

Gedling Borough Council

Response to 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?

7.1 The LPD (**LPD/REG/02**) at paragraph 3.3 confirms the urban area sites identified in Policy LPD 64 have been allocated following a site selection process set out in the Site Selection Document Appendix A (**LPD/GRO/06**). The same paragraph indicates that it is considered that there were exceptional circumstances required to amend the boundary of the Green Belt. The Site Selection Document Appendix A (**LPD/GRO/06**) summarises the likely impact of the allocation against a range of factors. The assessment has not identified any significant impacts and considers that the Brookfields Garden Centre site is suitable for allocation.

Q2. Is the proposed allocation deliverable? In particular, is it:

a. confirmed by the landowner involved as being available for the use proposed?

7.2 Brookfield Garden Centre, as landowner, has confirmed through their response to the 2016 SHLAA that the site is available for the use proposed. The site would be brought forward in two phases, the first phase commencing early on in the plan period and the second phase being potentially reliant on the relocation of the garden centre.

7.3 As for other housing allocations, two rounds of meetings have taken place with the landowner following consultation on the Local Planning Document Publication Draft. The purpose of the meetings has been to discuss any issues arising out the consultation exercise, consider the need for any further work to be undertaken and ensure that any issues are addressed at the earliest stage to allow a planning application to be submitted at the appropriate opportunity.

b. supported by evidence to demonstrate that safe and appropriate access for vehicles and pedestrians can be provided?

7.4 The Site Selection Document Appendix A (**LPD/GRO/06**) confirms that the current access to the site is sufficient to support the level of development proposed and that access could also be improved to the level required if additional development were required to be served from this access. It may

be necessary to move the 40mph area further north and/or provide a signalised junction.

c. deliverable, having regard to the provision of the necessary infrastructure and services, and any environmental or other constraints?

- 7.5 The Site Selection Document Appendix A (**LPD/GRO/07**) and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan Addendum October 2016 (**LPD/GRO/15**) have considered infrastructure and no significant infrastructure constraints have been identified.
- 7.6 Under the 2010 CIL regulations, local authorities must allocate at least 15% of CIL receipts to spend on infrastructure priorities that should be agreed with the local community in areas where development is taking place.
- 7.7 The Sustainability Appraisal of Site Allocations (**LPD/REG/19**) assessment does not identify any significant environmental constraints.
- 7.8 The Plan Wide Viability Study (**LPD/HOU/08**) showed that the Gedling Borough Local Planning Document Policies are broadly viable for all forms of housing development and demonstrate that Affordable Housing delivery at the Council's policy targets of 10-30% delivery proposed by the Plan are broadly viable allowing a degree of flexibility when based on typical site development.
- 7.9 The Council has been successful in gaining funding for this site from the Nottinghamshire Pre-Development Fund (NPDF). The purpose of this funding is to undertake masterplanning work to co-ordinate proposals for development of the 3 allocations at Brookfield Garden Centre, Howbeck Road/Mapperley Plains and Killisick Lane. It is intended that the masterplanning work would help to facilitate the early delivery of these sites, by providing clarity over the infrastructure requirements for the sites and addressing any obstacles at the earliest opportunity prior to the planning process.

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]

- 7.10 The Report of Responses (**LPD/REG/04**) sets out the Council's response to this issue which also relates to sites H5, H7 and H8. Site H2 is considered to be sufficiently far enough away from the existing clay extraction and landfill operations not to impact on these operations. As such the operations would not result in a delay to this housing allocation coming forward for development. The County Council (Minerals and Waste) has confirmed that it is generally accepted that a 250 m stand-off is an appropriate distance of separation from quarry operations depending upon the merits of individual sites. The plan entitled '250m standoff from Ibstock Eastern Extension' (**EX/47**) demonstrates that the H2 site is well outside of this distance.

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]

7.11 It is acknowledged that site H2 is underlain in its entirety by a minerals safeguarding area. It is proposed to add supporting text (through proposed change reference **MM50**) to ensure that the prior extraction of brick clay from this site is considered as part of the planning application. It would need to be considered for the site whether sufficient brick clay existed to make extraction viable and whether extraction was feasible given the proximity of existing residential areas. The County Council has confirmed that it is willing to withdraw its objection on this matter if this new supporting text is included.

Q5. Has full consideration been given to the loss of employment and retail facilities on the site?

7.12 As confirmed in the Report of Responses (**LPD/REG/04**), the site is not a protected employment or retail site. If the landowner wishes to relocate the existing garden centre use then the Borough Council will work closely with the landowner to try and identify an alternative site within the Borough. The Site Selection Document (**LPD/GRO/06**) recognises that the development of the site would result in the loss of jobs and land used for retail.

Q6. What are the exceptional circumstances which justify the removal of this site from the Green Belt?

7.13 The LPD (**LPD/REG/02**) at paragraph 3.3 confirms the urban area sites identified in Policy LPD 64, including Brookfield Garden Centre, have been allocated following a site selection process and indicates that it is considered that there were exceptional circumstances required to amend the boundary of the Green Belt. This matter is addressed in general terms in response to Q6 for Matter 6.

Q7. Are there any constraints to development?

7.14 The assessment of the site in the Site Selection Document (**LPD/GRO/06**) concludes that whilst development would result in the loss of jobs and land used for retail, the site is located adjacent to the urban area, is largely previously developed and would not significantly affect the landscape. As such it is concluded that the site can be considered for allocation. The landowner has confirmed that the site would be brought forward in two phases, the first phase commencing early on in the plan period and the second phase being potentially reliant on the relocation of the garden centre.

7.15 The Housing Implementation Strategy (**LPD/HOU/01**) considers the risk to the delivery of the LPD housing provision and describes what action would be taken if monitoring indicates the Borough is not meeting its housing targets once the LPD is adopted.

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?

7.16 The Housing Implementation Strategy indicates actions that would be necessary only if there were considered a risk to delivery. The developer of this site is involved discussions with the Council and has stated that they could be in a position to submit a planning application on part of the site immediately on adoption of the LPD. Progress on the housing site allocations will be monitored annually and reported through the Annual Monitoring Report.

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

Q9. Is the proposed allocation justified and appropriate in terms of the likely impacts of development?

