

Site Selection Document – Addendum 2

This document has been prepared in response to comments made through the hearing sessions seeking additional explanation for the allocation of certain sites over others through the site selection process.

Site selection methodology

The Site Selection Document and its appendices (**LPD/GRO/05-14**) set out how the Council has selected sites for allocation.

It is emphasised that a two stage process has been used to determine whether:

- The site could be allocated; and
- The site should be allocated.

The decision about whether sites could and should be allocated has been based on information from a range of sources in order to come to a balanced judgement. The sources of information that have informed decision making are set out in the Site Selection Document – Main Report (**LPD/GRO/05**).

The Site Selection document has assessed all 114 of the initial pool of reasonable alternative sites in isolation to consider whether the site could be allocated. The starting point for the consideration of sites was the SHLAA site as submitted by the developer or landowner. However, larger or smaller land areas were considered as appropriate. Larger sites may have been considered where this was necessary in green belt terms in order to ensure that any required change to green belt boundaries would follow a defensible and robust boundary. Alternatively where a site is depending on an adjoining area of land coming forward for example, for access or provision of infrastructure it would need to be considered in combination with this land. The consideration of a smaller site may be necessary in order to reduce the impact of the site for example, on the landscape to exclude an area of landscape value. Similarly the site capacity is based on the numbers of homes put forward by the developer/landowner or is based on using the Local Planning Document Policy 33 Residential Density. However, site capacity was adjusted where necessary to accommodate required infrastructure, where this needs to be limited for highway reasons or to allow for lower densities to reduce the impact on landscape. The results are summarised in the site schedules in the Site Selection Document and its Appendices A to

G. The Sustainability Appraisal is a key input and the results of this work are summarised in the site schedule. In terms of deciding whether a site could be allocated, consideration was given as to whether there were any 'show stoppers' which would mean that the site could not be allocated. The subsequent Addendum considered a further 3 sites identified through the consultation exercise on the Publication Draft Local Planning Document.

The conclusions are set out in a series of appendices to the Site Selection Document, as follows:-

- Appendix A: The Urban Area and adjoining Hucknall;
- Appendix B: Bestwood;
- Appendix C: Calverton;
- Appendix D: Ravenshead;
- Appendix E: Burton Joyce;
- Appendix F: Lambley
- Appendix G: other Villages; and
- Appendix H: Woodborough.
- Site Selection Document Addendum

In deciding whether a site should be allocated, a site was compared against the available alternatives in that location as well as other factors required as part of the policy preparation process. As such, decisions have had regard to:

- The harm development of the site would cause (including in terms of Green Belt, landscape and heritage) with preference to sites which on balance would cause less or no harm;
- Whether there are exceptional circumstances in terms of the need for the release of Green Belt to meet housing need;
- Whether the site would substantially exceed the housing figure for that location;
- Whether the site would require additional, unsuitable land to be allocated (for instance to allow access to be achieved); and
- The cumulative impact of sites allocated in that location.

Account has also been taken of other factors set out in the NPPF, including the requirement for sites to be deliverable and the requirement to demonstrate that the sites allocated in the Local Plan Document would ensure that the Council has a five year land supply.

In undertaking the comparative assessment, a balanced judgement has been taken by officers as professional planners. Each site has been considered on its own merits, giving appropriate weight to each element of the evidence base as outlined in the Site Selection Document – Main Report (**LPD/GRO/05**). As such, it was not possible to undertake this exercise using a scoring system or tick box exercise as the weight given to each element may vary for each site. For example, a site may score more highly in green belt terms than an alternative site but it might be considered that this is outweighed by other benefits (such as regeneration) or the opportunity to provide more robust green belt boundaries. Another site may result in a low level of harm on a conservation area but this is outweighed by the scope for mitigation and the sustainable location in relation to other alternative sites.

Purpose of this document

The body of this document comprises a table which categorises all 117 of the reasonable alternative sites according to whether the site has been:

- considered not suitable for allocation;
- considered suitable for allocation and then not allocated; or
- considered suitable for allocation and then allocated.

