

Gedling Borough Council

Response to Matter 8

Housing Allocations in Key Settlements for Growth

Issue 8a: Bestwood Village

Q1. Does the amount of housing proposed in Bestwood Village accord with the ACS? [Policy LPD 65]

8.1 The Housing Background Paper (**LPD/BACK/01**) explains how the housing figure for Bestwood Village has been provided for through Policy LPD63 and how it accords with the Aligned Core Strategy. Appendix A of the Housing Background Paper Addendum (**EX/22**) provides the housing supply for Bestwood Village and compares this to the proposed housing target for Bestwood Village as set out in Policy LPD63. A similar question has been raised in the Inspector's Initial Questions (**EX/01**) which relates to how the distribution of housing in the Plan differs to that set out in the ACS and whether this accords with the Spatial Strategy of the ACS – see paragraph 22 on page 4. The Council's response is provided in the Council response to initial questions (**EX/08**) – see pages 8-11.

Q2. Has full consideration been given to local services and facilities, drainage, flooding and highway safety in establishing the level of housing provision proposed in Bestwood Village?

8.2 The Site Selection Document (**LPD/GRO/07**) sets out how the sites were assessed against a range of factors as part of the site selection process. This includes consideration of the impact on local services and infrastructure and any infrastructure requirements. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan and Addendum (**LPD/GRO/15**) provides details of the likely requirements for each site and also for combinations of sites where relevant. The assessment has not identified any significant infrastructure constraints.

8.3 In combination, the three sites will require additional school places and the County Education Authority have indicated that the existing primary school is at capacity and cannot be extended. New primary school provision is required and currently options for the location of the primary school are being considered. The planning consent (reference 2014/0214) for Bestwood Business Park includes a S106 agreement which includes a contribution of £763,000 towards primary education. One option is to locate new primary school provision on the Westhouse Farm allocation. The Council has resolved to permit 101 homes subject to the signing of Section 106 Agreement on part of the Westhouse Farm Allocation (reference 2014/0238). An outline planning application (reference 2014/1343) for a new primary

school on 1.1 hectares on this same site has been submitted but not yet determined as the County Education Authority are presently assessing options.

- 8.4 The Infrastructure Delivery Plan and Addendum (**LPD/GRO/15**) also identifies a need for contributions towards primary health care estimated at around £227,000 as the Nottingham North and East Clinical Commissioning Group has indicated there is likely to be extra capacity needed at health centres in Hucknall and also the Bestwood part of Nottingham City.
- 8.5 The Greater Nottingham Flood Risk Assessment (**LPD/FLO/01**) indicates that Bestwood Village is not in a flood risk area being on higher ground than the River Leen which is close by. The Sustainability Appraisal of Site Allocations (**LPD/REG/19**) considered whether flood risk was an issue for the individual housing site allocations.
- 8.6 The housing sites do not fall within Flood Zones 2 and 3. The surface water flood risk map indicates there is a very small area of high risk surface water flooding issue to the south of site H11 and there is a considerable amount of surface water flooding on site H13. Comments received from Environment Agency state that sites H12 and H13 require a site specific flood risk assessment to focus on sustainable surface water drainage. The planning permission for H13 confirms that the sustainable drainage system will be designed to the standards set by the Environment Agency.
- 8.7 In terms of highway safety, Bestwood Village is served by the B643 Moor Road which is of sufficient width to provide satisfactory access with a 30 mph limit in force through the built up part of the Village. Traffic calming in the form of a series of speed humps are present along Moor Road as it passes through the Village. Access and highways issues have been considered at the planning application stage for both Bestwood Business Park (reference 2014/0214) and the Sycamores (reference 2007/0887) and found to be satisfactory. Westhouse Farm can be satisfactorily accessed from Moor Road and the transport assessment states that a new pavement would need to be provided along the site's frontage with Moor Road.
- 8.8 The impact of housing development in this location have also been considered through the Masterplanning work for Bestwood undertaken in June 2015 (**LPD/GRO/01**).
- 8.9 Contributions to the provision of infrastructure has been achieved through the granting of planning permissions subject to a S106 agreement. The S106 agreement for the Sycamores, site H11, requires contributions towards integrated transport, education and open space. Details of the S106 agreements for sites H12 and H13 are provided under questions 4(c) and 8(c) below.