7.17 The LPD (**LPD/REG/02**) at paragraph 3.3 confirms the urban area sites identified in Policy LPD 64 have been allocated following a site selection process set out in the Site Selection Document Appendix A (**LPD/GRO/06**). The same paragraph indicates that it is considered that there were exceptional circumstances required to amend the boundary of the Green Belt. The Site Selection Document Appendix A (**LPD/GRO/06**) summarises the likely impact of the allocation against a range of factors. The assessment has not identified any significant impacts and considers that the Willow Farm site is suitable for allocation.

Q10. Is the proposed allocation deliverable? In particular, is it:

a. confirmed by the landowner involved as being available for the use proposed?

7.18 Langridge Homes, as landowner, has confirmed through their response to the 2016 SHLAA that the site is available for the use proposed with delivery from 2020/21 - 2022/23.

7.19 As for other housing allocations, two rounds of meetings have taken place with the landowner following consultation on the Local Planning Document Publication Draft. The purpose of the meetings has been to discuss any issues arising out the consultation exercise, consider the need for any further work to be undertaken and ensure that any issues are addressed at the earliest stage to allow a planning application to be submitted at the appropriate opportunity.

b. supported by evidence to demonstrate that safe and appropriate access for vehicles and pedestrians can be provided?

7.20 The Site Selection Document Appendix A (**LPD/GRO/06**) confirms that both access points at Green's Farm Lane and Grange View Road have sufficient width to accommodate the additional development and access is likely to be acceptable.

c. deliverable, having regard to the provision of the necessary infrastructure and services, and any environmental or other constraints?

- 7.21 The Site Selection Document Appendix A (**LPD/GRO/07**) and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan Addendum October 2016 (**LPD/GRO/15**) have considered infrastructure and no significant infrastructure constraints have been identified.
- 7.22 Under the 2010 CIL regulations, local authorities must allocate at least 15% of CIL receipts to spend on infrastructure priorities that should be agreed with the local community in areas where development is taking place.
- 7.23 The Sustainability Appraisal of Site Allocations (**LPD/REG/19**) assessment does not identify any significant environmental constraints.
- 7.24 The Plan Wide Viability Study (**LPD/HOU/08**) showed that the Gedling Borough Local Planning Document sites are broadly viable for all forms of housing development and demonstrate that Affordable Housing delivery at the Council's policy targets of 10-30% delivery proposed by the Plan are broadly viable allowing a degree of flexibility when based on typical site development.

Q11. What are the exceptional circumstances which justify the removal of this site from the Green Belt?

- 7.25 The LPD (**LPD/REG/02**) at paragraph 3.3 confirms the urban area sites identified in Policy LPD 64, including Willow Farm, have been allocated following a site selection process and indicates that it is considered that there were exceptional circumstances required to amend the boundary of the Green Belt. This matter is addressed in general terms in response to Q6 for Matter 6.

Q12. When is the Gedling Access Road due to be completed?

- 7.26 The GAR is expected to be complete by spring 2020. The key milestones to delivery are as follows:-
- Spring 2017 – Submit Full Business Case to the D2N2 Local Enterprise Partnership;
 - Spring 2017 – Publish Compulsory Purchase Order;
 - Summer 2017 – Local Enterprise Partnership conditional funding approval;
 - Winter 2017 – Public Inquiry;
 - Spring 2018 – Secretary of State's Decision;
 - Spring 2018 – Commence construction; and
 - Spring 2020 – GAR complete and open to traffic.

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?

- 7.27 The policy wording in LPD64 would prevent housing delivery at Willow Farm should the GAR not come forward; however; there is now a great deal of certainty that GAR will be completed by spring 2020; and this does not prevent work on the detailed planning of the site from occurring nor delay the projected start on site in 2020/21.
- 7.28 Should the GAR not be constructed on time then there would be a delay to the delivery of the Willow Farm site although it is still highly likely that this site could be delivered entirely within the plan period.
- 7.29 Although considered unlikely, should the GAR not be constructed at all then there would be an adverse impact on traffic within the Gedling area. The Report of Responses (**LPD/REG/04**) sets out the purpose of the GAR and benefits including the removal of through traffic and increased capacity. This question is raised in relation to H3, H4 and H9 amounting to the potential non-delivery of 702 homes, which comprise as follows:-
- Gedling Colliery (over and above what can be delivered without the GAR) i.e. $792 - 315 = 477$ homes
 - Willow Farm = 110 homes
 - Linden Grove = 115 homes
- 7.30 The Council will closely monitor the progress on the GAR to identify any slippage or risk of no delivery. If the GAR cannot be delivered, the Council is of the view that the risk to housing delivery both in terms of scale and location would be of such significance to warrant an early review of the Local Plan. The trigger point for an early review would be conditional on confirmation from the GAR promoters that the scheme is not to be delivered. Whilst such a scenario is unlikely, a decision to drop the scheme or for a substantial delay is likely to be known by 2020 or shortly thereafter, effectively triggering an early review of the LPD.

Q14. Would the development of the site reduce the green corridor between Gedling and Lambley and Burton Joyce?

- 7.31 The Report of Responses (**LPD/REG/04**) sets out the Council's response to this issue and states the removal of the Willow Farm site would not reduce the gap between Lambley and Burton Joyce and the urban area, as the new development would be no closer than existing houses to these settlements.

Q15. Should the land allocated be extended up to the proposed Gedling Access Road?

- 7.32 The Council does not support the extension of the site for the reasons set out in the Report of Responses (**LPD/REG/04**) which states there are currently no existing defensible boundaries for the Green Belt.

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?

- 7.33 The Council's response to this is set out in the Report of Responses (**LPD/REG/04**) on page 69. The Gedling Colliery development is some distance away and it is unlikely that impacts arising from noise or dust would affect the Willow Farm area. The GAR is expected to be complete by spring 2020 after a two year construction period. The southern section running from Burton Road towards Lambley Lane is to commence first as the construction will use a cut and fill technique with the material from the cuttings used to construct embankments largely at the northern end. This means that the part of the road to the north of the Willow Farm site will commence earlier in the construction period than the more northern section of route.
- 7.34 Given that completions on the Willow Farm site are expected to be delivered in 2021 and construction of the stretch of the GAR closest to Burton Road site is expected to commence in 2018, it is not expected that there would be an overlap in terms of the GAR's construction and construction work on Willow Farm. In addition, the Borough Council requires Construction Environmental Management Plans (CEMP) for all major development.
- 7.35 The cumulative impact of the development of the site allocations have been assessed and are summarised in the Sustainability Appraisal Publication Draft Main Report (**LPD/REG/11**) with the full details in Appendix H (**LPD/REG/19**).

