Road. Planning

permission for residential development on the adjoining land (now identified as West of A60 (A)) is likely to be granted in August 2017. It is not considered that there are any other sites suitable for development within or adjoining the urban area. Whilst Safeguarded Land has been identified in this location, it is not intended that this will come forward for development as set out in Policy LPD16.

Land Adjoining Hucknall

- 4.6. There are no further SHLAA sites available adjoining Hucknall for consideration.

Key Settlements for Growth

- 4.7. Policy 2 of the Aligned Core Strategy provides an upper limit to future development in these locations.
- 4.8. In relation to Bestwood, the level of development previously proposed as set out in the Further Revised Housing Background Paper Addendum was 540 dwellings, only 20 dwellings short of the upper limit of 560 dwellings. There are no suitable reasonable alternative sites in Bestwood that could provide this number of dwellings as SHLAA sites at Broad Valley Farm and an extension to Westhouse Farm would either be unsuitable or would result in the upper limit for the settlement set by the ACS being exceeded.
- 4.9. In relation to Calverton, the level of development previously proposed as set out in the Further Revised Housing Background Paper Addendum was 764 dwellings, being 291 dwellings short of the upper limit of 1,055 dwellings. There are numerous reasonable alternative sites in this location as listed in Appendix B and 8 of these have been reconsidered through the current site selection process. A further site to the north of the settlement is now proposed which will increase the level of development to 824. Whilst this figure remains some 231 dwellings below the upper limit of 1,055 dwellings set by the Aligned Core Strategy it is considered that further allocations would not be appropriate. Some of the sites that have been considered lie within safeguarded land and would not contribute to the Council's Five Year Land Supply, others are not well related to the settlement (being located to the north of Mansfield Lane or to the east of the settlement) and others lie to the south of the settlement within the Southern Ridge Area as defined in the emerging Calverton Neighbourhood Plan.

4.10. In relation to Ravenshead, the level of development proposed as set out in the Further Revised Housing Background Paper Addendum is 244 being 86 dwellings short of the upper limit of 330 dwellings set by the Aligned core Strategy. Additional allocations for a total of 50 dwellings are proposed to the south of the settlement reducing the 'shortfall' to only 36 dwellings. It is not considered that suitable sites exist to accommodate this shortfall without breaching the clear limits to the settlement at Kighill Lane to the south and the B6383 to the north.

4.11. Policy 2 of the Aligned Core Strategy provides an upper limit to development in the 'other villages' of 260 dwellings. However, the availability of sites is limited as a result of a variety of constraints including flooding, heritage and high Green Belt value. The following table compares the supply in each village to the level of housing need set out in the Local Housing Need document (**LPD/GRO/04**). The supply comprises the number of net completions between 2011 and 2017, extant planning permissions at 31st March 2017 and sites below the threshold. It is reiterated that this document is intended as a guide rather than a precise assessment of need, but it is useful to note that the supply for all villages is within the estimate given apart from Newstead village where land at Station Road is allocated (site H22) but not included within the housing supply.

Village	Supply	Estimate of Local Housing Need
Burton Joyce	77	70-90
Woodborough	49	50-70
Lambley	31	40-60
Linby	4	0-10
Newstead	9	60-80
Papplewick	2	20-40
Stoke Bardolph	0	0-10


4.12. The upper limit to development in the other villages of 260 dwellings has not been reached. However, it is considered that there is no scope to increase provision in these locations further due to the lack of availability of sites. Whilst numerous reasonable alternative sites have been put forward in the other villages, nearly all of these were found not to be suitable for

allocation and only two sites (plus one other that has been actively promoted through the hearing sessions) have been reconsidered through the current site selection process.

4.13. In conclusion:-

- It is considered that all suitable sites are now allocated for development. As set out in section 3 above, there are no further suitable sites for allocation that would contribute to the Council's Five Year Land Supply.
- The housing requirement set by the Aligned Core Strategy is 7,250 dwellings. The Further Revised Housing Background Paper Addendum demonstrated a total supply of 7,756 i.e. exceeding this requirement by 506 dwellings. The Housing Background Paper Addendum 2 now further increases total supply to approximately 1000 dwellings over the requirement set by the ACS.
- It is considered that it would be inappropriate to increase supply further, given that Gedling Borough Council is a Green Belt authority and so any further increase in sites contributing to the five year land supply would result in additional changes to Green Belt boundaries and the need to justify 'very special circumstances'. It is also noted that Green Belt boundaries have already been amended in order to identify safeguarded land.
- The Council has demonstrated that it has a Five Year Land Supply based on a realistic and robust methodology. It is not considered that there is scope to increase the supply for the reasons outlined above. Any further increase is likely to require the strategic approach underpinning the Council's local plan to be revisited.