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

Q3. Is the proposed allocation justified and appropriate in terms of the likely impacts of development?

8.10 The Site Selection Document Appendix B – Bestwood Village (**LPD/GRO/07**) summarises the likely impact of the allocation against a range of factors. The assessment has not identified any significant impacts and considers the Westhouse Farm site is suitable for allocation. The masterplanning work (**LPD/GRO/01**) recommends that development should be to the north of Bestwood Village adding that this was the preferred option of most residents.

Q4. Is the proposed allocation deliverable? In particular, is it:

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

8.11 Langridge Homes has confirmed through their response to the 2016 SHLAA that the site is available for the use proposed. Housing Background Paper Addendum Appendix E (**EX/22**) sets out the projected completions for the site starting in 2018/19 and delivered by 2022/2023. The Council has resolved to permit 101 homes on part of the site subject to the signing of a section 106 Agreement (planning application reference 2014/0238).

8.12 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?

8.13 The transport assessment is summarised in the Site Selection Document Appendix B – Bestwood Village (**LPD/GRO/07**) and concludes that satisfactory access can be provided from two points on Moor Road and a footway would be required along the Moor Road frontage. No objections have been raised by County Highways to the proposed access arrangements. A single point of access to Moor Road has been considered satisfactory for the 101 homes the Council has resolved to permit on part of the site allocation (planning application reference 2014/0238) and a second point will be required in order to permit the remainder of the allocation.

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

8.14 The Site Selection Document Appendix B – Bestwood Village (**LPD/GRO/07**) and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and Addendum (**LPD/GRO/15**) has considered infrastructure and no significant infrastructure constraints have been identified. In combination with the other sites additional primary places

will be required and a new primary school provision in the area is identified in **LPD/GRO/15**.

- 8.15 The Sustainability Appraisal of Site Allocations (**LPD/REG/19**) assessment does not identify any significant environmental constraints.
- 8.16 The Plan Wide Viability Study (**LPD/HOU/08**) shows 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. The Westhouse Farm site was assessed as viable in both the 0-5 and 6-10 year periods.
- 8.17 Planning permission has been granted for residential development (101 homes) subject to a S106 agreement which has not yet been signed, but which is likely to require contributions towards infrastructure including affordable housing, open space and education.

Q5. Would the provision of a new primary school on this site lead to a reduction in the number of dwellings provided?

- 8.18 The housing density for the whole allocation equates to 21 dwellings per hectare to allow for the provision of a primary school on the site, see Matter 5 Statement. The provision of a new primary school on this site would therefore not lead to a reduction in the number of dwellings provided.

Q6. Would the development of this site for housing be viable?

- 8.19 The site has been subject to viability testing as part of the Plan Wide Viability testing (**LPD/HOU/08**) which assesses the site as being viable in both the 0 – 5 year and 6-10 year delivery phases.
- 8.20 The developer has applied for planning permission for a new primary school on the site and the supporting information with the planning application refers to entering into an agreement to make a contribution based on the likely number of pupils arising from the development of this site.

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

Q7. Is the proposed allocation justified and appropriate in terms of the likely impacts of development?

- 8.21 The Site Selection Document Appendix B – Bestwood Village (**LPD/GRO/07**) summarises the likely impact of the allocation against a range of factors. The assessment has not identified any significant impacts and considered the Bestwood Business Park is suitable for allocation. The masterplanning work (**LPD/GRO/01**) noted that there was a strong preference from those attending

a workshop in the village that as many of the new houses as possible should be built on this site rather than on Green Belt land.

