
Independent Examination of the Gedling Local Planning Document (Part 2 Local Plan)

Inspector's Draft Matters, Issues and Questions for Examination and Outline Programme of Hearings

By Karen Baker DipTP MA DipMP MRTPI

Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Date: 16 December 2016

Notes

- i. This draft schedule and outline programme is provisional and flexible and subject to detailed refinement and variation depending on the responses to the invitation to participate and any further issues raised.*
- ii. Representors are asked to consider the following matters and to confirm to the Programme Officer by 30 December 2016 whether or not they wish to attend the Hearings beginning on Tuesday 7 February 2017 and on which Matter or Matters they wish to speak, indicating if possible which issues or questions are of specific relevance to their representations.*
- iii. For the reasons explained in the Guidance Note from the Inspector [EX/20], Representors promoting an 'omission' site, as an alternative or in addition to those allocated in the Plan, must redirect their representation to an appropriate session addressing the soundness of the Plan as submitted. There will be no sessions for omission sites because it will be for the Council to propose additional sites if required for soundness.*
- iv. If Representors consider that any additional Matter or issue not listed below should be set down for discussion, they should notify the Programme Officer as soon as possible. The Inspector will then consider whether to amend the programme.*

As part of the consideration of the Matters for discussion, due attention will be given to any Main Modifications (MMs) to the Plan as to whether they are necessary and sufficient, with or without further amendment, to make the Plan sound.

The Council has put forward a number of Main Modifications for consideration. Your attention is drawn to MM63, MM64 and MM65 which each propose an additional appendix to the Plan in respect of the provision of affordable housing on both allocated and unallocated sites and the requirement for parking provision for residential and non-residential developments respectively. Although not part of the formal consultation process which, along with any other Main Modifications, would take place following receipt of my Report, interested parties may make comments on MM63, MM64 and MM65 either in writing or during the appropriate Hearing Sessions.

DRAFT SCHEDULE OF MATTERS FOR DISCUSSION

[numeric references are to evidence base and Examination documents]

Matter 1: Legal Compliance, including the Duty to Co-operate

Issue 1a: Legal compliance with respect to the Local Development Scheme [LPD/POL/01]

- Q1. Has the Plan been prepared in accordance with the Local Development Scheme?
- Q2. What is the scope of the Plan?
- Q3. Having regard to the scope of the Aligned Core Strategy (ACS) and the Council's intentions, as set out in the Local Development Scheme, are there any obvious omissions, in terms of policy guidance, from the submitted Plan?

Issue 1b: Legal compliance with respect to the Statement of Community Involvement [LPD/REG/07]

- Q4. Has the Plan been prepared in accordance with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement and met the minimum consultation requirements in the Regulations?
- Q5. Has the Council given interested parties the opportunity to make comments in a variety of forms, not just through the use of technology?

Issue 1c: Legal compliance with respect to Sustainability Appraisal [LPD/REG/11 – LPD/REG/20]

- Q6. Is the Plan legally compliant with respect to Sustainability Appraisal?

Issue 1d: Legal compliance with respect to the Habitats Regulations and any requirements for appropriate assessment [LPD/REG/21]

- Q7. Is the Plan legally compliant with respect to the Habitats Regulations and any requirement for appropriate assessment?
- Q8. What were the main findings of the Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) that was carried out in relation to this Plan?

Issue 1e: Legal compliance with respect to the provisions of the 2004 Act and Local Plan Regulations 2012 (as amended) for the preparation of the Plan

- Q9. Is the Plan legally compliant with the provisions of the 2004 Act and Local Plan Regulations 2012 (as amended) for the preparation of the Plan?

Issue 1f: Legal compliance with respect to national policy

- Q10. Are there any policies in the Plan that do not accord with the National Planning Policy Framework or advice in the Planning Practice Guidance?
- Q11. Are there any gaps in policy coverage? Have other policies been considered and discounted?

Issue 1g: Legal compliance with respect to the Duty to Co-operate [LPD/REG/07]

- Q12. Is the Plan and its preparation compliant with the Duty to Co-operate imposed by Section 33A of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended) with prescribed bodies regarding cross-boundary strategic matters, including with regards to housing provision in particular?
- Q13. Does the Council's Detailed Report on the Duty to Co-operate on the Local Planning Document (December 2016) [EX/11] demonstrate that the Duty to Co-operate been met?

Matter 2: Sustainability Appraisal

Issue 2a: Soundness of the Sustainability Appraisal

- Q1. Is the Plan based on a sound process of Sustainability Appraisal?
- Q2. Has the Sustainability Appraisal been undertaken at each stage of the Plan's preparation to clearly justify the Council's policy choices?
- Q3. Does the Sustainability Appraisal process represent the only site selection methodology or has the Council used any other process?
- Q4. Does it test reasonable alternatives? Has the Sustainability Appraisal been robustly prepared with a comparative and equal assessment undertaken of each reasonable alternative?
- Q5. Is the Sustainability Appraisal decision making and scoring robust, justified and transparent?
- Q6. How has the Sustainability Appraisal process given appropriate consideration to minerals and coal mining issues? Has the Sustainability Appraisal taken into account the presence of, and implications of, Minerals Safeguarding and Consultations Areas?
- Q7. Does it represent the most appropriate strategy in the circumstances?
- Q8. Does the final report set out the reasons for rejecting earlier options?