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

Q17. Is the proposed allocation justified and appropriate in terms of the likely impacts of development?

- 7.36 The LPD (**LPD/REG/02**) at paragraph 3.3 confirms the urban area sites identified in Policy LPD 64 have been allocated following a site selection process set out in the Site Selection Document Appendix A (**LPD/GRO/06**). The same paragraph indicates that it is considered that there were exceptional circumstances required to amend the boundary of the Green Belt. The Site Selection Document Appendix A (**LPD/GRO/06**) summarises the likely impact of the allocation against a range of factors. The assessment has not identified any significant impacts and considers that the Linden Grove site is suitable for allocation.
- 7.37 The assessment of sites on heritage assets (**LPD/HIS/01**) acknowledges that the development of the site would have an impact on the wider setting of Gedling House, which is a Grade II Listed Building, but not directly on its immediate setting. However the report concludes that if the development were low density, well planted and low in scale (single storey), then the impact would be less than for a denser urban form comprising 2/3 storey buildings.

Q18. Is the proposed allocation deliverable? In particular, is it:

- a. confirmed by the landowner involved as being available for the use proposed?**

- 7.38 Northern Trust, as landowner, has confirmed through their response to the 2016 SHLAA that the site is available for the use proposed with delivery from 2020/21 2022/23.
- 7.39 As for other housing allocations, two rounds of meetings have taken place with the landowner following consultation on the Local Planning Document Publication Draft. The purpose of the meetings has been to discuss any issues arising out the consultation exercise, consider the need for any further work to be undertaken and ensure that any issues are addressed at the earliest stage to allow a planning application to be submitted at the appropriate opportunity.
- 7.40 At this stage, it is understood that land required for the GAR may reduce the capacity of the site very slightly.

b. supported by evidence to demonstrate that safe and appropriate access for vehicles and pedestrians can be provided?

- 7.41 The Site Selection Document Appendix A (**LPD/GRO/06**) confirms that access to the site can be achieved from the existing access from Burton Road. However, consideration will need to be given to the operation of the adjacent signal controlled one way system and to the nearby school.

c. deliverable, having regard to the provision of the necessary infrastructure and services, and any environmental or other constraints?

- 7.42 The Site Selection Document Appendix A (**LPD/GRO/07**) and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan Addendum October 2016 (**LPD/GRO/15**) have considered infrastructure and no significant infrastructure constraints have been identified. However, County Highways would not wish to see homes completed before the completion of the GAR and land required for the GAR may reduce site capacity slightly.
- 7.43 Under the 2010 CIL regulations, local authorities must allocate at least 15% of CIL receipts to spend on infrastructure priorities that should be agreed with the local community in areas where development is taking place.
- 7.44 The Sustainability Appraisal of Site Allocations (**LPD/REG/19**) assessment does not identify any significant environmental constraints. Development of site H4 would have an impact on the wider setting of the Gedling House Grade II Listed Building but not directly on its immediate setting, thus this site scores a minor negative. Recommendations have been made for appropriate mitigation, including the development of the site at a lower density.
- 7.45 The Plan Wide Viability Study (**LPD/HOU/08**) showed that the Gedling Borough Local Planning Document Policies are broadly viable for all forms of housing development and demonstrate that Affordable Housing delivery at the Council's policy targets of 10-30% delivery proposed by the Plan are broadly viable allowing a degree of flexibility when based on typical site development.

Q19. Has full consideration been given to the likely contamination on this site, given its use for sewage sludge disposal in the past?

7.46 The Infrastructure Delivery Plan (LPD/GRO/15) requires a phase 1 walk over survey.

Q20. Has full consideration been given to the loss of agricultural land?

7.47 The Site Selection Document Appendix A (LPD/GRO/07) considers agricultural land amongst other considerations based on findings of the Sustainability Appraisal, which notes that site H4 would involve the loss of agricultural land grade 3 thereby scoring a minor negative. However, as the site has been used for sewage sludge disposal it is not usable for the growing of food for human consumption and the loss of agricultural land is therefore less significant in this instance.

Q21. Has full consideration been given to the cumulative impact of this and other recent developments?

7.48 The Gedling Colliery development is some distance away and it is unlikely that impacts arising from noise or dust would affect the Linden Grove area. The GAR is expected to be complete by spring 2020 after a two year construction period commencing at its eastern end initially close to the Linden Grove site. Given that completions on the Linden Grove site are expected to be delivered in 2020 and construction of the stretch of the GAR closest to Burton Road site is expected to commence in 2018, it is not expected that there would be an overlap in terms of the GAR's construction and construction work on Linden Grove site. In addition, the Borough Council requires Construction Environmental Management Plans (CEMP) for all major development.

Q22. If the site was previously not suitable for designation as Safeguarded Land, why is it now suitable for development?

7.49 The Report of Responses (LPD/REG/04) acknowledges that the Linden Grove site was rejected by the Inspector examining the 2005 Gedling Borough Replacement Local Plan. At that time, the A612 Link Road had not yet been constructed. It is considered that this is a material change as this road now provides a defensible Green Belt boundary.

Q23. What are the exceptional circumstances which justify the removal of this site from the Green Belt?

7.50 The LPD (LPD/REG/02) at paragraph 3.3 confirms the urban area sites identified in Policy LPD 64, including Linden Grove, have been allocated following a site selection process and indicates that it is considered that there were exceptional circumstances required to amend the boundary of the Green Belt. This matter is addressed in general terms in response to Q6 for Matter 6.

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?

7.51 The development would lead to some reduction in the gap between Nottingham and Burton Joyce but would not significantly reduce its effectiveness. The site was assessed as part of the Green Belt Assessment appendix N (**LPD/GRE/02**) which acknowledges there would be a reduction in the gap to Burton Joyce but the School and road/railway line reduce the impact of the loss of the gap.

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?