- 8.22 The site has planning permission and the likely impacts of the proposal have been assessed and are considered to be acceptable (planning application reference 2014/0214).

Q8. Is the proposed allocation deliverable? In particular, is it:

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

- 8.23 The landowner has confirmed through their response to the 2016 SHLAA that the site is available for the use proposed. Housing Background Paper Addendum Appendix E (**EX/22**) sets out the projected completions for the site starting in 2017/18 and delivered by 2022/2023. The landowner has secured planning permission for development.

- 8.24 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?

- 8.25 The site has planning permission (planning application reference 2014/0214) and the access arrangements are satisfactory to the County Highways.

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

- 8.26 The planning permission is subject to a S106 agreement which requires contributions towards infrastructure totalling over £2.6 m including:
- £852,190 towards off site affordable housing contribution;
 - £763,000 towards primary education;
 - £604,100 towards secondary education;
 - £152,396 maintenance contribution towards open space;
 - £105,600 primary health care;
 - £50,500 public transport contribution;
 - £45,000 pedestrian link;
 - £15,000 pedestrian crossing; and
 - £15,000 country park pedestrian link.

Q9. Has sufficient regard been had to ground contamination on the site? How would any problems be addressed?

8.27 Infrastructure Delivery Plan and Addendum (**LPD/GRO/15**) indicates that there may be a risk of contamination from previous employment uses and a phase 1 walk over ground survey is required. The phase 1 Geo-environmental study has been carried out as part of the supporting information for the planning application (reference 2014/0214). The report notes there is a risk of contamination given previous industrial uses on the site and recommends further ground investigations be carried out. The permission is conditional with condition 3 requiring before each phase a ground condition survey to be carried out and if necessary a remediation scheme in mitigation to be approved by the Council.

Q10. Would the density of development proposed on this site be appropriate?

8.28 Matter 5 explains the site density calculations for all site allocations. The site has planning permission (reference 2014/0214) and the proposed density was considered acceptable in planning terms.

Q11. Have these matters been addressed through the planning application process, given that the site now benefits from planning permission?

8.29 Yes, see above responses.

Q12. Would the dwellings allocated on this site come forward for development during the Plan period? What evidence is there to support this?

8.30 Housing Background Paper Addendum Appendix E (**EX/22**) sets out the projected completions for the site starting in 2017/18 and delivered by 2022/2023. This has been confirmed through the landowners response to the 2016 SHLAA.

Issue 8d: Calverton

Q13. Does the amount of housing allocated in Calverton accord with the ACS? [Policy LPD 66]

8.31 The Housing Background Paper (**LPD/BACK/01**) explains how the housing figure for Calverton has been provided for through Policy LPD63 and how it accords with the Aligned Core Strategy. Appendix A of the Housing Background Paper Addendum (**EX/22**) provides the housing supply for Calverton and compares this to the proposed housing target for Calverton as set out in Policy LPD63. A similar question has been raised in the Inspector's Initial Questions (**EX/01**) which relates how the distribution of housing in the Plan differs to that set out in the ACS and whether this accords with the Spatial Strategy of the ACS – see paragraph 22 on page 4. The Council's response is provided in the Council response to initial questions (**EX/08**) – see pages 8-11.

Q14. Is there a need to provide additional homes in Calverton? Are sufficient sites allocated for housing in the settlement?

- 8.32 The ACS identifies Calverton as key settlement for growth. The Housing Background Paper Addendum Appendix A (**EX/22**) sets out the updated housing supply position which together with the allocations gives a total housing supply of 759 against the target of 740.
- 8.33 Sufficient sites are allocated to meet the housing target at Dark Lane, Main Street, and Park Road with the former having obtained planning permission and construction of the site access road has commenced. The Report of Responses (**LPD/REG/04**) makes clear the Council's preference to provide a range of sites rather than rely on a single large allocation.

Q15. Why has Calverton received the largest reduction from the figures in the ACS despite it being identified as the most sustainable of the Key Settlements?