For sites that were not considered suitable for allocation, the site schedule for that site in the appropriate appendix of the Site Selection Document clearly explains the reasoning. Sites were ruled out for allocation at this stage either on the basis of a single major impact or a combination of factors.

For sites that were considered suitable for allocation and then allocated, the site schedule for that site in the appropriate appendix of the Site Selection Document confirms that the site is suitable for allocation. Section 3 of that appendix then sets out the justification for the allocation of the site.

This document therefore focuses on the second category, i.e. those sites that were considered suitable for allocation but then not allocated. There are a number of reasons why a site might not be allocated, including that more suitable sites were available. These sites were subject to a comparative assessment by officers and as such the justification for decision making, as set out in the Site Selection Document, may be less clear.

In the following tables, the right hand column sets out the reasons for the decision for each site. For those sites that were considered suitable for allocation but not allocated, the information from the Site Selection Document has been included and updated to provide additional information where appropriate.

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	✗	✗	See Site Selection Document Appendix A page 7.
6/667	Sir John Robinson House	✗	✗	See Site Selection Document Appendix A page 9.
6/872	Killisick Lane (GBC Site 2)	✓	✓	See Site Selection Document Appendix A paragraph 3.9.
6/768	B and Q Unit Mansfield Road	✗	✗	<p>Discussions with the owners of site B and Q (6/768) indicate they are considering a number of options for the site, including residential; there is not considered sufficient certainty of homes being delivered to justify the site being allocated.</p> <p>Note since the Publication Draft planning permission has been granted for additional retail floorspace in the form of a mezzanine floor and for a change of condition relating to the range of goods sold on the site. Go Outdoors has now occupied the former B+Q unit.</p>
6/13	Lambley Lane/Spring Lane	✗	✗	See Site Selection Document Appendix A page 15.
6/497	Metallifactory Ltd	✓	✗	<p>Below the threshold for allocation.</p> <p>Update: The capacity of the site was previously based on the density policy in the LPD but a planning application has since been submitted for a higher capacity. Likely to be determined April/May 2017. The site is included within the supply of sites below the threshold.</p>

6/24	Sherbrook Road/Prior Road	✗	✗	See Site Selection Document Appendix A page 19.
6/477	Daybrook Laundry	✓	✗	Vacant part of the site could be allocated but was considered below the threshold for allocation. Update: Pre-application has now been submitted for 49 homes and the site is included within the supply of sites below the threshold.
6/12	Lambley Lane (Adj Glebe Farm)	✗	✗	See Site Selection Document Appendix A page 23.
6/860	Trent Valley Road A612 (Land Adj Railway)	✗	✗	See Site Selection Document Appendix A page 25.
6/671	Extension of Howbeck Road	✓	✓	See Site Selection Document Appendix A paragraph 3.8.
6/668	Land Off Mapperley Plains	✗	✗	See Site Selection Document Appendix A page 29.
6/767	Spring Lane (156)	✓	✗	See Site Selection Document Appendix A page 31.
6/50	Killisick Lane	✓	✓	See Site Selection Document Appendix A paragraph 3.9.
6/49	Brookfields Garden Centre	✓	✓	See Site Selection Document Appendix A paragraph 3.3.
6/871	Killisick Lane (GBC Site 1)	✓	✓	See Site Selection Document Appendix A paragraph 3.9.
6/18	Rolleston Drive (NCC Offices)	✓	✓	See Site Selection Document Appendix A paragraph 3.2.
6/542	Linden Grove	✓	✓	See Site Selection Document Appendix A paragraph 3.5.