Matter 3: Vision, Objectives and Spatial Strategy

Issue 3a: Accordance with the ACS

- Q1. Does the Plan accord with the Vision and Objectives set out in the ACS?
- Q2. Does the Plan accord with the Spatial Strategy in the ACS, in particular with respect to:

- i. the identification and assessment of reasonable alternatives;
- ii. the overall distribution of development between the main built up area of Arnold and Carlton, around Hucknall, the Key Settlements for Growth and Other Villages;
- iii. the quantum of development proposed, both in terms of housing and employment land; and,
- iv. the removal of land from the Green Belt?

Matter 4: Green Belt

Issue 4a: Protection of the Green Belt

- Q1. Does the Plan make appropriate provisions for the protection of the Green Belt in accordance with national policy? [Policies LPD 12 – LPD 17]

Issue 4b: Removal of land from the Green Belt

- Q2. Has the principle of removing land from the Green Belt already been established in the ACS? If so, does the Plan deviate from the principles set out in the ACS in this regard?
- Q3. Have exceptional circumstances been demonstrated to enable the removal of land from the Green Belt in order that it be designated as Safeguarded Land in the Plan? [Policy LPD 16]

Issue 4c: Safeguarded Land

- Q4. Should Safeguarded Land be allocated in the Plan? If so, has sufficient Safeguarded Land been allocated?
- Q5. What evidence is there to support the quantum of Safeguarded Land allocated in the Plan? [Policy LPD 16]
- Q6. Is the distribution and amount of Safeguarded Land within the Borough appropriate? [Policy LPD 16]
- Q7. Is the allocation of Safeguarded Land at Bestwood Village appropriate? [Policy LPD 16]
- Q8. Is the allocation of Safeguarded Land at Calverton appropriate? [Policy LPD 16]
- Q9. Is the allocation of Safeguarded Land at Top Wighay Farm appropriate? [Policy LPD 16]
- Q10. Is it appropriate that some Safeguarded Land is protected from development as it is not suitable and/or available for development as suggested in proposed MM9? [Policy LPD 16]

Matter 5: Housing

Issue 5a: Housing Provision and Distribution

- Q1. Is the overall level of housing provision and its distribution in the Plan consistent with the ACS? [Policy LPD 63]

- Q2. Although the distribution of housing differs in the Plan to that set out in the ACS, would it accord with the Spatial Strategy of the ACS?
- Q3. The figures in Policy LPD 63 include dwellings which have already been built since 2011, sites with extant planning permission and sites below the threshold for allocation. Does the Plan adequately demonstrate where these sites are and how many dwellings are included? Are all those that have not already been built expected to be constructed in the Plan period?
- Q4. Although a planning application for the Gedling Colliery/Chase Farm site (H9) has been submitted and granted, subject to the signing of a Section 106 Agreement, would it still be necessary to plan for the total of 7,550 homes set out in the ACS (Policy 2) rather than the housing target of 7,250?
- Q5. Would this provide sufficient flexibility if problems were to arise with sites coming forward, particularly given that 7,250 homes is a minimum requirement?
- Q6. Is the distribution of homes between the Key Settlements appropriate? How has this distribution evolved? Is it clear how and why the housing requirement has been reduced in the Key Settlements? [Policy LPD 63]
- Q7. If the provision of up to 260 homes in Other Villages referred to in the ACS (Policy 2) is solely to meet local needs, what evidence of local needs is there to support a requirement for 140 dwellings in the Other Villages? [Policy LPD 63]

Issue 5b: Housing Supply in the Plan period

- Q8. Have sufficient sites been allocated in the Plan to meet the target of 7,250 homes set out in the ACS? [Policies LPD 63 – LPD 68 and Policy LPD 70]
- Q9. How has the actual number of dwellings allocated been arrived at? [LPD 64 – LPD 70]
- Q10. Should a buffer be included? If so, what level should it be? Specifically, have sufficient sites been allocated to meet the housing target and should more housing be allocated?
- Q11. Are there any important development/changes since the submission of the Plan, for instance in terms of planning permissions/completions? Is the SHLAA and SHMA up to date and robust?
- Q12. What evidence is there of the percentage of previous planning permissions being constructed? For instance, how many sites/dwellings with the benefit of planning permission have not been developed as a percentage of the total?
- Q13. On what basis are individual sites with planning permission excluded/included within the supply calculations?
- Q14. What evidence is there to support build out rates for each site, in particular larger sites?

- Q15. Should a lapse rate be included in the calculations?
- Q16. Are all of the housing sites allocated in Policies LPD 64 to LPD 70 justified and deliverable in terms of national policy and guidance and as indicated in the Housing Trajectory? [Appendix A]
- Q17. Should the housing sites allocated in Policies LPD 64, LPD 65, LPD 66, LPD 67, LPD 68 and LPD 70 which benefit from planning permission or a resolution to grant planning permission, or are under construction, be formally allocated in the Plan? Have these sites been assessed using the same site selection process? Have any been found to be unacceptable and allocated only because they benefit from planning permission? [H6, H9, H11, H13, H14, H19, H20 and H23]
- Q18. Is a windfall allowance of 230 homes in the last 5 years of the Plan period appropriate?
- Q19. Where are the existing housing commitments? What form do they take – large or small? Is their distribution in accordance with the ACS?
- Q20. Does the housing trajectory demonstrate realistically that the housing development, for which the Plan provides, will come forward within the Plan period? [Appendix A]
- Q21. What are the main findings of the Local Plan Viability Assessment? Has this work indicated that any sites are likely to be unviable? What are the implications? Is more work necessary? [LPD/HOU/08]
- Q22. How have site densities been determined? How rigid are these figures? [Policy LPD 33]
- Q23. What is the threshold for the inclusion of sites and why?
- Q24. Is the type and size of housing provided/planned meeting/likely to meet the needs of the area?
- Q25. Are the allocations based on a robust assessment of infrastructure requirements and their deliverability, including expected sources of funding?
- Q26. In assessing the speed at which development will come forward on certain sites, has full regard been had to the proposed Gedling Access Road?
- Q27. Does the development of the Strategic Site at Top Wighay Farm for 845 dwellings, rather than 1,000 homes accord with the ACS? Would this scale of development be viable on this site?
- Q28. Overall, does the Plan deal adequately with uncertainty? Is sufficient consideration given to monitoring and triggers for review?
- Q29. Should the development of brownfield sites be undertaken prior to the use of greenfield sites? If so, how would this be achieved and what would be the implications for housing supply and deliverability?