APPENDIX A – Killisick Lane



Gedling
Borough Council

Civic Centre, Arnot Hill Park, Arnold,
Nottinghamshire, NG5 6LU

Killisick Lane

-  Housing Allocation
-  Amended northern boundary

Reproduced with the permission of the Controller of H.M.S.O. Crown copyright, Licence No. LA100021246.
Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.

APPENDIX B - Re-consideration of 'reasonable alternative' sites (as set out in Site Selection Document Addendum 2)

Sites highlighted in **yellow** are those that are to be considered further (and are included in above table) or where new information has become available to support the approach taken.

Urban Area and adjoining Hucknall

Site Reference	Reasonable Alternative Site	Could the site be allocated?	Should the site be allocated?	Reasons
6/260	Sol Construction Ltd	x	x	See Site Selection Document Appendix A page 7. Planning permission has since been granted. The site is already included in the list of sites with planning permission (see appendix E of Housing Background Paper 2).
6/667	Sir John Robinson House	x	x	No change to conclusions. See Site Selection Document Appendix A page 9.
6/872	Killisick Lane (GBC Site 2)	✓	✓	Site already allocated. See Site Selection Document Appendix A paragraph 3.9.
6/768	B and Q Unit Mansfield Road	x	x	See Site Selection Document Addendum 2. Since the Publication Draft, Go Outdoors has now occupied the former B+Q unit and it is therefore no longer available for housing.
6/13	Lambley Lane/Spring Lane	x	x	No change to conclusions. See Site Selection Document Appendix A page 15.
6/479	Metallifactory Ltd	✓	x	See Site Selection Document Addendum 2. The capacity of the site was previously based on the density policy in the LPD but planning permission for 72 dwellings was granted on 30 th August 2017 subject to the signing of the S106 agreement. The site was previously included within the supply of sites below the threshold (see appendix E of the

				Further Revised Housing Background Addendum) but is now identified as housing allocation X2.
6/24	Sherbrook Road/Prior Road	x	x	No change to conclusions. See Site Selection Document Appendix A page 19.
6/477	Daybrook Laundry	✓	x	See Site Selection Document Appendix 2. Since the Publication Draft, a pre-application has been submitted for 49 homes. The site was previously included within the supply of sites below the threshold (see appendix E of the Further Revised Housing Background Paper Addendum) but is now identified as housing allocation X1.
6/12	Lambley Lane (Adj Glebe Farm)	x	x	No change to conclusions. See Site Selection Document Appendix A page 23.
6/860	Trent Valley Road A612 (Land Adj Railway)	x	x	No change to conclusions. See Site Selection Document Appendix A page 25.
6/671	Extension of Howbeck Road	✓	✓	Site already allocated. See Site Selection Document Appendix A paragraph 3.8.
6/668	Land Off Mapperley Plains	x	x	No change to conclusions. See Site Selection Document Appendix A page 29.
6/767	Spring Lane (156)	✓	x	No change to conclusions. See Site Selection Document Appendix A page 31.
6/50	Killisick Lane	✓	✓	Site already allocated. See Site Selection Document Appendix A paragraph 3.9.
6/49	Brookfields Garden Centre	✓	✓	Site already allocated. See Site Selection Document Appendix A paragraph 3.3.
6/871	Killisick Lane (GBC Site 1)	✓	✓	Size of allocation to be reduced in light of Inspector's letter EX/122.
6/18	Rolleston Drive (NCC Offices)	✓	✓	Site already allocated. See Site Selection Document Appendix A paragraph 3.2.
6/542	Linden Grove	✓	✓	Site already allocated. See Site Selection Document Appendix A paragraph 3.5.