A2	Lodge Farm Lane Phase 2	✓	✗	<p>The proposed second phase of the site (Site A2) is not being allocated due to the lack of clear defensible boundaries.</p> <p>The Replacement Gedling Borough Local Plan 2005 did use contours as boundaries for two housing sites allocated in the Local Plan but a decision has been made not to use contours for this Local Planning Document given advice in the NPPF.</p>
6/48	Lodge Farm Lane	✓	✓	See Site Selection Document Appendix A paragraph 3.6.
6/778	Land to the west of the A60 Redhill	✓	✗	<p>Access to this site can only be achieved onto Mansfield Road via the adjoining site (6/479). Whilst it is understood that discussions between the landowners have been ongoing for some time, this will only be confirmed through the grant of planning permission on site 6/479.</p> <p>Note this site is incorrectly recorded as 6/777 in paragraph 3.12 of Site Selection Document Appendix A.</p> <p>Update: It is understood that the planning application relating to site 6/479 will be determined at planning committee in April or May 2017.</p>
6/457	Lambley Lane (Adj Glebe Farm View)	✗	✗	See Site Selection Document Appendix A page 49.
6/873	Killisick Lane (GBC Site 3)	✓	✓	See Site Selection Document Appendix A paragraph 3.9.
6/51	Howbeck Road (Land East)	✓	✓	See Site Selection Document Appendix A paragraph 3.8.

6/25	Brookfield Road/Rolleston Drive	x	x	Note: the Rolleston Drive part of the site is considered under 6/18 above.
6/52	Spring Lane	✓	✓	See Site Selection Document Appendix A paragraph 3.7.
6/458	New Farm (Site D)	x	x	See Site Selection Document Appendix A page 59
6/459	Lambley Lane (Willow Farm)	✓	✓	See Site Selection Document Appendix A paragraph 3.4.
6/455	New Farm (Site B)	x	x	See Site Selection Document Appendix A page 63.
6/131	Gedling Colliery/Chase Farm	✓	✓	See Site Selection Document Appendix A paragraph 3.10.
6/466	New Farm (SUE)	x	x	See Site Selection Document Appendix A page 67.
6/658	Mapperley Golf Course	x	x	See Site Selection Document Appendix A page 69.
6/462	New Farm (Site E)	x	x	See Site Selection Document Appendix A page 71.
Considered in LPD/GRO /14	North of Bestwood Lodge Drive	✓	x	<p>There are concerns about the access arrangements for the site and the increased risk of surface water flooding. The proposed density is lower than would be permitted under policy. There would also be minor impacts on other factors including heritage and landscape. However, the site does not make a significant contribution to the purposes of the Green Belt and accords with the ACS strategy of urban concentration.</p> <p>While it is acknowledged that the North of Bestwood Lodge Drive 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 impact of the site on key junctions is not known until further work has been undertaken and the density of the site is lower than required by the Council's density</p>

				<p>policy which suggests that a larger number of homes could be possible on site. We are also mindful that the site could form part of a potential wider area of development and the additional impact this could have on the highway network. The impact of the development of the site in terms of flooding and (less so) landscape and heritage assets would also need to be mitigated</p> <p>No updated information on traffic impact has been provided.</p>
6/460	Hayden Lane, Hucknall	✓	✓	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	✓	✓	See Site Selection Document Appendix B paragraph 3.2.
6/20	Bestwood Business Park	✓	✓	See Site Selection Document Appendix B paragraph 3.5.
6/28	Broad Valley Farm	✗	✗	<p>Broad Valley Farm (6/28) is a wholly within the Green Belt and does not offer the opportunity to make use of non-Green Belt sites. Access is problematic in that 3rd party land would be needed. Broad Valley Farm would not relate well to the proposed new primary school and is not considered the most sustainable option for allocation at Bestwood Village.</p> <p>Update – The Assessment of Impact of LPD Development Sites on Scheduled Monuments (EX/43) concluded that the development of this site would obstruct the existing views of the Scheduled Monument over open agricultural land and reduce its relative visual and physical detachment from the main built up framework of the village.</p>
6/27	Westhouse Farm	✓	✓	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
6/774	Borrowside Farm Bonnerhill (Site A)	✗	✗	See Site Selection Document Appendix C page 4.
6/686	The Cherry Tree	✗	✗	Site is below the threshold and has planning permission.
6/664	Calverton Miners Welfare	✗	✗	See Site Selection Document Appendix C page 8
6/289	Bottom Farm	✗	✗	See Site Selection Document Appendix C page 10.
6/649	Woods Lane	✗	✗	See Site Selection Document Appendix C page 12.
6/661	Land at Broom Farm	✗	✗	See Site Selection Document Appendix C page 14
6/775	Borrowside Farm Bonnerhill (Site B)	✗	✗	See Site Selection Document Appendix C page 16
6/662	Hollinwood Lane/North Green	✓	✓	See paragraph 3.3 of the Site selection Document Appendix C
6/588	Mansfield Lane (250)	✓	✗	<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>
6/772	Broom Farm, Mansfield Lane	✓	✗	The option of developing to the north-east of Calverton was considered (sites 6/587, 6/588, 6/772 and 6/834). This

