

Gedling Local Planning Document

Mill Field Close Response to Inspector Request (Ex/86) for Views on Revised Housing Background Paper Addendum March 2017 and Revised Policy LPD 63 (Housing Distribution)

1 Increased housing delivery assumptions for Burton Joyce

1.1 The revised document increases the expected delivery of new housing in Burton Joyce, from 55 to 80 units, over the delivery period of the Plan. Windfall allowance is listed separately in the table, so, we must presume, is not included within that allocation of 80, and the eventual increase may well be more than 80.

1.2 The revised document also states that developments in the 'other villages' will only be to meet local need. Burton Joyce is in the 'other villages' group. The new delivery assumptions must therefore be based on a new needs analysis for Burton Joyce that indicates this increased requirement. We are not aware of any, or new, needs analysis, nor how the specifics of that need should influence that type of housing that should be developed. We would also expect, given the topography and individual characteristics of the sites listed, that the needs analysis would suggest that the nature of the housing would differ between the sites, if the commitment is to respond only to local need.

1.3 Is the Inspector satisfied that there is an appropriate needs analysis to justify the proposed level of development for Burton Joyce?

1.4 Can the Inspector or the Council, direct us to the analysis that has supported the change to this delivery assumption and how it will apply to the different sites?

2 Housing Density

2.1 As we submitted at the hearing on March 21, the housing density assumption for Burton Joyce, in LPD 33, is 20 dwellings per hectare as the minimum, unless there are circumstances to indicate otherwise.

2.2 The site at Mill Field Close, is given in the application, as 0.74 hectares, which, given the 20 dph rate, would indicate an assumed build of 16 dwellings, or more if justified. Also as we submitted at the hearing, the Council made an initial assumption of 20 dwellings for the site and agreed to the applicants request for 'up to 23' dwellings. The various documents associated with the approval process state that the exact number will be considered at the detailed planning stage. However, the assumptions in the revised LPD 63, assumes the full 23 in the projections. This must surely lead to a pressure to finalise permissions for the higher level.

2.3 Can the Inspector be satisfied, that the Council will not assume, or encourage the developer to apply for, the higher build level of 23, and will

instead, undertake a proper and public consideration of the appropriate build level for the site, particularly given the flood and drainage issues?

2.3 There has been no public analysis or explanation as to why the higher build rate has been agreed. Whilst recognising that the density rate is a minimum, there must surely be a requirement to actively and publicly consider why density levels should differ from the baselines agreed in the original planning documents. We consider this to be a flaw in the decision.

2.4 Is this a matter that the Inspector and Council can address through the Examination process, and if not, how can it be addressed?

2.5 Given that the higher density level has been given approval for Mill Field Close, without explanation, we cannot be confident that the 'other village' density levels, have been applied to any other applications or strategic plans for the village of Burton Joyce.

2.6 Can the Inspector be satisfied that the housing density rate for Burton Joyce, has been applied appropriately, in the revised planning document?

Mrs S Johnson for Residents of Burton Joyce

April 2017