A2	Lodge Farm Lane Phase 2	✓	✗	See section 3 above.
6/48	Lodge Farm Lane	✓	✓	Site already allocated. See Site Selection Document Appendix A paragraph 3.6.
6/778	Land to the west of the A60 Redhill	✓	✗	See section 3 above.
6/457	Lambley Lane (Adj Glebe Farm View)	✗	✗	No change to conclusions. See Site Selection Document Appendix A page 49.
6/873	Killisick Lane (GBC Site 3)	✓	✓	Site already allocated. See Site Selection Document Appendix A paragraph 3.9.
6/51	Howbeck Road (Land East)	✓	✓	Site already allocated. See Site Selection Document Appendix A paragraph 3.8.
6/25	Brookfield Road/Rolleston Drive	✗	✗	No change to conclusions. Note: the Rolleston Drive part of the site is considered under 6/18 above.
6/52	Spring Lane	✓	✓	Site already allocated. See Site Selection Document Appendix A paragraph 3.7.
6/458	New Farm (Site D)	✗	✗	No change to conclusions. See Site Selection Document Appendix A page 59
6/459	Lambley Lane (Willow Farm)	✓	✓	Site already allocated. See Site Selection Document Appendix A paragraph 3.4.
6/455	New Farm (Site B)	✗	✗	No change to conclusions. See Site Selection Document Appendix A page 63.
6/131	Gedling Colliery/Chase Farm	✓	✓	Site already allocated. See Site Selection Document Appendix A paragraph 3.10.
6/466	New Farm (SUE)	✗	✗	No change to conclusions. See Site Selection Document Appendix A page 67.
6/658	Mapperley Golf Course	✗	✗	No change to conclusions. See Site Selection Document Appendix A page 69.
6/462	New Farm (Site E)	✗	✗	No change to conclusions. See Site Selection Document Appendix A page 71.
Considered in	North of Bestwood Lodge Drive	✓	✗	See section 3 above.

LPD/GRO/14				
6/460	Hayden Lane, Hucknall	✓	✓	Site already allocated. See Site Selection Document Appendix A paragraph 3.13.

Key Settlement - Bestwood Village

Site Reference	Reasonable Alternative Site	Could the site be allocated?	Should the site be allocated?	Reasons
6/484	The Sycamores	✓	✓	Site already allocated. See Site Selection Document Appendix B paragraph 3.2.
6/20	Bestwood Business Park	✓	✓	Site already allocated. See Site Selection Document Appendix B paragraph 3.5.
6/28	Broad Valley Farm	x	x	No change to conclusions. See Site Selection Document Appendix 2.
6/27	Westhouse Farm	✓	✓	Site already allocated. See Site Selection Document Appendix B paragraph 3.3.

Key Settlement - Calverton

Site Reference	Reasonable Alternative Site	Could the site be allocated?	Should the site be allocated?	Reasons
6774	Borrowside Farm Bonnerhill (Site A)	x	x	No change to conclusions. See Site Selection Document Appendix C page 4.
6686	The Cherry Tree	x	x	Site is below the threshold and has planning permission (see appendix E of Housing Background Paper 2).
6664	Calverton Miners Welfare	x	x	No change to conclusions. See Site Selection Document Appendix C page 8
6289	Bottom Farm	x	x	No change to conclusions. See Site Selection Document Appendix C page 10.
6649	Woods Lane	x	x	No change to conclusions. See Site Selection Document Appendix C page 12.
6661	Land at Broom Farm	x	x	No change to conclusions. See Site Selection Document Appendix C page 14
6775	Borrowside Farm Bonnerhill (Site B)	x	x	No change to conclusions. See Site Selection Document Appendix C page 16
6662	Hollinwood Lane/North Green	✓	✓	Site already allocated. See paragraph 3.3 of the Site selection Document Appendix C
6588	Mansfield Lane (250)	✓	x	<p>The option of developing to the north-east of Calverton was considered (sites 6/587, 6/588, 6/772 and 6/834). This area was considered more valuable to the purposes of the Green Belt than the Park Road site and would be beyond the strong defensible boundary of Flatts Lane.</p> <p>Update – The Assessment of Impact of LPD Development Sites on Scheduled Monuments (EX/43) concluded that the development of this site would impact on the Scheduled Ancient Monument which lies 350m to the north east.</p>