7.52 This question is raised in relation to Sites H3, H4 and H9. Please see response to question 13 above.

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?

7.53 The Report of Responses (**LPD/REG/04**) acknowledges that the housing trajectory included as Appendix A of the Publication Draft Local Planning Document suggests that the Linden Grove site will deliver homes from 2017 and this will be amended. The Revised Schedule of Changes (**EX/10A**) includes proposed change reference **MM58** which amends the housing delivery for site H4 to commence in 2020/21 and not 2017/18.

Q27. Could the development of the site be undertaken prior to the completion of the Gedling Access Road without having severe highway safety implications?

7.54 The Report of Responses (**LPD/REG/04**) explains that Northern Trust's proposal to allow for the possibility of homes being built before the GAR is unacceptable to County Highways who are concerned that the development of the housing allocations in advance of the GAR would significantly worsen the existing traffic congestion and problems, particularly on Arnold Lane.

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?

7.55 The LPD (**LPD/REG/02**) at paragraph 3.3 confirms the urban area sites identified in Policy LPD 64 have been allocated following a site selection process set out in the Site Selection Document Appendix A (**LPD/GRO/06**).

The same paragraph indicates that it is considered that there were exceptional circumstances required to amend the boundary of the Green Belt. The Site Selection Document Appendix A (**LPD/GRO/06**) summarises the likely impact of the allocation against a range of factors. The assessment has not identified any significant impacts and considers that the Lodge Farm Lane site is suitable for allocation.

Q29. Is the proposed allocation deliverable? In particular, is it:

a. confirmed by the landowner involved as being available for the use proposed?

7.56 Langridge Homes have confirmed the site is available for the use proposed through their response on the 2016 SHLAA.

7.57 As for other housing allocations, two rounds of meetings have taken place with the landowner following consultation on the Local Planning Document Publication Draft. The purpose of the meetings has been to discuss any issues arising out the consultation exercise, consider the need for any further work to be undertaken and ensure that any issues are addressed at the earliest stage to allow a planning application to be submitted at the appropriate opportunity.

b. supported by evidence to demonstrate that safe and appropriate access for vehicles and pedestrians can be provided?

7.58 The Site Selection Document Appendix A (**LPD/GRO/06**) confirms that the A60 can provide access up to 10m enabling bus penetration if required. Access from Stockings Farm is also possible although the width of the roads is unlikely to allow bus access through to Calverton Road. The site should be designed to reduce the number accessed from the A60 without creating a rat run through from Stockings Farm.

c. deliverable, having regard to the provision of the necessary infrastructure and services, and any environmental or other constraints?

7.59 The Site Selection Document Appendix A (**LPD/GRO/07**) and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan Addendum October 2016 (**LPD/GRO/15**) have considered infrastructure and no significant infrastructure constraints have been identified.

7.60 Under the 2010 CIL regulations, local authorities must allocate at least 15% of CIL receipts to spend on infrastructure priorities that should be agreed with the local community in areas where development is taking place.

7.61 The Sustainability Appraisal of Site Allocations (**LPD/REG/19**) assessment does not identify any significant environmental constraints.

7.62 The Plan Wide Viability Study (**LPD/HOU/08**) showed that the Gedling Borough Local Planning Document Policies are broadly viable for all forms of

housing development and demonstrate that Affordable Housing delivery at the Council's policy targets of 10-30% delivery proposed by the Plan are broadly viable allowing a degree of flexibility when based on typical site development.

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]

7.63 The Report of Responses (**LPD/REG/04**) sets out the Council's response to this issue on page 64. The Site H5 is considered to be sufficiently far enough away from the existing clay extraction and landfill operations not to impact on these operations. As such the operations would not result in a delay to this housing allocation coming forward for development. The County Council (Minerals and Waste) has confirmed that it is generally accepted that a 250 m stand-off is an appropriate distance of separation from quarry operations. The plan entitled '250m standoff around Ibstock Brickworks' (**EX/46**) demonstrates that the edge of the H5 site is just less than 500 m on the other side of the ridge to the Ibstock Brickworks and is also further away than the existing housing on the edge of the urban area.

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]

7.64 It is acknowledged that site H5 is underlain in its entirety by a minerals safeguarding area. It is proposed to add supporting text (through proposed change reference **MM51**) to ensure that the prior extraction of brick clay from this site is considered as part of the planning application. It would need to be considered for the site whether sufficient brick clay existed to make extraction viable and whether extraction was feasible given the proximity of existing residential areas. The County Council has confirmed that it is willing to withdraw its objection on this matter if this new supporting text is included.

Q32. Has full consideration been given to the loss of agricultural land?

7.65 The Site Selection Document Appendix A (**LPD/GRO/07**) balances a range of factors and concludes that, whilst the site would involve the loss of Grade 2 and 3 agricultural land, the amount lost is not significant¹ and is outweighed by the benefit providing houses in accordance with the Aligned Core Strategy.

Q33. What are the exceptional circumstances which justify the removal of this site from the Green Belt?

¹ Natural England Technical Information Note TIN049 'Agricultural Land Classification: protecting the best and most versatile agricultural land' confirms that for planning applications, specific consultations with Natural England are required for areas that involve the loss of 20 ha or more of the best and most versatile land and it is for the planning authority to decide how significant the agricultural land issues are.

- 7.66 The LPD (**LPD/REG/02**) at paragraph 3.3 confirms the urban area sites identified in Policy LPD 64, including Lodge Farm Lane, have been allocated following a site selection process and indicates that it is considered that there were exceptional circumstances required to amend the boundary of the Green Belt. This matter is addressed in general terms in response to Q6 for Matter 6.

Q34. Should the land allocated be extended to the north?

- 7.67 The Report of Responses (**LPD/REG/02**) sets out the reasons why this is not supported by the Council due to the lack of defensible Green Belt boundaries. The allocation extends the urban area towards the ridgeline but not over it and so this important landscape feature would not be breached. As shown in the Landscape and Visual Impact Study (**LPD/NAT/01**), the study area has a low sensitivity to development of the site, although there is a ridgeline to the northwest that needs protecting.

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?