Issue 5c: 5 Year Housing Land Supply

- Q30. Is it robustly demonstrated that the Plan can deliver a 5 year housing land supply throughout the Plan period, calculated in accordance with

national policy and guidance, taking account of past delivery performance and applying the appropriate 5% or 20% buffer?

- Q31. What is the current position with regard to housing supply? Is there a 5 year supply? How has this been calculated?
- Q32. Is the use of a 5% buffer appropriate when calculating the Council's 5 year supply of deliverable housing? Is there any justification for a 20% buffer?
- Q33. What evidence is there to support the projected completions on the sites expected to deliver homes within the 5 year period 2016 – 2021, in particular on allocated sites which do not currently have planning permission?
- Q34. What evidence is there to support build out rates for each site, in particular larger sites?

Issue 5d: Range of different types of homes

- Q35. Does the Plan make appropriate provisions for a range of different types of homes in accordance with national policy (Policies LPD 36 – LPD 42)?

Issue 5e: Gypsy and Traveller Sites

- Q36. Does the Plan make appropriate provision for Gypsy and Traveller Sites, having regard to evidence of need?
- Q37. Does the Council's approach in relation to traveller sites generally conform with the expectations of the ACS and Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (August 2015)? If not, why not?
- Q38. The South Nottinghamshire Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (January 2016) identifies a baseline need for a total of 3 additional pitches in Gedling Borough between 2014 and 2029. The Plan does not seek to provide any pitches within the Borough. How does the Council intend to ensure that the 3 additional pitches required within the Borough will be provided?
- Q39. Is the Council's approach to future provision, set out in an additional paragraph suggested in proposed MM37 appropriate?

Issue 5f: Affordable Housing

- Q40. Does the Plan make appropriate provision for affordable housing? [Policy LPD 36]
- Q41. What are the targets for the provision of affordable housing? [Policy LPD 36]
- Q42. Why are these targets dependent on location?
- Q43. What is the justification for this?
- Q44. Should the targets and the locations to which they apply be set out in an appendix to the Plan, as suggested in the Council's proposed MM64, without reference to the Affordable Housing SPD in Policy LPD 36 as suggested in proposed MM63? Are they clearly defined?
- Q45. As it is intended that they apply to allocated and unallocated sites, should this be set out in the supporting text to the Policy as suggested in the Council's proposed MM63 and MM64?

- Q46. What has been achieved in recent years?
Q47. Should the Plan make provision for Starter Homes?

Issue 5g: Self Build/Custom Build Homes

- Q48. Does the Plan make appropriate provision for the development of Self Build/Custom Build homes in a range of locations and on a variety of sites? [Policy LPD 41]
Q49. How would the appropriate percentage of the dwellings to be provided for Self Build/Custom Build homes be defined?
Q50. What is the demand/need for Self Build/Custom Build homes in the Borough?

Issue 5h: Specialist Accommodation

- Q51. Does the Plan make appropriate provision for the development of C2 accommodation? [Policy LPD 38]

Issue 5i: Residential Design

- Q52. Do Policies LPD 32 – LPD35 incorporate appropriate measures to ensure good design in new developments?
Q53. Should the Plan include a policy on space standards?

Issue 5j: Residential Densities

- Q54. Are the residential densities included in Policy LPD 33 appropriate and achievable?
Q55. What evidence is there to support lower densities of 20dph in Burton Joyce, Lambley, Ravenshead and Woodborough and 25dph in Bestwood Village, Calverton and Newstead? [Policy LPD 33]

Matter 6: Housing Allocations

Issue 6a: General Questions

- Q1. Was the site selection process robust? Was an appropriate selection of potential sites assessed? Were appropriate criteria taken into account in deciding which sites to select and was the assessment against these criteria robust?
Q2. Are there any significant factors that indicate that any sites should not have been allocated?
Q3. Is there any risk that site conditions and constraints might prevent development or adversely affect viability and delivery?
Q4. Are the allocated sites viable and deliverable, having regard to the provision of the necessary infrastructure, affordable housing and other facilities, and taking account of environmental constraints?
Q5. Are the detailed requirements for each of the allocations clear and justified? Have site constraints, development mix and viability considerations been adequately addressed? Are the boundaries and extent of the sites correctly defined?

- Q6. For those sites that have been removed from the Green Belt, have exceptional circumstances been demonstrated to enable the alteration of existing Green Belt boundaries? Have all potential sites in the Green Belt been considered for inclusion based on clear criteria?
- Q7. Has full consideration been given to the Human Rights Act when allocating sites in the Plan?