6772	Broom Farm, Mansfield Lane	✓	✗	<p>The option of developing to the north-east of Calverton was considered (sites 6/587, 6/588, 6/772 and 6/834). This area was considered more valuable to the purposes of the Green Belt than the Park Road site and would be beyond the strong defensible boundary of Flatts Lane.</p> <p>Update – The Assessment of Impact of LPD Development Sites on Scheduled Monuments (EX/43) concluded that the development of this site would impact on the Scheduled Ancient Monument which lies 350m to the north east.</p>
6834	Woodview Farm	✓	✗	<p>The option of developing to the north-east of Calverton was considered (sites 6/587, 6/588, 6/772 and 6/834). This area was considered more valuable to the purposes of the Green Belt than the Park Road site and would be beyond the strong defensible boundary of Flatts Lane.</p> <p>Update – The Assessment of Impact of LPD Development Sites on Scheduled Monuments (EX/43) concluded that the development of this site would impact on the Scheduled Ancient Monument which lies 350m to the north east.</p>
6770	Land at Collyer Road	✗	✗	No change to conclusions. See Site Selection Document Appendix C page 26.
6/921	Shire Farm, Calverton	✓	✓	Site already allocated. See Site Selection Document Appendix C page 28.
6/540	Land to the South of Crookdole Lane	✓	✗	See section 3 above.
6/130	Dark Lane	✓	✓	Site already allocated. See paragraph 3.2 of Site Selection Document Appendix C.
6/37	Long Acre Lodge	✓	✗	See section 3 above.

6/587	Mansfield Lane (Whitehaven Farm)	✓	✗	The option of developing to the north-east of Calverton was considered (sites 6/587, 6/588, 6/772 and 6/834). This area was considered more valuable to the purposes of the Green Belt than the Park Road site and would be beyond the strong defensible boundary of Flatts Lane. Update – The Assessment of Impact of LPD Development Sites on Scheduled Monuments (EX/43) concluded that the development of this site would impact on the Scheduled Ancient Monument which lies 350m to the north east.
6/544	Main Street/Hollinwood Lane (Land Adj To)	✓	✓	Site already allocated. See paragraph 3.2 of Site Selection Document Appendix C. Extension to site considered within section 3 above.
6/36	Lampwood Close	✓	✗	See section 3 above.
6/33	Hollinwood Lane/Long West Croft	✓	✗	See section 3 above.
6/45	Georges Lane/Gorse Close	✗	✗	No change to conclusions. See Site Selection Document Appendix C page 44
6/665	Warren Place	✓	✓	Site already allocated. See paragraph 3.3 of the Site Selection Document Appendix C
6/35	Mansfield Lane (Flatts Hill)	✓	✗	See section 3 above.
6/780	Ramsdale Park Golf Course	✗	✗	No change to conclusions. See Site Selection Document Appendix C page 50.
6/47	Park Road/Hollinwood Lane	✓	✓	Site already allocated. See paragraph 3.3 of the Site Selection Document Appendix C

Key Settlement - Ravenshead

Site Reference	Reasonable Alternative Site	Could the site be allocated?	Should the site be allocated?	Reasons
6669	Kighill Lane (18)	✓	✗	See section 3 above.
6841	Land at Kighill Lane	✗	✗	See section 3 above.
6845	28 Kighill Lane Site 1	✓	✗	See section 3 above.
6843	26 Kighill Lane Site 2 (land rear of)	✓	✗	See section 3 above.
Considered in LPD/GRO/14	22 Kighill Lane	✓	✗	See section 3 above.
686	Larch Farm Public House	✗	✗	No change to conclusions. See Site Selection Document Appendix D page 12.
6670	Kighill Lane (15a & 19)/Longdale Lane (170 & 172)	✗	✗	No change to conclusions. See Site Selection Document Appendix D page 14.
6536	Nottingham Road (183)	✗	✗	No change to conclusions. See Site Selection Document Appendix D page 16.
6659	Main Road (9 & 11, Land Adj To)	✓	✗	No change to conclusions. The landscape assessment indicates the need for a buffer across the northern part of the site. County Highways indicate that access from Main Road and impacts on Larch Farm junction would be a concern. The development of the site would form a pocket on the northern side of Main Road which is otherwise a defensible Green Belt boundary. Development north of Main Road (including sites (6/659, 6/919 and 6/920) was considered but rejected.