- 8.34 The Council's response to the Inspector's initial questions explains why the housing target for Calverton was reduced to 740 homes (see response to question 23 in the Council Response to Initial Questions **EX/08**). Details of how the reduction was calculated are set out in paragraph 4.10 of the Housing Background Paper (**LPD/BACK/01**).

Q16. Has sufficient assessment of the impact of the proposed development sites on the three Scheduled Ancient Monuments in Calverton been carried out?

- 8.35 Trigpoint has been commissioned to carry out a heritage assessment of the potential impact of proposed development sites on Scheduled Ancient Monuments (**EX/43**). The report concludes that development of the Main Street site will not harm the setting or overall significance of the Scheduled Ancient Monument at Cockpit Hill.
- 8.36 For the Park Road site, paragraph 7.22 of the Trigpoint report finds that there are no direct visual associations between site H16 and the Roman Camps Scheduled Monument and therefore the development of this site will not encroach into the open rural setting that this Monument currently enjoys. It is therefore considered that the development of site H16 will not harm the setting or overall significance of the Scheduled Monument at Whinbush Lane.
- 8.37 However, the report also considers the 'reasonable alternative sites', including sites to the north and south of Calverton. In terms of sites to the north, paragraphs 8.6 and 8.7 of the report conclude that site 6/37 could be developed without harming the Roman Camps Scheduled Monument at Whinbush Lane, but that development of the remaining safeguarded land would significantly reduce the present open and rural edge of Calverton and encroach upon the more remote rural setting of the Scheduled Monument, having a moderate to high impact on the Monument's setting that would be difficult to mitigate against.

- 8.38 In terms of the sites to the south, paragraph 8.10 of the report concludes that the extension of built development may have a low level of impact on the rural setting of the Scheduled Monument at Cockpit Hill, although this could be mitigated by suitable landscaping on the southern boundary of the development sites.
- 8.39 The impact of the proposed development at Dark Lane has been assessed through the planning application (2012/1503).

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

- 8.40 The proposed housing allocations in Calverton have been set out in Policy LPD 66, and proposed Safeguarded Land set out in Policy LPD 16. These sites have been selected through the site selection process set out in the Site Selection Document Appendix C – Calverton (**LPD/GRO/08**). The Calverton Neighbourhood plan must align with the strategic policies set out in the development plan currently in force, which at this time comprises the ACS and the 2005 Gedling Borough Replacement Local Plan (**EX/16**). Having established that there is no requirement for the LPD to conform to the emerging Neighbourhood Plan, it should be noted that the Neighbourhood Plan is less advanced than the LPD in its preparation being currently published for consultation and it can only be given very limited weight in the determination of planning applications (in accordance with paragraph 216 of Annex 1 to the NPPF).
- 8.41 The Council considers therefore that in the context of the examination of the Local Planning Document, little regard should be given to the content of the Neighbourhood Plan, particularly when bearing in mind that whilst the Neighbourhood Plan will not be tested against the policies in the LPD, paragraph 13 of the Planning Practice Guidance states that the reasoning and evidence informing the LPD process will be relevant to the consideration of the basic conditions against which the Neighbourhood Plan will be tested when it is examined. If the Neighbourhood Plan does not meet the basic conditions, it will not be made.
- 8.42 **LPD/GRO/08** demonstrates that overall the site performs well against the factors considered and no major negatives were identified in the Sustainability Appraisal Appendix H Appraisal of Site Allocations (**LPD/REG/19**).
- 8.43 As set out in question 14, the Council's preference is to provide a range of sites rather than rely on a single large allocation. It is also the case that relatively few objections were made about Main Street (site H15) which is located on the south western edge of the settlement of Calverton effectively rounding it off. The Landscape and Visual Analysis Assessment (**LPD/NAT/01**) states that overall it is felt that the development (site H15) would extend the settlement in an appropriate direction and consolidate the existing staggered settlement edge. Overall it is felt that the study area has low landscape sensitivity to development on the site.