				<p>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>
6/834	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>
6/770	Land at Collyer Road	✗	✗	See Site Selection Document Appendix C page 26.
6/921	Shire Farm, Calverton	✓	✓	See Site Selection Document Appendix C page 28.
6/540	Land to the South of Crookdole Lane	✓	✗	<p>Site 6/540 is not proposed for allocation as it has weak defensible features to act as the Green Belt boundary and would require additional sites to be removed from the Green Belt to meet the housing target for the settlement.</p> <p>Development in this location was not favoured by Calverton Parish Council and many local residents through a number of public consultations.</p>

6/130	Dark Lane	✓	✓	See paragraph 3.2 of Site Selection Document Appendix C.
6/37	Long Acre Lodge	✓	✗	<p>Consideration was given to the allocation, or part allocation, of sites 6/35 and 6/37. While these sites have many of the benefits of the sites to be allocated they would lead to the 'left to find' figure being exceeded and it is considered that the sites to be allocated offer a range and choice of sites. Sites 6/35 and 6/37 will be designated as part of the safeguarded land formed by moving the Green Belt boundary to Oxton Road. While there is a need for a buffer to the north of the sites for landscape, flooding and heritage reasons some of the land is considered to be suitable for development beyond the plan period.</p> <p>Although adjacent to site 6/35, this site relates well to the built up area and could come forward on its own. The site does not contribute significantly to the purposes of the Green Belt and development would not result in a significant visual or landscape impact.</p> <p>Update – The Assessment of Impact of LPD Development Sites on Scheduled Monuments (EX/43) concluded that the site could be developed with no impact on the nearby Scheduled Ancient Monument. As with site 6/35, ensuring that the northern part of the site is free from development would mitigate impacts on the landscape.</p>
6/587	Mansfield Lane (Whitehaven 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</p>

				<p>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>
6/544	Main Street/Hollinwood Lane (Land Adj To)	✓	✓	See paragraph 3.2 of Site Selection Document Appendix C.
6/36	Lampwood Close	✓	✗	<p>Site 6/36 would have defensible boundaries but would have a major impact on the Conservation Area.</p> <p>Development of the site would not result in significant impact on the landscape and it is well connected to the settlement although it would result in the loss of agricultural land. The site has some value to the Green Belt as it is open land and development would lead to a major impact on the Conservation Area.</p>
6/33	Hollinwood Lane/Long West Croft	✓	✗	<p>Development to the south of Calverton (including site 6/33) was opposed by Calverton Parish Council and many local residents through a number of public consultations. This area is not considered to relate as well to the existing settlement and would require additional land to be allocated elsewhere in order to meet the housing target for the settlement.</p> <p>The site nestles close to the settlement but forms part of larger area which is open and has Green Belt value. Development of the site would result in the loss of agricultural land but would have a low impact on the</p>

				landscape. Access to the site would need to come through an adjacent sites (6/544 or 6/45) and will need to be considered in combination with at least one of those sites. The site can be considered for allocation together with site 6/544 and/or 6/45.
6/45	Georges Lane/Gorse Close	x	x	See Site Selection Document Appendix C page 44
6/665	Warren Place	✓	✓	See paragraph 3.3 of the Site Selection Document Appendix C
6/35	Mansfield Lane (Flatts Hill)	✓	x	<p>Although the site in isolation does not connect to the existing built up area it would in combination with the adjoining site (6/37) and will need to be considered in combination with that site. Ensuring that development would not extend too far north would mitigate the negative impacts related to landscape, flooding and heritage. The site does not make a valuable contribution to the openness of the Green Belt. The site can be considered for allocation in connection with 6/37. Consideration was given to the allocation, or part allocation, of sites 6/35 and 6/37.</p> <p>While these sites have many of the benefits of the sites to be allocated they would lead to the 'left to find' figure being exceeded and it is considered that the sites to be allocated offer a range and choice of sites. Sites 6/35 and 6/37 will be designated as part of the safeguarded land formed by moving the Green Belt boundary to Oxton Road. While there is a need for a buffer to the north of the sites for landscape, flooding and heritage reasons some of the land is considered to be suitable for development beyond the plan period.</p>