				This option was opposed by the Parish Council and local residents and would breach Main Road which is seen as the defensible Green Belt boundary. The Inspector's Report into the Aligned Core Strategies agrees that Main Road should be the defensible boundary. The next appropriate boundary would be Ricket Lane; this would result in a substantial area of the Green Belt being removed for a small number of new homes. Development here would also be complicated by the need to improve the Larch Farm junction.
6/648	Land at Beech Avenue/Fishpool	x	x	No change to conclusions. See Site Selection Document Appendix D page 20.
6/39	Longdale Lane/Kighill Lane	✓	✓	Site already allocated. See Site selection Document Appendix D paragraph 3.2
6/919	Silverland Farm (Ricket Lane, Site A)	x	x	No change to conclusions. See Site selection Document Appendix D page 24.
6/920	Silverland Farm (Ricket Lane, Site B)	x	x	No change to conclusions. See Site selection Document Appendix D page 26.

Burton Joyce

Site Reference	Reasonable Alternative Site	Could the site be allocated?	Should the site be allocated?	Reasons
6/29	Lambley Lane (23)	x	x	No change to conclusions. See Site Selection Document Appendix E.
6/469	Millfield Close (Safeguarded Land)	✓	✓	Site already allocated. See Site Selection Document Appendix E.
6/537	Land to the North of Orchard Close	✓	✓	Site already allocated. See Site Selection Document Appendix E.
6/923	Orchard Close/Hillside Drive (land to the north of)	✓	x	See section 3 above.
6/539	Glebe Farm, Burton Joyce	x	x	See section 3 above.
6/30	Woodside Road (Land Off)	x	x	No change to conclusions. See Site Selection Document Appendix E.
6/31	Hillside Farm	✓	x	See section 3 above.

Lambley

Site Reference	Reasonable Alternative Site	Could the site be allocated?	Should the site be allocated?	Reasons
6/672	Land adj Steeles Way/Orchard Rise	x	x	See section 3 above.
A1	Hill Close Farm, Lambley	✓	x	No change to conclusions. The site will be removed from the Green Belt. Access to the site is very problematic and its development would impact on the nearby Conservation Area.
6/838	Stables - Site A	x	x	No change to conclusions. See Site selection Document Appendix F page 9.
6/839	Spring Lane (Land Off) - Site B	x	x	No change to conclusions. See Site selection Document Appendix F page 11
6/831	Catfoot Lane	x	x	No change to conclusions. See Site selection Document Appendix F page 13
6/538	Land Off Spring Lane	x	x	No change to conclusions. See Site selection Document Appendix F page 15
6/917	Catfoot Lane (land adj Orchard Rise/Steels Way)	x	x	No change to conclusions. See Site selection Document Appendix F page 17
Considered in LPD/GRO/14	Steeles Way/Orchard Rise	x	x	No change to conclusions. There are no defensible boundaries on the site's western side where the land slopes upwards and becomes visually prominent. The development of the site would have unacceptable impacts on the landscape character of the settlement through the perceived expansion of the village into its rural setting and would also harm the setting of the Conservation Area. The development of the site would have a minor impact on flood risk given the presence of a surface water flood flow route to the north of the boundary.

Other Villages: Linby, Newstead, Papplewick and Stoke Bardolph.

Site Reference	Reasonable Alternative Site	Could the site be allocated?	Should the site be allocated?	Reasons
6/535	Greenacres, Linby	✘	✘	No change to conclusions. See Site selection Appendix H
A3	North of Altham Lodge, Papplewick	✔	✘	No change to conclusions. Papplewick is washed over by the Green Belt. It is not considered appropriate to remove land from the Green Belt adjacent to washed over settlements. An appeal for the erection of a single additional dwelling in this location has recently been dismissed.
6/132	Newstead Sports Ground, Newstead	✔	✔	See section 3 above.
6/586	Stoke Bardolph Farm and Land, Stoke Bardolph.	✘	✘	No change to conclusions. See Site selection Appendix H
6/924	Land South of Newstead, Newstead	✘	✘	No change to conclusions. See Site selection Appendix H

Woodborough

Site Reference	Reasonable Alternative Site	Could the site be allocated?	Should the site be allocated?	Reasons
6/874	Long Meadow Farm (Site A)	✓	✗	No change to conclusions. Site is too small to allocate. The three Long Meadow Farm sites) are not accessible as they rely on adjacent sites (6/827 and 6/828) which are not considered suitable for allocation. A Conservation Area Appraisal for Woodborough was adopted in June 2017 and this amends the boundary of the conservation area to the south of the village to include this site.
6/832	109 Main Street	✓	✗	No change to conclusions. The site is within the Conservation Area. On its own, the site is not large enough for allocation and would need to be allocated together with adjoining sites (6/762, 6/836 and 6/833). The three sites on Main Street (6/832, 6/833 and 6/836) require access along Field Lane, a private road which is not suitable for the cumulative level of development that would be provided; access via site 6/762 is not possible as the site is not being allocated.
6/636	Main Street (119)	✓	✗	No change to conclusions. The site is within the Conservation Area. On its own the site is not large enough for allocation and would need to be allocated together with adjoining sites (6/762, 6/836 and 6/833). The three sites on Main Street (6/832, 6/833 and 6/836) require access along Field Lane, a private road which is not suitable for the