Matter 7: Housing Allocations in/adjacent to the Urban Area

Issue 7a: Brookfields Garden Centre (H2) [Policy LPD 64]

- Q1. Is the proposed allocation justified and appropriate in terms of the likely impacts of development?
- Q2. Is the proposed allocation deliverable? In particular, is it:
 - a. confirmed by the landowner involved as being available for the use proposed?
 - b. supported by evidence to demonstrate that safe and appropriate access for vehicles and pedestrians can be provided?
 - c. deliverable, having regard to the provision of the necessary infrastructure and services, and any environmental or other constraints?
- Q3. Would the development of housing on H2 harm the clay extraction and landfill operations at Dorket Head? Would these operations result in a delay to this housing allocation coming forward for development? [Policy LPD 64]
- Q4. Would the development of housing on H2 accord with the County Council's policy on minerals, the National Planning Policy Framework (paras. 143 and 144), the Planning Practice Guidance and advice from British Geological Survey? [Policy LPD 64]
- Q5. Has full consideration been given to the loss of employment and retail facilities on the site?
- Q6. What are the exceptional circumstances which justify the removal of this site from the Green Belt?
- Q7. Are there any constraints to development?
- Q8. The Housing Implementation Strategy [LPD/HOU/01] indicates that the Council will invite the developer/owner of this site to participate in a partnership approach to facilitate partnership working to help deliver this site. Why is this necessary? What is the timetable for this work?

Issue 7b: Willow Farm (H3) [Policy LPD 64]

- Q9. Is the proposed allocation justified and appropriate in terms of the likely impacts of development?
- Q10. Is the proposed allocation deliverable? In particular, is it:

- a. confirmed by the landowner involved as being available for the use proposed?
 - b. supported by evidence to demonstrate that safe and appropriate access for vehicles and pedestrians can be provided?
 - c. deliverable, having regard to the provision of the necessary infrastructure and services, and any environmental or other constraints?
- Q11. What are the exceptional circumstances which justify the removal of this site from the Green Belt?
- Q12. When is the Gedling Access Road due to be completed?
- Q13. The development of this site for housing is dependent on the completion of the Gedling Access Road. What would be the effect of the failure to complete this road on this allocation and has the Council identified any alternative site(s) on which to accommodate the 120 dwellings allocated on H3 if this road is not completed?
- Q14. Would the development of the site reduce the green corridor between Gedling and Lambley and Burton Joyce?
- Q15. Should the land allocated be extended up to the proposed Gedling Access Road?
- Q16. Would the cumulative impact of the development of this site, along with the Gedling Colliery/Chase Farm site (H9) and the Gedling Access Road be acceptable?

Issue 7c: Linden Grove (H4) [Policy LPD 64]

- Q17. Is the proposed allocation justified and appropriate in terms of the likely impacts of development?
- Q18. Is the proposed allocation deliverable? In particular, is it:
- a. confirmed by the landowner involved as being available for the use proposed?
 - b. supported by evidence to demonstrate that safe and appropriate access for vehicles and pedestrians can be provided?
 - c. deliverable, having regard to the provision of the necessary infrastructure and services, and any environmental or other constraints?
- Q19. Has full consideration been given to the likely contamination on this site, given its use for sewage sludge disposal in the past?
- Q20. Has full consideration been given to the loss of agricultural land?
- Q21. Has full consideration been given to the cumulative impact of this and other recent developments?
- Q22. If the site was previously not suitable for designation as Safeguarded Land, why is it now suitable for development?

- Q23. What are the exceptional circumstances which justify the removal of this site from the Green Belt?
- Q24. Would the development of the site reduce the openness and effectiveness of the gap between Nottingham and Burton Joyce? If so, would this accord with the purposes of including land within the Green Belt?
- Q25. The development of the site for housing is dependent on the completion of the Gedling Access Road. What would be the effect of the failure to complete this road on this allocation and has the Council identified any alternative site(s) on which to accommodate the 115 dwellings allocated on H4 if this road is not completed?
- Q26. Does the housing trajectory accurately reflect the delivery of homes on this site, given that it is dependent on the completion of the Gedling Access Road?
- Q27. Could the development of the site be undertaken prior to the completion of the Gedling Access Road without having severe highway safety implications?

Issue 7d: Lodge Farm Lane (H5) [Policy LPD 64]

- Q28. Is the proposed allocation justified and appropriate in terms of the likely impacts of development?
- Q29. Is the proposed allocation deliverable? In particular, is it:
 - a. confirmed by the landowner involved as being available for the use proposed?
 - b. supported by evidence to demonstrate that safe and appropriate access for vehicles and pedestrians can be provided?
 - c. deliverable, having regard to the provision of the necessary infrastructure and services, and any environmental or other constraints?
- Q30. Would the development of housing on H5 harm the clay extraction and landfill operations at Dorket Head? Would these operations result in a delay to this housing allocation coming forward for development? [Policy LPD 64]
- Q31. Would the development of housing on H5 accord with the County Council's policy on minerals, the National Planning Policy Framework (paras. 143 and 144), the Planning Practice Guidance and advice from British Geological Survey? [Policy LPD 64]
- Q32. Has full consideration been given to the loss of agricultural land?
- Q33. What are the exceptional circumstances which justify the removal of this site from the Green Belt?
- Q34. Should the land allocated be extended to the north?