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

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

- 8.44 The Site Selection Document Appendix C – Calverton (**LPD/GRO/08**) summarises the likely impact of the allocation against a range of factors. The assessment has not identified any significant impacts and considers the Main Street site is suitable for allocation.

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

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

- 8.45 The developer has confirmed through their response to the 2016 SHLAA that the site is available for the use proposed. Housing Background Paper Addendum Appendix E (**EX/22**) sets out the projected completions for the site starting in 2018/19 and delivered by 2020/2021.
- 8.46 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?

- 8.47 The transport assessment is summarised in the Site Selection Document Appendix C – Calverton (**LPD/GRO/08**) and concludes that access from Main Street is likely to be suitable subject to a change in the speed limit of the road at this point.

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

- 8.48 The Site Selection Document Appendix C – Calverton (**LPD/GRO/08**) and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and Addendum (**LPD/GRO/15**) has considered infrastructure and no significant infrastructure constraints have been identified.
- 8.49 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.

- 8.50 The Sustainability Appraisal of Site Allocations (**LPD/REG/19**) assessment does not identify any significant environmental constraints.
- 8.51 The Plan Wide Viability Study (**LPD/HOU/08**) shows 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. The Main Street site was assessed as viable in both the 0-5 and 6-10 year periods.

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

- 8.52 The Council does not support an extension of H15 to the south as the site allocation has clear defensible boundaries whereas the area proposed for extension is not considered to have a defensible boundary, see Report of Responses (**LPD/REG/04**).

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

- 8.53 See response to question 17 above.

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

- 8.54 The Council's response to Matter 6 (question 6) sets out the exceptional circumstances justifying the removal of sites from the Green Belt. The LPD (**LPD/REG/02**) at paragraph 5.3 states that the sites identified in LPD Policy 66 have been allocated following a site selection process set out in the Site Selection Document Appendix C – Calverton (**LPD/GRO/08**). This process considers sites both within and adjoining Calverton. The same paragraph indicates that for Main Street and Park Road it is considered that there were exceptional circumstances required to amend the boundary of the Green Belt. The Site Selection Document (**LPD/GRO/08**) summarises the likely impact of the allocation against a range of factors. The assessment has not identified any significant impacts and considers the Main Street site as suitable for allocation.

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

- 8.55 Langridge Homes, as landowner, has confirmed through their response to the 2016 SHLAA that the site is available for the use proposed. Housing Background Paper Addendum Appendix E (**EX/22**) sets out the projected completions for the site starting in 2017/18 and delivered by 2022/2023.

8.56 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.

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

8.57 The Site Selection Document Appendix C – Calverton (**LPD/GRO/08**) refers to issues raised during consultation as one of the factors to be considered. It was noted that development to the south west of Calverton was generally opposed although the number of objections received at the publication stage was quite low (9 responses). This compares to 25 responses received in relation to the Main Street site, plus two petitions containing 25 and 75 signatures.

8.58 **LPD/GRO/08** demonstrates that overall the site performs well against the factors considered and no major negatives were identified in the Sustainability Appraisal Appendix H Appraisal of Site Allocations (**LPD/REG/19**).

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

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

8.59 The housing allocation has been subject to a site selection process that has considered the likely impact of the allocation against a range of factors. The assessment has not identified any significant impacts (see site selection document **LPD/GRO/08**). The masterplanning work (**LPD/GRO/02**) recommended that the north west of the settlement was the most sustainable location and was preferred by local residents.

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

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

8.60 Persimmon Homes has confirmed through their response to the 2016 SHLAA that the site is available for the use proposed and free from constraints. Housing Background Paper Addendum Appendix E (**EX/22**) sets out the projected completions for the site starting in 2017/18 and delivered by 2025/2026.

8.61 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. Persimmon Homes has also entered into pre-application discussions with the Council.

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

8.62 The transport assessment is summarised in the Site Selection Document Appendix C – Calverton (**LPD/GRO/08**) and concludes that access from Oxtan Road is likely to be suitable although a signalised junction may be appropriate. Access can also be achieved from points along Park Road and County Highways confirm that the principle of access can be achieved at this site.