				cumulative level of development that would be provided; access via site 6/762 is not possible as the site is not being allocated.
6/833	111 Main Street	✓	✗	No change to conclusions. The site is within the Conservation Area. On its own the site is not large enough for allocation and would need to be allocated together with adjoining sites (6/762, 6/836 and 6/833). The three sites on Main Street (6/832, 6/833 and 6/836) require access along Field Lane, a private road which is not suitable for the cumulative level of development that would be provided; access via site 6/762 is not possible as the site is not being allocated.
6/840	Plemont	✓	✓	Site already allocated. See Site Selection Document Appendix G paragraph 4.3. Allocate in combination with 6/776.
6/876	Long Meadow Farm (Site C)	✓	✗	No change to conclusions. Site is too small to allocate. The three Long Meadow Farm sites) are not accessible as they rely on adjacent sites (6/827 and 6/828) which are not considered suitable for allocation.
6/660	Land South of Smalls Croft	✗	✗	No change to conclusions. See Site Selection Document Appendix G page 17.
6/776	Land at Broad Close/Private Road	✓	✓	Site already allocated. See Site Selection Document Appendix G paragraph 4.3.
6/777	Land on Shelt Hill adj 67	✗	✗	No change to conclusions. See Site Selection Document Appendix G page 21.
6/875	Long Meadow Farm (Site B)	✓	✗	No change to conclusions. Site is too small to allocate. The three Long Meadow Farm sites) are not accessible as they rely on adjacent sites (6/827 and 6/828) which are not considered suitable for allocation. A Conservation Area Appraisal for Woodborough was adopted in June 2017 and this amends the boundary of the conservation area to the

				south of the village to include this site.
6/196	Ash Grove	✓	✓	Site already allocated. See Site Selection Document Appendix G paragraph 4.2.
6/762	Land at Grimesmoor Farm Shelt Hill (Phase 1)	x	x	No change to conclusions. See Site Selection Document Appendix G page 26.
6/826	Main Street/ Taylor's Croft	x	x	No change to conclusions. See Site Selection Document Appendix G page 28.
6/42	Lowdham Lane	x	x	No change to conclusions. See Site Selection Document Appendix G page 30.
6/827	Lingwood Lane (land adj Rose Marie cottage)	x	x	No change to conclusions. See Site Selection Document Appendix G page 32.
6/828	Park Avenue (land south of)	x	x	No change to conclusions. See Site Selection Document Appendix G page 34.
6/43	Old Manor Farm (Land adj to)	x	x	No change to conclusions. See Site Selection Document Appendix G page 36.
6/763	Land at Grimesmoor Farm Shelt Hill (Phase 2,3,4)	x	x	No change to conclusions. See Site Selection Document Appendix G page 38.
6/835	40 Shelt Hill	x	x	No change to conclusions. See Site Selection Document Appendix G page 40.
6/44	Bank Hill	x	x	No change to conclusions. See Site Selection Document Appendix G page 42.

APPENDIX C – site plans

Site A2




Gedling Borough Council
Civic Centre, Annot Hill Park, Arnold,
Nottinghamshire, NG5 8LU

Reproduced with the permission of the Controller of H.M.S.O. Crown copyright. Licence No. LA 100021248.
Unauthorized reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.

Arnold

 A2
 Landscape Buffer

Site 6/778



Gedling
Borough Council


Civic Centre, Arnot Hill Park, Arnold,
Nottinghamshire, NG5 8LU

Arnold

- 6/479
- 6/778

Reproduced with the permission of the Controller of H.M.S.O. Crown copyright, Licence No. LA100021246.
Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.



North of Bestwood Lodge Drive



Gedling
Borough Council


Civic Centre, Amot Hill Park, Arnold,
Nottinghamshire, NG5 8LU

Arnold

 North of Bestwood Lodge Drive
 Borough Boundary


Reproduced with the permission of the Controller of H.M.S.O. Crown copyright, Licence No. LA100021246.
Unauthorized reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.