6780	Ramsdale Park Golf Course	x	x	See Site Selection Document Appendix C page 50.
647	Park Road/Hollinwood Lane	✓	✓	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
6/669	Kighill Lane (18)	✓	✗	<p>The site is adjacent to the settlement but does not make an important contribution to the purposes of the Green Belt. There are no major negative impacts of development that have been identified. Site size and configuration mean the site may be considered further in combination with adjoining sites.</p> <p>Additional land (sites 6/669, 6/843 and 6/845) was considered as part of the allocation of land to the south but was not necessary to meet the housing numbers identified. Consideration was also given to safeguarding land (made up of the area bounded by Longdale Lane in the east, Kighill Lane in the South and Mansfield Road in the west). However, it was not considered justified to remove such a large area while strong defensible boundaries were available for use although 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>
6/841	Land at Kighill Lane	✗	✗	See Site Selection Document Appendix D page 7.
6/845	28 Kighill Lane Site 1	✓	✗	<p>The site is adjacent to the settlement but does not make an important contribution to the purposes of the Green Belt. There are no major negative impacts of development that have been identified. Site size and configuration mean the site may be considered further in combination with</p>

				<p>adjoining sites.</p> <p>Additional land (sites 6/669, 6/843 and 6/845) was considered as part of the allocation of land to the south but was not necessary to meet the housing numbers identified. Consideration was also given to safeguarding land (made up of the area bounded by Longdale Lane in the east, Kighill Lane in the South and Mansfield Road in the west). However, it was not considered justified to remove such a large area while strong defensible boundaries were available for use although it is noted that there is some local support for using Kighill Lane as a defensible Green Belt boundary on the south of the settlement.</p>
6843	26 Kighill Lane Site 2 (land rear of)	✓	✗	<p>The site is adjacent to the settlement but does not make an important contribution to the purposes of the Green Belt. There are no major negative impacts of development that have been identified. Site size and configuration mean the site may be considered further in combination with adjoining sites.</p> <p>Additional land (sites 6/669, 6/843 and 6/845) was considered as part of the allocation of land to the south but was not necessary to meet the housing numbers identified. Consideration was also given to safeguarding land (made up of the area bounded by Longdale Lane in the east, Kighill Lane in the South and Mansfield Road in the west). However, it was not considered justified to remove such a large area while strong defensible boundaries were</p>

				available for use although it is noted that there is some local support for using Kighill Lane as a defensible Green Belt boundary on the south of the settlement.
Considered in LPD/GRO/14	22 Kighill Lane	✓	✗	<p>The site is adjacent to the settlement but does not make an important contribution to the purposes of the Green Belt. There are no major negative impacts of development that have been identified. Site size and configuration mean the site may be considered further in combination with adjoining sites.</p> <p>The site adjoins a number of other sites that were considered for allocation through the original Site Selection Document. Land here was not considered necessary to meet the housing target for Ravenshead identified in the Local Planning Document. This is still the situation and it is not proposed to amend the Local Planning Document to allocate land in this location.</p>
6/86	Larch Farm Public House	✗	✗	See Site Selection Document Appendix D page 12.
6/670	Kighill Lane (15a & 19)/Longdale Lane (170 & 172)	✗	✗	See Site Selection Document Appendix D page 14.
6/536	Nottingham Road (183)	✗	✗	See Site Selection Document Appendix D page 16.
6/659	Main Road (9 & 11, Land Adj To)	✓	✗	<p>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.</p> <p>Development north of Main Road (including sites (6/659,</p>