Issue 7e: Howbeck Road/Mapperley Plains (H7) [Policy LPD 64]

- Q35. Is the proposed allocation justified and appropriate in terms of the likely impacts of development?
- Q36. Is the proposed allocation deliverable? In particular, is it:
- a. confirmed by the landowner involved as being available for the use proposed?
 - b. supported by evidence to demonstrate that safe and appropriate access for vehicles and pedestrians can be provided?
 - c. deliverable, having regard to the provision of the necessary infrastructure and services, and any environmental or other constraints?
- Q37. Would the development of housing on H7 harm the clay extraction and landfill operations at Dorket Head? Would these operations result in a delay to this housing allocation coming forward for development? [Policy LPD 64]
- Q38. Would the development of housing on H7 accord with the County Council's policy on minerals, the National Planning Policy Framework (paras. 143 and 144), the Planning Practice Guidance and advice from British Geological Survey? [Policy LPD 64]
- Q39. Has full consideration been given to the site's location and access to it by alternative means of transport other than the private car?
- Q40. What are the exceptional circumstances which justify the removal of this site from the Green Belt?
- Q41. Are there any constraints to the development of this site?
- Q42. The Housing Implementation Strategy [LPD/HOU/01] indicates that the Council will invite the developer/owner of this site to participate in a partnership approach to facilitate partnership working to help deliver this site. Why is this necessary? What is the timetable for this work?

Issue 7f: Killisick Lane (H8) [Policy LPD 64]

- Q43. Is the proposed allocation justified and appropriate in terms of the likely impacts of development?
- Q44. Is the proposed allocation deliverable? In particular, is it:
- a. confirmed by the landowner involved as being available for the use proposed?
 - b. supported by evidence to demonstrate that safe and appropriate access for vehicles and pedestrians can be provided?
 - c. deliverable, having regard to the provision of the necessary infrastructure and services, and any environmental or other constraints?

- Q45. Would the development of housing on H8 harm the clay extraction and landfill operations at Dorket Head? Would these operations result in delays in this housing allocation coming forward for development? [Policy LPD 64]
- Q46. Would the development of housing on H8 accord with the County Council's policy on minerals, the National Planning Policy Framework (paras. 143 and 144), the Planning Practice Guidance and advice from British Geological Survey? [Policy LPD 64]
- Q47. What are the exceptional circumstances which justify the removal of this site from the Green Belt?
- Q48. The Housing Implementation Strategy [LPD/HOU/01] indicates that the Council will invite the developer/owner of this site to participate in a partnership approach to facilitate partnership working to help deliver this site. Why is this necessary? What is the timetable for this work?

Issue 7g: Gedling Colliery/Chase Farm (H9) [Policy LPD 64]

- Q49. Is the proposed allocation justified and appropriate in terms of the likely impacts of development?
- Q50. Is the proposed allocation deliverable? In particular, is it:
- a. confirmed by the landowner involved as being available for the use proposed?
 - b. supported by evidence to demonstrate that safe and appropriate access for vehicles and pedestrians can be provided?
 - c. deliverable, having regard to the provision of the necessary infrastructure and services, and any environmental or other constraints?
- Q51. Has the S106 Agreement been signed for the Gedling Colliery/Chase Farm planning permission (2015/1376)?
- Q52. The development of more than 315 houses on this site is dependent on the completion of the Gedling Access Road, due to a condition imposed on the planning permission (2015/1376). Should reference be made to this in the policy? What would be the effect of the failure to complete this road on this allocation and has the Council identified any alternative site(s) on which to accommodate the remaining 345 dwellings on this site within the Plan period?
- Q53. What evidence is there to support the build rates put forward by the developer of 60-80 dpa on the site? Are they realistic? Has the developer achieved these rates on similar developments elsewhere? Would there be a single developer or multiple developers building out this site?

Issue 7h: Hayden Lane (H10) [Policy LPD 64]

- Q54. Would the allocation of land for housing on this site accord with the housing requirement for the area around Hucknall set out in the ACS?
- Q55. Has full consideration been given to the development of this site, in addition to the Strategic Sites at Top Wighay Farm and North of Papplewick Lane, on the infrastructure in Hucknall?
- Q56. Would the development of the site lead to the coalescence of Linby, Papplewick and Hucknall?
- Q57. Is the proposed allocation justified and appropriate in terms of the likely impacts of development?
- Q58. Is the proposed allocation deliverable? In particular, is it:
- a. confirmed by the landowner involved as being available for the use proposed?
 - b. supported by evidence to demonstrate that safe and appropriate access for vehicles and pedestrians can be provided?
 - c. deliverable, having regard to the provision of the necessary infrastructure and services, and any environmental or other constraints?
- Q59. Has full consideration been given to the loss of greenfield land and agricultural land?
- Q60. Would the density of the development proposed on this site be appropriate?
- Q61. If the strategic site at Top Wighay Farm is developed for 1,000 homes, as set out in the ACS, are there any mechanisms in place to prevent the development of more than 1,300 dwellings on the edge of Hucknall, in particular at Hayden Lane?

Matter 8: Housing Allocations in Key Settlements for Growth

Issue 8a: Bestwood Village

- Q1. Does the amount of housing proposed in Bestwood Village accord with the ACS? [Policy LPD 65]
- Q2. Has full consideration been given to local services and facilities, drainage, flooding and highway safety in establishing the level of housing provision proposed in Bestwood Village?

Issue 8b: Westhouse Farm (H12) [Policy LPD 65]

- Q3. Is the proposed allocation justified and appropriate in terms of the likely impacts of development?
- Q4. Is the proposed allocation deliverable? In particular, is it:
- a. confirmed by the landowner involved as being available for the use proposed?

- b. supported by evidence to demonstrate that safe and appropriate access for vehicles and pedestrians can be provided?
 - c. deliverable, having regard to the provision of the necessary infrastructure and services, and any environmental or other constraints?
- Q5. Would the provision of a new primary school on this site lead to a reduction in the number of dwellings provided?
- Q6. Would the development of this site for housing be viable?