Site 6/540




Gedling Borough Council
Civic Centre, Arnot Hill Park, Arnold,
Nottinghamshire, NG5 6LU

Calverton

 6/540

Reproduced with the permission of the Controller of H.M.S.O. Crown copyright. Licence No. LA100021248.
Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.

Sites 6/35 and 6/37




Gedling Borough Council
 Civic Centre, Arnot Hill Park, Arnold,
 Nottinghamshire, NG5 8LU

Calverton

- 6/37
- 6/35
- Housing Allocation

Reproduced with the permission of the Controller of H.M.S.O. Crown copyright, Licence No. LA100021246.
 Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.

Site 6/36




Gedling Borough Council
Civic Centre, Arnot Hill Park, Arnold,
Nottinghamshire, NG5 8LU

Calverton

 6/36




Reproduced with the permission of the Controller of H.M.S.O. Crown copyright, Licence No. LA100021248.
Unauthorized reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.

Site 6/33




Gedling Borough Council
Civic Centre, Arnot Hill Park, Arnold,
Nottinghamshire, NG5 8LU

Calverton

-  6/33
-  Boundary considered as extension to housing allocation
-  Housing Allocation

Reproduced with the permission of the Controller of H.M.S.O. Crown copyright. Licence No. LA100021248.
Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.

Sites 6/47 and 6/665



Gedling
Borough Council

Civic Centre, Amot Hill Park, Arnold,
Nottinghamshire, NG5 6LU

Reproduced with the permission of the Controller of H.M.S.O. Crown copyright. Licence No. LA100021246.
Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.

Calverton

- 6/47 (part)
- 6/665 (part)
- Housing Allocation
- Landscape Buffer

Sites 6/669, 6/841, 6/843, 6/845 and 6/166




Gedling Borough Council
 Civic Centre, Arnold Hill Park, Arnold,
 Nottinghamshire, NG5 8LU

Ravenshead

- 6/166
- 6/669
- 6/843
- 6/845
- 6/841
- Housing Allocation





Reproduced with the permission of the Controller of H.M.S.O. Crown copyright, Licence No. LA100021248.
 Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.

Sites 6/31 and 6/923




Gedling Borough Council
Civic Centre, Arnot Hill Park, Arnold,
Nottinghamshire, NG5 8LU

Burton Joyce

-  6/923
-  6/31
-  Housing Allocation
-  Borough Boundary

Reproduced with the permission of the Controller of H.M.S.O. Crown copyright. Licence No. LA100021248.
Unauthorized reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.

Site 6/539




Gedling Borough Council
Civic Centre, Arnot Hill Park, Arnold,
Nottinghamshire, NG5 6LU

**Glebe Farm
Burton Joyce**

 Site

Reproduced with the permission of the Controller of H.M.S.O. Crown copyright, Licence No. LA100021246.
Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.

Site 6/132



Civic Centre, Amot Hill Park, Amold,
Nottinghamshire, NG5 6LU

Reproduced with the permission of the Controller of H.M.S.O. Crown copyright. Licence No. LA100021246.
Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.

Newstead

6/132

APPENDIX D Housing Supply 2011-2028

Urban Area	Net completions 2011 to 2017	1,108
	Planning Permissions (31 March 2017)	390
	Site Allocations	
	Teal Close	824
	H1 Rolleston Drive	140
	H2 Brookfields Garden Centre	90
	H3 Willow Farm	110
	H4 Linden Grove	115
	H5 Lodge Farm Lane	150
	H6 Spring Lane ¹	123
	H7 Howbeck Road/Mapperley Plain	205
	H8 Killisick Lane	230
	H9 Gedling Colliery/Chase Farm ²	1,050
	X1 Daybrook Laundry	49
	X2 West of A60 A	72
	X3 West of A60 B	150
	Sites Below Threshold	87
	Total	4,893
	Proposed Policy LPD64 – Urban Area	4,890
Hucknall	Net completions 2011 to 2017	36
	Planning Permissions (31 March 2017)	0
	Site Allocations	
	North of Papplewick Lane ³	237
	Top Wighay Farm ⁴	809

¹ To date, 27 homes are completed and included in the 'Net completions 2011 to 2017' category.

² Planning permission (2015/1376) granted in March 2017.

³ Planning permission (2017/0201) granted in July 2017.