- 7.68 The LPD (**LPD/REG/02**) at paragraph 3.3 confirms the urban area sites identified in Policy LPD 64 have been allocated following a site selection process set out in the Site Selection Document Appendix A (**LPD/GRO/06**). The same paragraph indicates that it is considered that there were exceptional circumstances required to amend the boundary of the Green Belt. The Site Selection Document Appendix A (**LPD/GRO/06**) summarises the likely impact of the allocation against a range of factors. The assessment has not identified any significant impacts and considers that the Howbeck Road site is suitable for allocation.

Q36. Is the proposed allocation deliverable? In particular, is it:

a. confirmed by the landowner involved as being available for the use proposed?

- 7.69 The landowner has confirmed that the site is available for the use proposed through their response on the 2016 SHLAA.
- 7.70 As for other housing allocations, two rounds of meetings have taken place with the landowner following consultation on the Local Planning Document Publication Draft. The purpose of the meetings has been to discuss any issues arising out the consultation exercise, consider the need for any further work to be undertaken and ensure that any issues are addressed at the earliest stage to allow a planning application to be submitted at the appropriate opportunity.

b. supported by evidence to demonstrate that safe and appropriate access for vehicles and pedestrians can be provided?

7.71 The Site Selection Document Appendix A (**LPD/GRO/06**) confirms that there is sufficient space and visibility to achieve a new access onto the junction of Howbeck Road and Killisick Lane. Access to the site requires the loss of a small part of an adjacent nature reserve; a replacement area will be provided in compensation. Consideration will need to be given to the operation of Killisick Lane.

c. deliverable, having regard to the provision of the necessary infrastructure and services, and any environmental or other constraints?

7.72 The Site Selection Document Appendix A (**LPD/GRO/07**) and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan Addendum October 2016 (**LPD/GRO/15**) have considered infrastructure and no significant infrastructure constraints have been identified beyond the need to provide a new primary school to serve this and adjacent allocations.

7.73 Under the 2010 CIL regulations, local authorities must allocate at least 15% of CIL receipts to spend on infrastructure priorities that should be agreed with the local community in areas where development is taking place.

7.74 Appendix H of the Sustainability Appraisal of Site Allocations (**LPD/REG/19**) assessment does not identify any significant environmental constraints beyond the need to ensure that the ridgeline that lies roughly parallel to Mapperley Plains will be respected. This, and the need for a new primary school to serve the area, has resulted in density being assumed to be 25dph rather than the usual 30dph.

7.75 The Plan Wide Viability Study (**LPD/HOU/08**) showed that the Gedling Borough Local Planning Document Policies are broadly viable for all forms of housing development and demonstrate that Affordable Housing delivery at the Council's policy targets of 10-30% delivery proposed by the Plan are broadly viable allowing a degree of flexibility when based on typical site development.

7.76 The Council has been successful in gaining funding for this site from the Nottinghamshire Pre-Development Fund (NPDF). The purpose of this funding is to undertake masterplanning work to co-ordinate proposals for development of the 3 allocations at Brookfield Garden Centre, Howbeck Road/Mapperley Plains and Killisick Lane. It is intended that the masterplanning work would help to facilitate the early delivery of these sites, by providing clarity over the infrastructure requirements for the sites and addressing any obstacles at the earliest opportunity prior to the planning process.

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]

- 7.77 The Report of Responses (**LPD/REG/04**) sets out the Council's response to this issue on page 64. It is acknowledged that site H7 is in close proximity to the existing clay extraction and landfill operations at Dorket Head. It is proposed that supporting text be added to identify that the development of sites H7 and H8 will take account of the minerals and waste operation to the north (proposed change **MM52**). This could take the form of a phasing scheme to ensure that development of the site aligns with the expected extraction of minerals in the Eastern Extension and the maintenance of an appropriate standoff from active workings. Other forms of mitigation, such as bunds and screening, may also be required. Landfill operations are 'paused' at present.
- 7.78 The County Council (Minerals and Waste) has confirmed that it is generally considered that a distance of 250 m should provide sufficient standoff from the site given the various controls in place through the planning permission and the separate operation permit. The plan entitled '250m standoff from Ibstock Eastern Extension' (**EX/47**) demonstrates that the H7 allocation is located more than 250 m from the edge of the eastern extension to the north and not appreciably closer than existing housing development at Campbell Gardens. The proposed change (**MM 52**) allows for consideration of impacts from quarrying to be considered at the planning application stage and it is likely in this case that mitigation in the form of landscaping and screening would be sufficient to manage any impact.

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]

- 7.79 It is acknowledged that site H7 is underlain nearly in its entirety by a minerals safeguarding area. It is proposed to add supporting text (proposed change **MM52**) to ensure that the prior extraction of brick clay from this site is considered as part of the planning application. It would need to be considered for the site whether sufficient brick clay existed to make extraction viable and whether extraction was feasible given the proximity of existing residential areas. The County Council has confirmed that it is willing to withdraw its objection on this matter if this new supporting text is included.

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?

- 7.80 The site would be accessed through the existing development to the west of the site as well as via Mapperley Plains, in order to ensure that the development is integrated with the existing urban area and can benefit from existing services and facilities. As such, the site will be well served by bus services along the B684 (Mapperley Plains), Coppice Road (no. 59) and others.

Q40. What are the exceptional circumstances which justify the removal of this site from the Green Belt?

7.81 The LPD (**LPD/REG/02**) at paragraph 3.3 confirms the urban area sites identified in Policy LPD 64, including Howbeck Road/Mapperley Plains, have been allocated following a site selection process and indicates that it is considered that there were exceptional circumstances required to amend the boundary of the Green Belt. This matter is addressed in general terms in response to Q6 for Matter 6.

Q41. Are there any constraints to the development of this site?

7.82 The assessment of the site in the Site Selection Document (**LPD/GRO/06**) concludes that the site makes some contribution to the purposes of the Green Belt and development would have landscape and visual impacts. This could be mitigated by ensuring that development respects the ridgeline either by not developing along it or only allowing single storey development. As such it is concluded that the site can be considered for allocation. In addition, there are potential constraints relating to mineral extraction and waste operations, which are considered under Q37 above.

7.83 The Housing Implementation Strategy (**LPD/HOU/01**) considers the risk to the delivery of the LPD housing provision and describes what action would be taken if monitoring indicates the Borough is not meeting its housing targets once the LPD is adopted. The document considers possible risks to delivery, including constraints, and sets out what actions may be taken to reduce these risks.