Issue 8c: Bestwood Business Park (H13) [Policy LPD 65]

- Q7. Is the proposed allocation justified and appropriate in terms of the likely impacts of development?
- Q8. Is the proposed allocation deliverable? In particular, is it:
- a. confirmed by the landowner involved as being available for the use proposed?
 - b. supported by evidence to demonstrate that safe and appropriate access for vehicles and pedestrians can be provided?
 - c. deliverable, having regard to the provision of the necessary infrastructure and services, and any environmental or other constraints?
- Q9. Has sufficient regard been had to ground contamination on the site? How would any problems be addressed?
- Q10. Would the density of development proposed on this site be appropriate?
- Q11. Have these matters been addressed through the planning application process, given that the site now benefits from planning permission?
- Q12. Would the dwellings allocated on this site come forward for development during the Plan period? What evidence is there to support this?

Issue 8d: Calverton

- Q13. Does the amount of housing allocated in Calverton accord with the ACS? [Policy LPD 66]
- Q14. Is there a need to provide additional homes in Calverton? Are sufficient sites allocated for housing in the settlement?
- Q15. Why has Calverton received the largest reduction from the figures in the ACS despite it being identified as the most sustainable of the Key Settlements?
- Q16. Has sufficient assessment of the impact of the proposed development sites on the three Scheduled Ancient Monuments in Calverton been carried out?

Q17. Having regard to the emerging Neighbourhood Plan for Calverton, should allocations to the south of the settlement be removed and a single strategic site allocated in the north west of Calverton?

Issue 8e: Main Street (H15) [Policy LPD 66]

Q18. Is the proposed allocation justified and appropriate in terms of the likely impacts of development?

Q19. Is the proposed allocation deliverable? In particular, is it:

- a. confirmed by the landowner involved as being available for the use proposed?
- b. supported by evidence to demonstrate that safe and appropriate access for vehicles and pedestrians can be provided?
- c. deliverable, having regard to the provision of the necessary infrastructure and services, and any environmental or other constraints?

Q20. Should this site be extended to include the strip of land between the edge of the allocation site and Ramsdale Golf Course, with the capacity increased from 75 to 90 homes?

Q21. Does the allocation of this site accord with the objectives of the emerging Neighbourhood Plan for Calverton?

Q22. What are the exceptional circumstances which justify the removal of this site from the Green Belt?

Q23. Will this site deliver the allocated number of homes during the Plan period?

Q24. Has full consideration been given to the lack of support for development to the south of the settlement when allocating this site for housing development?

Issue 8f: Park Road (H16) [Policy LPD 66]

Q25. Is the proposed allocation justified and appropriate in terms of the likely impacts of development?

Q26. Is the proposed allocation deliverable? In particular, is it:

- a. confirmed by the landowner involved as being available for the use proposed?
- b. supported by evidence to demonstrate that safe and appropriate access for vehicles and pedestrians can be provided?
- c. deliverable, having regard to the provision of the necessary infrastructure and services, and any environmental or other constraints?

Q27. Has full consideration been given to potential mining subsidence when allocating this site for housing development?

- Q28. Would the scale of development be appropriate?
- Q29. Would this site deliver the allocated number of homes during the Plan period, particularly given the multiple landowners involved?
- Q30. Should this site be extended to the north to include around 650 homes, in preference to the development to the south of Main Street (H15)?
- Q31. Are there any constraints to the development of this site?
- Q32. The Housing Implementation Strategy [LPD/HOU/01] indicates that the Council will invite the developer/owner of this site to participate in a partnership approach to facilitate partnership working to help deliver this site. Why is this necessary? What is the timetable for this work?

Issue 8g: Ravenshead

- Q33. Has sufficient land been allocated in Ravenshead? Does it accord with the ACS? [Policy LPD 67]

Issue 8h: Longdale Lane A (H17), Longdale Lane B (H18) and Longdale Lane C (H19) [Policy LPD 67]

- Q33. Is the proposed allocation justified and appropriate in terms of the likely impacts of development?
- Q34. Is the proposed allocation deliverable? In particular, is it:
 - a. confirmed by the landowner involved as being available for the use proposed?
 - b. supported by evidence to demonstrate that safe and appropriate access for vehicles and pedestrians can be provided?
 - c. deliverable, having regard to the provision of the necessary infrastructure and services, and any environmental or other constraints?
- Q35. Has full consideration been given to the cumulative impact of this development and past infilling in the settlement?
- Q36. Has full consideration been given to the impact of this development on the nature conservation, open space and local services and facilities?
- Q37. Would the homes on these allocated sites be developed during the Plan period? What evidence is there to support this?
- Q38. Are there any constraints to the development of these sites?

Matter 9: Housing Allocations in Other Villages

Issue 9a: Burton Joyce

- Q1. Has sufficient land been allocated for housing in Burton Joyce to meet local needs? [Policy LPD 68]
- Q2. Could sufficient small scale development to meet local needs in Burton Joyce have been found from infill development and small sites in the settlement?
- Q3. Is there sufficient provision of housing for young people and the elderly in Burton Joyce?

Issue 9b: Millfield Close (H20) [Policy LPD 68]

- Q4. Is the proposed allocation justified and appropriate in terms of the likely impacts of development?
- Q5. Is the proposed allocation deliverable? In particular, is it:
 - a. confirmed by the landowner involved as being available for the use proposed?
 - b. supported by evidence to demonstrate that safe and appropriate access for vehicles and pedestrians can be provided?
 - c. deliverable, having regard to the provision of the necessary infrastructure and services, and any environmental or other constraints?
- Q6. Have these matters been addressed through the planning application process, given that the site benefits from planning permission, subject to the signing of a Section 106 Agreement?