⁴ Figure includes planning permission granted for 38 homes on part of the Top Wighay Farm site which are currently under construction (37 built and 2 remaining homes).

	H10 Hayden Lane	120
	Sites Below Threshold	0
	Total	1,202
	Proposed Policy LPD64 – Hucknall ⁵	1,265
Bestwood Village	Net completions 2011 to 2017	66
	Planning Permissions (31 March 2017)	16
	Site Allocations	
	H11 The Sycamores ⁶	25
	H12 Westhouse Farm ⁷	210
	H13 Bestwood Business Park ⁸	220
	Sites Below Threshold	0
	Total	537
	Proposed Policy LPD64 – Bestwood Village	540
Calverton	Net completions 2011 to 2017	159
	Planning Permissions (31 March 2017)	63
	Site Allocations	
	H14 Dark Lane ⁹	72
	H15 Main Street	75
	H16 Park Road	390
	X4 Flatts Lane	60
	Sites Below Threshold	0
	Total	819
	Proposed Policy LPD64 – Calverton	820

⁵ The number of homes to be provided on the edge of Hucknall is limited to no more than 1,265 to accord with the requirement of the Inspector examining the Aligned Core Strategy in order to reduce the impact of new development on Hucknall. The current supply information suggests that this figure may be somewhat lower but the 'up to' figure has been kept at 1,265 in order to allow a degree of flexibility in relation to sites that are still to be developed whilst remaining below the maximum figure set by the Aligned Core Strategy.

⁶ Planning permission (2007/0887) granted in December 2008.

⁷ In February 2015, Planning Committee resolved to grant planning permission for 101 homes on part of this site; the s106 agreement is being finalised.

⁸ Planning permission (2014/0214) granted in March 2015.

⁹ Planning permission (2012/1503) granted in August 2013.

Ravenshead	Net completions 2011 to 2017	93
	Planning Permissions (31 March 2017)	23
	Site Allocations	
	H17 Longdale Lane A	30
	H18 Longdale Lane B ¹⁰	30
	H19 Longdale Lane C ¹¹	70
	X5 Kighill Lane A	20
	X6 Kighill Lane B	30
	Sites Below Threshold	0
	Total	296
	Proposed Policy LPD64 – Ravenshead	300
Other Villages		
Burton Joyce	Net completions 2011 to 2017	12
	Planning Permissions (31 March 2017)	26
	Site Allocations	
	H20 Mill Field Close ¹²	23
	H21 Orchard Close	15
	Sites Below Threshold	0
	Total (Burton Joyce)	76
	Proposed Policy LPD64 – Burton Joyce	80
Woodborough	Net completions 2011 to 2017	11
	Planning Permissions (31 March 2017)	11
	Site Allocations	
	H23 Ash Grove ¹³	12

¹⁰ Planning application (2014/0273) for 31 homes currently being determined.

¹¹ Planning permission (2013/0836) granted in October 2014.

¹² Planning permission (2015/0424) granted in March 2017.

¹³ Planning permission (2007/0831) granted in November 2000. Planning permission for one plot (2016/0888) granted in November 2016 and is currently under construction.

	H24 Broad Close	15
	Sites Below Threshold	0
	Total (Woodborough)	49
	Proposed Policy LPD64 – Woodborough	50
Lambley	Net completions 2011 to 2017	16
	Planning Permissions (31 March 2017)	16
	Sites Below Threshold	0
Linby	Net completions 2011 to 2017	2
	Planning Permissions (31 March 2017)	1
	Sites Below Threshold	0
Newstead	Net completions 2011 to 2017	1
	Planning Permissions (31 March 2017)	9
	Site Allocations H22 Station Road	0
	Sites Below Threshold	0
Papplewick	Net completions 2011 to 2017	2
	Planning Permissions (31 March 2017)	0
	Sites Below Threshold	0
Stoke Bardolph	Net completions 2011 to 2017	0
	Planning Permissions (31 March 2017)	0
	Sites Below Threshold	0
	Total (Lambley, Linby, Newstead, Papplewick and Stoke Bardolph)	47
	Total (all villages)	172
	Proposed Policy LPD64 – Other Villages	170
	Windfall Allowance ¹⁴	320
Total		8,239

¹⁴ 40 dwellings per annum from Year 4 (i.e. 2020/21). 40 dwellings x 8 remaining years in the plan period (i.e. 2020 to 2028) = 320.