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

8.63 The Site Selection Document Appendix C – Calverton (**LPD/GRO/08**) and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and Addendum (**LPD/GRO/15**) has considered infrastructure and no significant infrastructure constraints have been identified.

8.64 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.

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

8.66 The Plan Wide Viability Study (**LPD/HOU/08**) shows 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. The Park Road site was assessed as viable for all of the 0-5, 6-10 and 10-15 year periods.

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

8.67 This issue was raised as part of the Inspector's initial questions. The Council response to question 40 (**EX/08**) confirms that the Coal Authority has been consulted and has raised no objections.

Q28. Would the scale of development be appropriate?

- 8.68 The site allocation comprises three sites (SHLAA references 6/47, 6/662 and 6/665) which have been assessed through the Site Selection Document Appendix C – Calverton (**LPD/GRO/08**). The three sites have been considered suitable for allocation subject to restricting development to the southern portion of sites 6/665 and 6/47 so that the land to the north remains open. The Matter 5 statement provides information on density indicating that the density is based on LPD Policy 33 which requires 25 homes per hectare in this location and adjusted to take into account information provided through the 2016 SHLAA. The density is estimated at 27 homes per hectare which is considered appropriate. Large sites can also lead to a more comprehensive and phased approach to infrastructure planning due to scale and the ability to control delivery on a single large site.
- 8.69 As set out in questions 14 and 17 above, the Council's preference is to provide a range of sites rather than rely on a single large allocation and the Council would not support the extension of this site to the north (see response to question 30 below).

Q29. Would this site deliver the allocated number of homes during the Plan period, particularly given the multiple landowners involved?

- 8.70 Persimmon Homes, who act for two of the three landowners covering the majority of the allocated site, has confirmed the site is available and free from constraints and has entered into pre-application discussions with the Council. Housing Background Paper Addendum Appendix E (**EX/22**) sets out the projected completions for the site starting in 2017/18 and be delivered by 2025/2026.

Q30. Should this site be extended to the north to include around 650 homes, in preference to the development to the south of Main Street (H15)?

- 8.71 As stated in the Report of Responses (**LPD/REG/04**), the Council does not agree that the site should be extended to the north as this area is recommended as a green buffer in the Landscape and Visual Analysis of Potential Development Sites (**LPD/NAT/01**).
- 8.72 Work done more recently by Trigpoint dated February 2017 (**EX/43**) advises that further incursion into the land to the north of Park Road is likely to adversely impact on the Scheduled Ancient Monument at Whinbush Lane. See response to Q7 above.
- 8.73 The Habitats Regulations Assessment (**LPD/REG/21**) has assessed the housing allocations for possible impact on the prospective Special Protection Area (SPA) and considers that there are no significant effects. It also notes that the numbers of homes to be provided in more sensitive areas have been reduced from those included in the ACS. However, for Park Road, Calverton mitigation measures will still be required including green infrastructure and visitor management which should help avoid the likelihood of a significant effect on the prospective SPA. On this basis, there is a concern that developing right up to the line of the Oxtun Road could result in greater

impacts on the prospective Special Protection Area as a result of visitor pressure including dog walking and presence of domestic pets.

- 8.74 The Report of Responses (**LPD/REG/04**) considers this question and considers that there may be an additional area of land to the immediate north of H16 that may be suitable for residential development. This could provide an additional 29 homes (based on a density of 25 dph) and would not therefore fully compensate for the proposed deletion of site H15. This land is currently identified as safeguarded land and would need to be allocated for development through the preparation of a development plan document. In considering the extent of land that is considered suitable for development, careful consideration would need to be given to the landscape and visual impact of development and the impact on the Scheduled Monument at Whinsall Lane in accordance with the conclusions of the Trigpoint Report (**EX/43**), which was not available at the time of writing of the Report of Responses.
- 8.75 As set out in questions 14, 17 and 28 above, the Council's preference is to provide a range of sites rather than rely on a single large allocation and the Council would not support the extension of this site to the north.