Issue 9c: Orchard Close (H21) [Policy LPD 68]

- Q6. Is the proposed allocation justified and appropriate in terms of the likely impacts of development?
- Q7. Is the proposed allocation deliverable? In particular, is it:
 - a. confirmed by the landowner involved as being available for the use proposed?
 - b. supported by evidence to demonstrate that safe and appropriate access for vehicles and pedestrians can be provided?
 - c. deliverable, having regard to the provision of the necessary infrastructure and services, and any environmental or other constraints?
- Q8. Should this site be extended to enable the construction of around 65 homes on an enlarged site?
- Q9. Has full consideration been given to the impact of the development of housing on this site on agricultural land?

- Q10. What are the exceptional circumstances which justify the removal of this site from the Green Belt?
- Q11. Has sufficient regard been had to flood risk?
- Q12. Has full consideration been given to unstable land?

Issue 9d: Newstead

- Q13. Is the level of development proposed in Newstead appropriate?
[Policy LPD 69]

Issue 9e: Station Road (H22) [Policy LPD 69]

- Q14. Is the proposed allocation justified and appropriate in terms of the likely impacts of development?
- Q15. Is the proposed allocation deliverable? In particular, is it:
- a. confirmed by the landowner involved as being available for the use proposed?
 - b. supported by evidence to demonstrate that safe and appropriate access for vehicles and pedestrians can be provided?
 - c. deliverable, having regard to the provision of the necessary infrastructure and services, and any environmental or other constraints?
- Q14. Why do the homes allocated on this site not count towards achieving the OAN for the Borough as set out in Policy LPD 63? Should the site be allocated in the Local Plan?

Issue 9f: Woodborough

- Q15. Is the level of residential development proposed in Woodborough appropriate? [Policy LPD 70]

Issue 9g: Ash Grove (H23) and Broad Close (H24) [Policy LPD 70]

- Q16. Are the proposed allocations justified and appropriate in terms of the likely impacts of development?
- Q17. Are the proposed allocations deliverable? In particular, are they:
- a. confirmed by the landowners involved as being available for the use proposed?
 - b. supported by evidence to demonstrate that safe and appropriate access for vehicles and pedestrians can be provided?
 - c. deliverable, having regard to the provision of the necessary infrastructure and services, and any environmental or other constraints?

Q18. In relation to Ash Grove (H23) have these matters been addressed through the planning application process, given that the site benefits from planning permission?

Matter 10: Employment

Issue 10a: Employment Provision and Distribution

- Q1. Is the overall level of employment provision and its distribution in the Plan consistent with the ACS? [Policies LPD 64 and LPD 66]
- Q2. What are the key employment land targets for the Borough?
- Q3. Are there sufficient employment sites available of the appropriate nature and in the right place to meet anticipated needs?
- Q4. Should the Plan allocate land for the provision of 23,000sqm of new office and research and development floorspace and a minimum of 10ha for new and relocating industrial and warehouse uses, in addition to the strategic employment allocations at Top Wighay Farm (8.5ha) and Teal Close (7ha) and the strategic location of Gedling Colliery/Chase Farm (at least 2ha)?
- Q5. Does the Plan allocate sufficient land for the provision of 23,000sqm of new office and research and development floorspace? If not, why not?
- Q6. Does the Plan allocate sufficient land for the provision of a minimum of 10ha for new and relocating industrial and warehouse uses be made? If not, why not?
- Q7. How much land will be lost from employment use as a result of allocations in the Plan? Is it anticipated that other employment land will be lost to other uses over the Plan period?
- Q8. How much of the land allocated for employment uses has already been built out? What are the implications of this going forward?

Issue 10b: Protected Employment Areas

- Q9. Does the protection of the existing employment areas accord with the strategy in the ACS?
- Q10. How much employment land is protected in the Plan? Is this appropriate?
- Q11. Are there any protected employment areas in the Borough that have not yet been developed?
- Q12. Do Policies LPD 43 to LPD 47 make appropriate provisions for the retention, expansion and development of a range of different types of employment sites and uses within the Borough in accordance with national policy?

Matter 11: Employment Allocation in/adjacent to the Urban Area

Issue 11a: Gedling Colliery (E1) [Policy LPD 64]

- Q1. Would the allocation of employment uses on the site be appropriate? Which employment uses would be appropriate on this site?
- Q2. Should it be limited to B1, B2 and B8 uses? Would other uses be appropriate, for example retail?
- Q3. What evidence is there to support it coming forward for employment uses during the Plan period?
- Q4. Has full consideration been given to the relationship between the housing and employment allocations? Would the proposed employment uses be compatible with the adjacent housing site?
- Q5. Has full consideration been given to the impact of the development of this site on wildlife and surface water run off?
- Q6. Are there any constraints to the development of this site?
- Q7. The Housing Implementation Strategy [LPD/HOU/01] indicates that the Council is to set up a development partnership group to progress this site. Why is this necessary? What is the timetable for this work?

Matter 12: Employment Allocation in the Key Settlements for Growth

Issue 12a: Hillcrest Park (E2) [Policy LPD 66]

- Q1. Is the continued allocation of this site for employment uses appropriate given that it was allocated in the Gedling Borough Replacement Local Plan (2005) and remains undeveloped?
- Q2. Is it likely that it will come forward for development within the Plan period?
- Q3. Given that the level of housing provision within Calverton has been reduced, would the provision of this employment site be required in this settlement?
- Q4. Are there any constraints to the development of this site?
- Q5. The Housing Implementation Strategy [LPD/HOU/01] indicates that the Council is to set up a development partnership group to progress this site. Why this necessary and what is the timetable for this work?