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?

7.84 The Housing Implementation Strategy indicates actions that would be necessary only if there were considered a risk to delivery. The developer of this site is involved discussions with the Council and has stated that they could be in a position to submit a planning application on part of the site immediately on adoption of the LPD. Progress on the housing site allocations will be monitored annually and reported through the Annual Monitoring Report.

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

Q43. Is the proposed allocation justified and appropriate in terms of the likely impacts of development?

7.85 The LPD (**LPD/REG/02**) at paragraph 3.3 confirms the urban area sites identified in Policy LPD 64 have been allocated following a site selection process set out in the Site Selection Document Appendix A (**LPD/GRO/06**). The same paragraph indicates that it is considered that there were exceptional circumstances required to amend the boundary of the Green Belt.

The Site Selection Document Appendix A (**LPD/GRO/06**) summarises the likely impact of the allocation against a range of factors. The assessment has not identified any significant impacts and considers that the Killisick Lane site is suitable for allocation.

Q44. Is the proposed allocation deliverable? In particular, is it:

a. confirmed by the landowner involved as being available for the use proposed?

7.86 Gedling Borough Council (Property) as landowner for the site has confirmed through the 2016 SHLAA that the site is available for the use proposed.

7.87 As for other housing allocations, two rounds of meetings have taken place with the landowner following consultation on the Local Planning Document Publication Draft. The purpose of the meetings has been to discuss any issues arising out the consultation exercise, consider the need for any further work to be undertaken and ensure that any issues are addressed at the earliest stage to allow a planning application to be submitted at the appropriate opportunity.

b. supported by evidence to demonstrate that safe and appropriate access for vehicles and pedestrians can be provided?

7.88 The Site Selection Document Appendix A (**LPD/GRO/06**) confirms that there is sufficient space and visibility to achieve a new access onto the junction of Howbeck Road and Killisick Lane. Consideration will need to be given to the operation of Killisick Lane.

c. deliverable, having regard to the provision of the necessary infrastructure and services, and any environmental or other constraints?

7.89 The Site Selection Document Appendix A (**LPD/GRO/07**) and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan Addendum October 2016 (**LPD/GRO/15**) have considered infrastructure and no significant infrastructure constraints have been identified.

7.90 Under the 2010 CIL regulations, local authorities must allocate at least 15% of CIL receipts to spend on infrastructure priorities that should be agreed with the local community in areas where development is taking place.

7.91 The Sustainability Appraisal of Site Allocations (**LPD/REG/19**) assessment does not identify any significant environmental constraints.

7.92 The Plan Wide Viability Study (**LPD/HOU/08**) showed that the Gedling Borough Local Planning Document Policies are broadly viable for all forms of housing development and demonstrate that Affordable Housing delivery at the Council's policy targets of 10-30% delivery proposed by the Plan are broadly viable allowing a degree of flexibility when based on typical site development.

7.93 The Council has been successful in gaining funding for this site from the Nottinghamshire Pre-Development Fund (NPDF). The purpose of this funding is to undertake masterplanning work to co-ordinate proposals for development of the 3 allocations at Brookfield Garden Centre, Howbeck Road/Mapperley Plains and Killisick Lane. It is intended that the masterplanning work would help to facilitate the early delivery of these sites, by providing clarity over the infrastructure requirements for the sites and addressing any obstacles at the earliest opportunity prior to the planning process.

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]

7.94 The Report of Responses (**LPD/REG/04**) sets out the Council's response to this issue on page 64. It is acknowledged that site H8 is in close proximity to the existing clay extraction and landfill operations at Dorket Head. It is proposed that supporting text be added (Proposed Change Reference **MM53**) to identify that the development of site H8 will take account of the minerals and waste operation to the north. This could take the form of a phasing scheme to ensure that development of the site aligns with the expected extraction of minerals in the Eastern Extension and the maintenance of an appropriate standoff from active workings. Other forms of mitigation, such as bunds and screening, may also be required. Landfill operations are 'paused' at present. A distance of about 250m should provide sufficient standoff from the site given the various controls in place through the planning permission and the separate operation permit.

7.95 Turning to clay extraction, the eastern extension is planned to advance in an eastward direction away from the Killisick area and be substantially complete by 2026. The plan entitled '250m standoff from Ibstock Eastern Extension' (**EX/47**) demonstrates that a relatively small parcel of land at the northern part of site H8 falls within 250 m radius of the quarrying operations potentially affecting phases 1 and 2 through proximity. The likely progress of the eastern extension into phases 2 and 3 would mean that after around 2021 a 250 m buffer would be established. On this basis, the housing on the northern part of H8 could be phased for completion after 2021.

7.96 The Report of Responses (**LPD/REG/04**) acknowledges that possible extraction of clay in the ownership of Ibstock to the north of site H8, should it be permitted, would be potentially hindered by the proximity of new housing due to amenity issues. This area of land immediately north of H8 is characterised by a substantial amount of woodland planting. The Report of Responses states it is understood that this area:

- does not have planning permission for clay extraction;
- has not been promoted for clay extraction through the emerging County's Minerals Local Plan; and
- was not regarded as an alternative to the eastern extension through the EIA carried out for the planning permission.

7.97 The Council therefore considers there is no firm evidence that minerals will be extracted from this area to the north of H8 at some point in the future.

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]

7.98 It is acknowledged that parts of site H8 are underlain by a minerals safeguarding area. It is also acknowledged that possible extraction of clay in an area in the ownership of Ibstock to the north of site H8, should it be permitted, would potentially be hindered by the proximity of new housing due to amenity issues.

7.99 It is proposed to add supporting text (Proposed Change reference **MM53**) to ensure that the prior extraction of brick clay from this site is considered as part of the planning application. It would need to be considered for the site whether sufficient brick clay existed to make extraction viable and whether extraction was feasible given the proximity of existing residential areas. The County Council has confirmed that it is willing to withdraw its objection on this matter if this new supporting text is included.

Q47. What are the exceptional circumstances which justify the removal of this site from the Green Belt?