Q31. Are there any constraints to the development of this site?

- 8.76 The Site Selection Document Appendix C – Calverton (**LPD/GRO/08**) considers the three separate sites (6/47, 6/662 and 6/665) which have been combined to form this allocation and considers them suitable for allocation subject to restricting development to the southern portion of sites 6/665 and 6/47 so that the land to the north remains open (see also response to question 30 above). The Infrastructure Delivery Plan and Addendum (**LPD/GRO/15**) has not identified any significant constraints that would prevent the site coming forward. See also the response to Q30 above.
- 8.77 The Sustainability Appraisal of Site Allocations (**LPD/REG/19**) assessment does not identify any significant environmental constraints.
- 8.78 The Plan Wide Viability Study (**LPD/HOU/08**) shows 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. The Park Road site was assessed as viable for all the 0-5, 6-10 and 11 – 15 year periods.

Q32. The Housing Implementation Strategy [LPD/HOU/01] indicates that the Council will invite the developer/owner of this site to participate in a partnership approach to facilitate partnership working to help deliver this site. Why is this necessary? What is the timetable for this work?

- 8.79 The Housing Implementation Strategy indicates actions that would be necessary if there were considered a risk to delivery. The developer of this

site is currently involved in pre-application discussions with the Council and has carried out initial work and stated that they could be in a position to submit a planning application on 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 8g: Ravenshead

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

8.80 The Housing Background Paper (**LPD/BACK/01**) explains how the housing figure for Ravenshead has been provided for Policy LPD63 and accords with the Aligned Core Strategy. Appendix A of the Housing Background Paper Addendum (**EX/22**) provides the housing supply for Ravenshead and compares this to the proposed housing target for Ravenshead as set out in Policy LPD63. A similar question has been raised in the Inspector's Initial Questions (**EX/01**) which relates to how the distribution of housing in the Plan differs to that set out in the ACS and whether this accords with the Spatial Strategy of the ACS – see paragraph 22 on page 4. The Council's response is provided in the Council response to initial questions (**EX/08**) – see pages 8-11.

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

Q33. Is the proposed allocation justified and appropriate in terms of the likely impacts of development?

8.81 The Site Selection Document Appendix D – Ravenshead (**LPD/GRO/09**) summarises the likely impact of the allocations against a range of factors. The assessment has not identified any significant impacts and considers the three sites are suitable for allocation. The masterplanning work (**LPD/GRO/03**) recommends that development should be to the south of Ravenshead adding that this was the preferred option of most residents. Appendix E of the Housing Background Paper Addendum (**EX/22**) provides the list of housing allocations in Ravenshead and includes the source of information on delivery.

Q34. Is the proposed allocation deliverable? In particular, is it:

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

8.82 The landowners/developers of the three sites have confirmed through their responses to the 2016 SHLAA that the sites are available for the use proposed. Housing Background Paper Addendum Appendix E (**EX/22**) sets

out the projected completions for the site starting in 2018/19 and delivered by 2022/2023.

- 8.83 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. The Council has granted planning permission (2013/0836) for Longdale Lane C and a planning application has been submitted but not yet determined for Longdale Lane B.

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

- 8.84 The transport assessment is summarised in the Site Selection Document Appendix D – Ravenshead (**LPD/GRO/09**). For site 6/39 (which makes up the three allocation sites), the highways comments state that satisfactory access can be achieved to the site from Longdale Lane and a footway would be required along the frontage of the site. Appendix 3 of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and Addendum (**LPD/GRO/15**) reiterates this information.