Matter 13: Retail

Issue 13a: Retail Development Strategy

- Q1. Do the retail proposals in Policies LPD 48 to LPD 56 fit with the overall strategy for retail development in the ACS?
- Q2. Is the retail hierarchy of town, district and local centres consistent with the ACS?
- Q3. On what basis have the boundaries of the town and local centres been altered?

- Q4. What evidence is there to support the designation of Carlton Square as a local centre rather than a district centre in Policy LPD 48?
- Q5. On what basis have the maximum levels of non-A1 uses within the Arnold Primary Area and the Local Centres been calculated in Policy LPD 49?
- Q6. What is the Plan doing to enhance the vitality and viability of Arnold, Carlton Hill and Netherfield, which the ACS, in Policy 6, considers to be in need of enhancement or underperforming?
- Q7. On what basis does Policy LPD 54 restrict A5 uses within 400m of a secondary school?
- Q8. Would the additional text proposed to Policy LPD 54 be effective, given the use of the word 'unacceptable'?

Matter 14: Transport

Issue 14a: Promotion of Sustainable Transport Modes

- Q1. Do Policies LPD 57 to LPD 61 promote sustainable transport modes and ensure new developments would not have a severe impact upon highway safety in accordance with national policy?

Issue 14b: Car Parking Requirements for New Developments

- Q2. Should the Plan make reference to the parking requirements for new developments? [Policy LPD 57]
- Q3. Are the parking requirements for residential and non-residential developments clearly defined in the Plan?
- Q4. Should reference be made to the SPD in Policy LPD 57?
- Q5. Should the parking standards for residential and non-residential developments be set out in an appendix to the Plan as suggested in proposed MM65? If so, why?
- Q6. What is the justification for the parking requirements set out in the appendix to the Plan as suggested in proposed MM65?

Issue 14c: Local Transport Schemes

- Q7. Will the local transport schemes come forward during the Plan period? [Policy LPD 60]
- Q8. What evidence is there to support the protection of the local transport schemes? [Policy LPD 60]
- Q9. What is the timetable for the completion of the Gedling Access Road? [Policy LPD 60]
- Q10. Should the Plan include the provision of a park and ride site at Leapool Island? [Policies LPD 59 and LPD 60]

Matter 15: Historic Environment

Issue 15a: Heritage Assets

- Q1. Has the Plan had regard to heritage assets, including the statutory test set out in Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990?
- Q2. Has appropriate regard been had to conservation area appraisals?

Matter 16: Open Space

Issue 16a: Open Space and Local Green Space

- Q1. Does the Plan make appropriate provisions for the protection and provision of open space; and the designation and protection of local green space; in accordance with national policy? [Policies LPD 20 – LPD 22]
- Q2. Is it appropriate for Policies LPD 20 and LPD 22 to be strategic for Neighbourhood Plan purposes?
- Q3. In assessing the provision of new open space as part of residential developments, should Policy LPD 21 have regard to the viability of the scheme proposed?
- Q4. Has sufficient consideration been given to the designation of Local Green Space? [Policy LPD 22]

Matter 17: Policies Map

Issue 17a: Green Belt Boundary

- Q1. Should any further changes be made to the Green Belt boundary? If so, what are the exceptional circumstances which justify the changes?

Issue 17b: Changes to the Policies Map

- Q2. Are any changes required to the Policies Map in response to policy changes?

Matter 18: Implementation and Monitoring

Issue 18a: Provision for Monitoring its Implementation

- Q1. Does the Plan make appropriate provision for the monitoring of its implementation?

OUTLINE PROGRAMME OF HEARINGS

Date	Time	Matters	Venue
Week 1			
Tuesday 7 February 2017	1000hrs	1, 2	Civic Centre, Arnold
Tuesday 7 February 2017	1400hrs	3, 4	Civic Centre, Arnold
Wednesday 8 February 2017	1000hrs	5	Civic Centre, Arnold
Wednesday 8 February 2017	1400hrs	5	Civic Centre, Arnold
Thursday 9 February 2017	1000hrs	13	Civic Centre, Arnold
Thursday 9 February 2017	1400hrs	14	Civic Centre, Arnold
Week 2			
Monday 27 February 2017	1400hrs	6, 7	Civic Centre, Arnold
Tuesday 28 February 2017	1000hrs	7	Civic Centre, Arnold
Tuesday 28 February 2017	1400hrs	7	Civic Centre, Arnold
Wednesday 1 March 2017	1000hrs	7	Civic Centre, Arnold
Wednesday 1 March 2017	1400hrs	8	Civic Centre, Arnold
Thursday 2 March 2017	1000hrs	8	Civic Centre, Arnold
Thursday 2 March 2017	1400hrs	8	Civic Centre, Arnold
Week 3			
Tuesday 21 March 2017	1000hrs	9	Civic Centre, Arnold
Tuesday 21 March 2017	1400hrs	10, 11, 12	Civic Centre, Arnold
Wednesday 22 March 2017	1000hrs	15, 16	Civic Centre, Arnold
Wednesday 22 March 2017	1400hrs	17, 18	Civic Centre, Arnold
Thursday 23 March 2017	1000hrs	Contingency	Civic Centre, Arnold
Thursday 23 March 2017	1400hrs	Contingency	Civic Centre, Arnold