				<p>6/919 and 6/920) was considered but rejected.</p> <p>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.</p>
6/648	Land at Beech Avenue/Fishpool	✗	✗	See Site Selection Document Appendix D page 20.
6/39	Longdale Lane/Kighill Lane	✓	✓	See Site Selection Document Appendix D paragraph 3.2
6/919	Silverland Farm (Ricket Lane, Site A)	✗	✗	See Site Selection Document Appendix D page 24.
6/920	Silverland Farm (Ricket Lane, Site B)	✗	✗	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)	✗	✗	See Site Selection Document Appendix E.
6/469	Millfield Close (Safeguarded Land)	✓	✓	See Site Selection Document Appendix E.
6/537	Land to the North of Orchard Close	✓	✓	See Site Selection Document Appendix E.
6/923	Orchard Close/Hillside Drive (land to the north of)	✓	✗	Additional development to the east of the Orchard Close site is not considered appropriate due to the necessary arrangements to access the site.
6/539	Glebe Farm, Burton Joyce	✗	✗	See Site Selection Document Appendix E.
6/30	Woodside Road (Land Off)	✗	✗	See Site Selection Document Appendix E.
6/31	Hillside Farm	✓	✗	Additional development to the east of the Orchard Close site is not considered appropriate due to the necessary arrangements to access the site. Development would be visible for a long distance and affect the key part of landscape setting for the rights of way that cross the site.

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	✗	✗	See Site Selection Document Appendix F page 5
A1	Hill Close Farm, Lambley	✓	✗	A1 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	✗	✗	See Site Selection Document Appendix F page 9.
6/839	Spring Lane (Land Off) - Site B	✗	✗	See Site Selection Document Appendix F page 11
6/831	Catfoot Lane	✗	✗	See Site Selection Document Appendix F page 13
6/538	Land Off Spring Lane	✗	✗	See Site Selection Document Appendix F page 15
6/917	Catfoot Lane (land adj Orchard Rise/Steeles Way)	✗	✗	See Site Selection Document Appendix F page 17
Considered in LPD/GRO/14	Steeles Way/Orchard Rise	✗	✗	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	✗	✗	See Site Selection Appendix H
A3	North of Altham Lodge, Papplewick	✓	✗	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.
6/132	Newstead Sports Ground, Newstead	✓	✓	See Site Selection Appendix H paragraph 4.2 – 4.4.
6/586	Stoke Bardolph Farm and Land, Stoke Bardolph.	✗	✗	See Site Selection Appendix H
6/924	Land South of Newstead, Newstead	✗	✗	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)	✓	✗	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.
6/832	109 Main Street	✓	✗	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)	✓	✗	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	✓	✗	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	✓	✓	See Site Selection Document Appendix G paragraph 4.3. Allocate in combination with 6/776.
6/876	Long Meadow Farm (Site C)	✓	✗	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	✗	✗	See Site Selection Document Appendix G page 17.
6/776	Land at Broad Close/Private Road	✓	✓	See Site Selection Document Appendix G paragraph 4.3.
6/777	Land on Shelt Hill adj 67	✗	✗	See Site Selection Document Appendix G page 21.
6/875	Long Meadow Farm (Site B)	✓	✗	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.
6/196	Ash Grove	✓	✓	See Site Selection Document Appendix G paragraph 4.2.
6/762	Land at Grimesmoor Farm Shelt Hill (Phase 1)	✗	✗	See Site Selection Document Appendix G page 26.
6/826	Main Street/ Taylor's Croft	✗	✗	See Site Selection Document Appendix G page 28.
6/42	Lowdham Lane	✗	✗	See Site Selection Document Appendix G page 30.
6/827	Lingwood Lane (land adj Rose Marie cottage)	✗	✗	See Site Selection Document Appendix G page 32.

6/828	Park Avenue (land south of)	x	x	See Site Selection Document Appendix G page 34.
6/43	Old Manor Farm (Land adj to)	x	x	See Site Selection Document Appendix G page 36.
6/763	Land at Grimesmoor Farm Shelt Hill (Phase 2,3,4)	x	x	See Site Selection Document Appendix G page 38.
6/835	40 Shelt Hill	x	x	See Site Selection Document Appendix G page 40.
6/44	Bank Hill	x	x	See Site Selection Document Appendix G page 42.