7.100 The LPD (**LPD/REG/02**) at paragraph 3.3 confirms the urban area sites identified in Policy LPD 64, including Killisick Lane, have been allocated following a site selection process and indicates that it is considered that there were exceptional circumstances required to amend the boundary of the Green Belt. This matter is addressed in general terms in response to Q6 for Matter 6.

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?

7.101 The Housing Implementation Strategy indicates actions that would be necessary only if there were considered a risk to delivery. The developer of this site is involved discussions with the Council and has stated that they could be in a position to submit a planning application on part of the site immediately on adoption of the LPD. Progress on the housing site allocations will be monitored annually and reported through the Annual Monitoring Report.

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?

7.102 The LPD (**LPD/REG/02**) at paragraph 3.3 confirms the urban area sites identified in Policy LPD 64 have been allocated following a site selection process set out in the Site Selection Document Appendix A (**LPD/GRO/06**). The same paragraph indicates that it is considered that there were exceptional circumstances required to amend the boundary of the Green Belt.

7.103 The Site Selection Document Appendix A (**LPD/GRO/06**) summarises the likely impact of the allocation against a range of factors. The assessment confirms that the site is identified by the ACS as a strategic location. The site is to be allocated in the LPD in order to establish boundaries and uses. The major negative impact on the Environment objective identified through the Sustainability Appraisal is caused by the impact on a Local Wildlife Site and the Country Park. It is considered that the benefits of development on a brownfield site adjacent to the urban area outweigh the harm caused. Compensatory measures should be explored through the determination of the planning application.

7.104 The document also acknowledges that the site would have a major impact on a heritage asset, in that the development would result in the loss of a local interest building (non-designated), due to the construction of the Gedling Access Road in order to provide access to the site. Glebe Farm has potential for conversion for another use.

Q50. Is the proposed allocation deliverable? In particular, is it:

a. confirmed by the landowner involved as being available for the use proposed?

7.105 The site is already allocated in the 2005 Gedling Borough Replacement Local Plan for development. Keepmoat, as developer, has confirmed through their response to the 2016 SHLAA that the site is available for the use proposed with delivery from 2017/18. Full planning permission was granted (reference 2015/1376) for 506 homes and outline permission for subsequent phases. Signature of the S106 agreement is understood to be imminent.

b. supported by evidence to demonstrate that safe and appropriate access for vehicles and pedestrians can be provided?

7.106 The Site Selection Document Appendix A (**LPD/GRO/06**) confirms that, given the size of the site and requirement for the Gedling Access Road, access will be from new roundabouts proposed on Arnold Lane and Lambley Lane, and from the Gedling Access Road. A range of improvements to junctions/roads nearby are likely to be required.

7.107 The determination of the planning application has considered the need for safe and appropriate access for vehicles and pedestrians to be provided.

c. deliverable, having regard to the provision of the necessary infrastructure and services, and any environmental or other constraints?

- 7.108 The Site Selection Document Appendix A (**LPD/GRO/07**) and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan Addendum October 2016 (**LPD/GRO/15**) have considered infrastructure and have identified that the development of the site will need to be supported by a new primary school on site and the provision of the new Gedling Access Road.
- 7.109 Under the 2010 CIL regulations, local authorities must allocate at least 15% of CIL receipts to spend on infrastructure priorities that should be agreed with the local community in areas where development is taking place.
- 7.110 The Sustainability Appraisal of Site Allocations (**LPD/REG/19**) assessment acknowledges that the development of the site cannot take place without the GAR, which would result in the loss of local interest building Glebe Farm (non-designated heritage asset). The planning permission for the GAR (2014/0915) was granted subject to the condition that a historic building recording take place and submitted to the Nottinghamshire County Council Historic Environment Record. In addition, there is a Local Wildlife Site within part of the site and the appraisal recommends that proposals should be designed to avoid/mitigate impacts on biodiversity.
- 7.111 The Plan Wide Viability Study (**LPD/HOU/08**) showed that the Gedling Borough Local Planning Document Policies are broadly viable for all forms of housing development and demonstrate that Affordable Housing delivery at the Council's policy targets of 10-30% delivery proposed by the Plan are broadly viable allowing a degree of flexibility when based on typical site development. In terms of the Gedling Colliery/Chase Farm site, the assessment excluded the requirement for the GAR and the delivery of the site is reliant on a significant level of public funding.

Q51. Has the S106 Agreement been signed for the Gedling Colliery/Chase Farm planning permission (2015/1376)?

- 7.112 It is understood that the S106 agreement for the Gedling Colliery/Chase Farm site is to be signed imminently. The document has been agreed between all parties and is currently being circulated for signature.
- 7.113 The S106 agreement requires contributions towards infrastructure including affordable housing provision, air quality management, provision of a site for a primary school, a financial contribution towards primary school provision, a financial contribution towards health provision, a financial contribution towards library provision, the provision of on site open space, a financial contribution towards public transport provision, a financial contribution towards sustainable transport improvements and a financial contribution towards public transport 'taster tickets'.

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?

7.114 This question is raised in relation to Sites H3, H4 and H9. Please see response to question 13 above.

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?

7.115 Significant progress has been made in terms of delivering the Gedling Colliery Site. The project will deliver 1,050 dwellings in three major phases. The first phase (phase 1a) can deliver 315 dwellings prior to completion of the GAR and enabling works for phase 1a are expected to commence shortly. The GAR is due to be completed by 2020 and phase 1b, taking the number of homes up to 506, is expected to start on site in 2021 and to be completed by 2025. Phase 2 is planned to commence in 2025. The build out rate for phase 1a and 1b is around 65 per annum.

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?

7.116 The Housing Background Paper (**LPD/HOU/01**) explains the approach taken to the distribution of housing and the reason for allocating land at Hayden Lane on the edge of Hucknall (see paragraphs 4.2 and 4.3).

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?

7.117 The Housing Background Paper (**LPD/HOU/01**) explains the approach taken to the distribution of housing and the reason for allocating land at Hayden Lane on the edge of Hucknall (see paragraphs 4.2 and 4.3). The total number of dwellings allocated on land adjoining Hucknall is 35 dwellings less than that provided for by the Aligned Core Strategy.