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

- 8.85 Appendix 3 of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and Addendum (**LPD/GRO/15**) provides the infrastructure requirements for the three site allocations.
- 8.86 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. Sites H17 and H18 would both be CIL liable.
- 8.87 No environmental or other constraints have been identified through the Site Selection process, with the exception of the southern part of the site 6/39 which has significant constraints in the form of a Local Wildlife Site and woodland Tree Preservation Order. See site 6/39 in the Site Selection Document Appendix D – Ravenshead (**LPD/GRO/09**).
- 8.88 The site allocations have been assessed as part of the Sustainability Appraisal. See Sustainability Appraisal Publication Draft Appendix H: Appraisal of Site Allocations for Housing and Employment (**LPD/REG/19**) for details.
- 8.89 Outline planning permission for Longdale Lane C has been granted subject to a S106 agreement which requires contributions towards infrastructure. The precise figures will be confirmed at the reserved matters stage, but the contributions will cover the provision of on site open space or an off site contribution in lieu of provision on site, a contribution to education provision

and £128,000 off site highway contribution. The requirement for an affordable housing contribution has been removed following a recent appeal decision.

Q35. Has full consideration been given to the cumulative impact of this development and past infilling in the settlement?

- 8.90 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**). However the assessment does take account of the existing built form and has therefore given full consideration to both cumulative impact and past infilling in the settlement.
- 8.91 Paragraph 1.2 of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and Addendum (**LPD/GRO/15**) states that the document provides the infrastructure requirements of the reasonable alternative development sites identified in the Site Selection Document and also considers the infrastructure needs arising from cumulative impacts from particular combinations of allocated sites. The document is a living document which has been updated since the Aligned Core Strategy ACS in order to reflect current impacts. As such, full consideration has been given to the cumulative impact of housing allocations, including those in Ravenshead, and recent development such as past infilling to identify key impacts on infrastructure and services. The emerging LPD policies on residential design and residential gardens were drafted to ensure that future decisions reflect and do not harm the local characteristics of the area.

Q36. Has full consideration been given to the impact of this development on the nature conservation, open space and local services and facilities?

- 8.92 The site allocations have been assessed as part of the Site Selection process and the Sustainability Appraisal. See site 6/39 in the Site Selection Document Appendix D – Ravenshead (**LPD/GRO/09**) and Sustainability Appraisal Publication Draft Appendix H: Appraisal of Site Allocations for Housing and Employment (**LPD/REG/19**) for details which include:-
- Nature conservation - development on the sites would involve the loss of natural and semi-natural land. Further ecological appraisal required to assess the value of site. Sites H18 and H19 are adjacent to a Local Wildlife Site and Tree Preservation Orders. Any direct or indirect effects on the Local Wildlife Site and Tree Preservation Orders would need to be fully mitigated.
 - Open space - none of the sites contain open space. Site H17 is adjacent to an area of open space. Developer contribution could be used to enhance area of open space to increase biodiversity and allow opportunities for recreation.
 - Local services and facilities - the number of anticipated additional patients is small so the new housing sites should not have a great impact on the existing practices. The housing sites are within 400 m of a leisure centre which is located on the edge of the village. The sites are within 800 m of

community facilities – a post office, a village hall, a library and a primary school – within the village.

8.93 Appendix 3 of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and Addendum (**LPD/GRO/15**) provides infrastructure requirements arising from the housing sites.

Q37. Would the homes on these allocated sites be developed during the Plan period? What evidence is there to support this?

8.94 Appendix E of the Housing Background Paper Addendum (**EX/22**) confirms the details of the delivery of the three sites have been provided through the SHLAA 2016 update.

Q38. Are there any constraints to the development of these sites?

8.95 Sites H18 and H19 are adjacent to a Local Wildlife Site and Tree Preservation Orders. It is considered that there are no other constraints to the development of the sites. The biodiversity impacts on the Local Wildlife Site and Tree Preservation Orders are covered by Policy LPD18: Protecting and Enhancing Biodiversity in the Local Planning Document.

Conclusion

8.96 The Council considers that the numbers proposed for the key settlements which were expressed as “up to” figures in the ACS are justified. 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.

8.97 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.

8.98 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

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