7.118 Full consideration has been given to the development of this site in addition to the Top Wighay Farm and North of Papplewick Lane site through the preparation of the Site Selection Document Appendix A (**LPD/GRO/07**) and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan Addendum October 2016 (**LPD/GRO/15**), which have considered infrastructure and concluded that no significant infrastructure constraints have been identified. The Site Selection Document recognises at paragraph 3.13 that, as the site adjoins Ashfield District, careful consideration will need to be given to the impact on local infrastructure and the most appropriate way to use contributions.

Q56. Would the development of the site lead to the coalescence of Linby, Papplewick and Hucknall?

7.119 The site is located adjacent to the sub-regional centre of Hucknall and is currently designated as safeguarded land. As such its development would not involve the loss of Green Belt land and would not lead to the coalescence of Linby, Papplewick and Hucknall. The site lies to the west of the North of Papplewick Lane site which was allocated for development in the Aligned Core Strategy and the development of the Hayden Lane site would not extend development further east.

Q57. Is the proposed allocation justified and appropriate in terms of the likely impacts of development?

7.120 The LPD (**LPD/REG/02**) at paragraph 3.3 confirms the urban area sites identified in Policy LPD 64 have been allocated following a site selection process set out in the Site Selection Document Appendix A (**LPD/GRO/06**). It summarises the likely impact of the allocation against a range of factors. The assessment has not identified any significant impacts and considers that the Hayden Lane site is suitable for allocation.

Q58. Is the proposed allocation deliverable? In particular, is it:

a. confirmed by the landowner involved as being available for the use proposed?

7.121 The landowner has confirmed through the 2016 SHLAA that the site is available for the use proposed.

7.122 As for other housing allocations, two rounds of meetings have taken place with the landowner following consultation on the Local Planning Document Publication Draft. The purpose of the meetings has been to discuss any issues arising out the consultation exercise, consider the need for any further work to be undertaken and ensure that any issues are addressed at the earliest stage to allow a planning application to be submitted at the appropriate opportunity.

b. supported by evidence to demonstrate that safe and appropriate access for vehicles and pedestrians can be provided?

7.123 The site was assessed as part of the Sustainable Urban Extension Study (**LPD/GRO/16**) and the Aligned Core Strategy and the highways assessments indicates sufficient capacity in the network. The site can be satisfactorily accessed from Hayden Lane or Papplewick Lane.

c. deliverable, having regard to the provision of the necessary infrastructure and services, and any environmental or other constraints?

7.124 The Site Selection Document Appendix A (**LPD/GRO/07**) and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan Addendum October 2016 (**LPD/GRO/15**) have

considered infrastructure and no significant infrastructure constraints have been identified.

7.125 Under the 2010 CIL regulations, local authorities must allocate at least 15% of CIL receipts to spend on infrastructure priorities that should be agreed with the local community in areas where development is taking place.

7.126 The Sustainability Appraisal of Site Allocations (**LPD/REG/19**) assessment does not identify any significant environmental constraints.

7.127 The Plan Wide Viability Study (**LPD/HOU/08**) showed that the Gedling Borough Local Planning Document Policies are broadly viable for all forms of housing development and demonstrate that Affordable Housing delivery at the Council's policy targets of 10-30% delivery proposed by the Plan are broadly viable allowing a degree of flexibility when based on typical site development.

7.128 It is anticipated that planning permission for the development of this site would be subject to a S106 agreement requiring contributions towards infrastructure. It is relevant to note that the development of the adjoining site (North of Papplewick Lane) will deliver the following:

- £1,140,000 towards the provision of a 105 place primary school either within the site or within two miles of the centre of the development;
- Secondary school contribution – number of dwellings multiplied by 0.16 (NCC formula for generating likely pupil numbers) multiplied by cost per school place of £17,260;
- £800,000 towards offsite affordable housing;
- £144,000 towards primary health care;
- £45,000 towards integrated transport measures;
- £11,615 towards the provision of extra books at Hucknall Library;
- A travel plan and £7,000 towards the monitoring of the travel plan;
- A sum towards open space maintenance, to be determined in accordance with the Open Space Guidance

Q59. Has full consideration been given to the loss of greenfield land and agricultural land?

7.129 The Site Selection Document Appendix A (**LPD/GRO/07**) acknowledges that the site is agricultural land and 100% Greenfield land although the loss is not considered to be significant. However, this is balanced against the fact that the site is located adjoining the Hucknall Sub Regional Centre and is not located within the Green Belt; Policy 3.3 of the ACS requires consideration of non- Green Belt sites before Green Belt sites.

Q60. Would the density of the development proposed on this site be appropriate?

7.130 The capacity of the site is 120 homes to be provided on a site area of 4.80 hectares. This equates to a density of 27dph and has been reduced from

30dph as required by Policy LPD 33 in order to allow for the provision of SUDs and the possible extension of a school playing field located on the adjoining development site. It is therefore considered that the density of the proposed development is appropriate for this site.

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?

7.131 The Housing Background Paper (LPD/HOU/01) states at paragraph 4.2 that, as part of the preparation of the Top Wighay Farm Development Brief, it was identified that the 1,000 homes allocated for the site in the Aligned Core Strategy could not be satisfactorily achieved, but rather a figure of 845 is considered achievable. This is 155 fewer homes than anticipated. It is considered highly unlikely that this figure will increase given the densities that would need to be achieved for this to happen. However, if a planning application was submitted for a higher number of dwellings then this would be considered on its merits and the impact on Hucknall would be a significant factor that would be taken into account through the determination of the planning application. If the impact was found to be unacceptable then planning permission would be refused or the capacity of the site would be reduced to a level at which the impact on Hucknall would be acceptable.

Conclusion

7.132 In meeting the housing targets, the site selection process has considered sites within or adjoining the urban area, key settlements and other villages and the Council considers that there are exceptional circumstances required to remove certain sites from the Green Belt.

7.133 Sites have been subject to a sustainability appraisal and infrastructure needs considered as part of the work on an infrastructure delivery plan and no significant environmental or infrastructure constraints have been identified.

7.134 The site selection process has taking into account a wide range of factors and the impact of the proposed sites have been assessed and they are considered suitable for allocation. The sites have been promoted through the local planning process by landowners/developers who have confirmed availability, tested through the plan wide viability study work and are deliverable.

Further Proposed Changes

7.135 No further proposed changes are being put forward at this stage.