

Gedling Borough Council

Response to Matter 9

Housing Allocations in Other Villages

Issue 9a: Burton Joyce

Q1. Has sufficient land been allocated for housing in Burton Joyce to meet local needs? [Policy LPD 68]

9.1 The Housing Background Paper (**LPD/BACK/01**) explains how the housing figure for Burton Joyce has been provided for through Policy LPD63 and accords with the Aligned Core Strategy. Appendix A of the Housing Background Paper Addendum (**EX/22**) provides the housing supply for Burton Joyce and compares this to the proposed housing target for Burton Joyce 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. Could sufficient small scale development to meet local needs in Burton Joyce have been found from infill development and small sites in the settlement?

9.2 The Housing Background Paper Addendum (**EX/22**) provides an updated housing supply for Burton Joyce and identifies that the allocations at Mill Field Close and Orchard Close amounting to 38 homes are needed to meet the housing target of 55 in LPD63.

Q3. Is there sufficient provision of housing for young people and the elderly in Burton Joyce?

9.3 The assessment of Local Housing needs (**LPD/GRO/04**) identifies a lower proportion of 18 – 29 year olds and a higher proportion of older persons currently residing in the village. The assessment also finds that there is a degree of under occupation in the village and concludes that additional homes with two or three bedrooms would suit both first time buyers and older residents. The Site Selection Document Appendix E Burton Joyce (**LPD/REG/10**) has assessed the allocations at Orchard Close and Mill Field Close as being suitable to meet the identified housing need. The policy requirement is for 30% affordable homes to be provided. LPD37 Housing Type, Size and Tenure provides the policy means to provide for an appropriate mix of housing.

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

Q4. Is the proposed allocation justified and appropriate in terms of the likely impacts of development?

- 9.4 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 and the deliverability of the housing sites is demonstrated through the SHLAA and the housing trajectory. The Site Selection Document Main Report (**LPD/GRO/05**) and Appendix H (**LPD/GRO/10**) in relation to the housing sites provide the details. The assessment has not identified any significant impacts and considered the Mill Field Close site is suitable for allocation.
- 9.5 The Council has approved an outline planning application subject to a S106 agreement and the likely impacts of the proposal have been assessed and are considered to be acceptable (reference 2015/0424).

Q5. Is the proposed allocation deliverable? In particular, is it:

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

- 8.1 Appendix E of the Housing Background Paper Addendum (**EX/22**) confirms the details of the delivery of the site has been provided through the SHLAA 2016 update. The landowner has obtained planning approval subject to agreeing a section 106 agreement. Housing Background Paper Addendum Appendix E (**EX/22**) sets out the projected completions for the site starting in 2017/18 and be delivered by 2018/2019.

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

- 9.6 The site has approval for outline planning subject to a Section 106 agreement (reference 2015/0424) and the access arrangements are satisfactory to the County Highways. The Site Selection Document (**LPD/GRO/10**) notes that access to Mill Field Close would be acceptable for the scale of development proposed, subject to the existing footway being extended along the site frontage.

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

- 9.7 The Site Selection Document Appendix E – Burton Joyce (**LPD/GRO/10**) and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan Addendum October 2016 (**LPD/GRO/15**) has considered infrastructure and no significant infrastructure constraints have been identified.

- 9.8 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.
- 9.9 The Sustainability Appraisal of Site Allocations (LPD/REG/19) assessment does not identify any significant environmental constraints.
- 9.10 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 Mill Field Close site was assessed as viable in the 0-5 year period.
- 9.11 Outline planning permission (reference 2015/0424) has been granted for residential development (23 homes) on the site subject to a S106 agreement which has not yet been signed but is considered to be imminent. It is likely that the S106 agreement will require the provision of 30% affordable housing, 10% on site open space, a contribution toward open space maintenance and a contribution towards education provision.

Q6. Have these matters been addressed through the planning application process, given that the site benefits from planning permission, subject to the signing of a Section 106 Agreement?

- 9.12 Yes see above.

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

Q6. Is the proposed allocation justified and appropriate in terms of the likely impacts of development?

- 9.13 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 and the deliverability of the housing sites is demonstrated through the SHLAA and the housing trajectory. The Site Selection Document Main Report (**LPD/GRO/05**) and Appendix E (**LPD/GRO/10**) in relation to the housing sites provide the details. The assessment has not identified any significant impacts and considered the Orchard Close site is suitable for allocation.

Q7. Is the proposed allocation deliverable? In particular, is it:

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

- 9.14 The landowner has confirmed through their response to the 2016 SHLAA that the site is available for the use proposed. Appendix E of the Housing

Background Paper Addendum (**EX/22**) sets out the projected completions for the site.

- 9.15 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 of 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?

- 9.16 The transport assessment is summarised in the Site Selection Document Appendix E – Burton Joyce (**LPD/GRO/10**) and concludes that access to Orchard Close would be acceptable for the level of development proposed. County Highways have indicated that the necessary gradients required are possible with this smaller development.

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

- 9.17 The Site Selection Document Appendix E – Burton Joyce (**LPD/GRO/10**) and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan Addendum October 2016 (**LPD/GRO/15**) has considered infrastructure and no significant infrastructure constraints have been identified.
- 9.18 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.
- 9.19 The site allocations have been assessed as part of the Sustainability Appraisal which notes the need for good sustainable drainage systems. See Sustainability Appraisal Publication Draft Appendix H: Appraisal of Site Allocations for Housing and Employment (**LPD/REG/19**) for details.
- 9.20 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 Orchard Close site was assessed as viable in the 0-5 year period.
- 9.21 No environmental and other constraints have been identified through the Site Selection process, although the assessment notes that due to relatively steep slope the site would require good sustainable drainage systems. See site 6/537 in the Site Selection Document Appendix E – Burton Joyce (**LPD/GRO/10**).

Q8. Should this site be extended to enable the construction of around 65 homes on an enlarged site?

9.22 The Site Selection Document (**LPD/GRO/10**) has considered the wider site and concluded that only the smaller site should be allocated for development. The Council does not support an extension of H21 as County Highways has confirmed that in terms of access the larger site would not be acceptable. It is also noted that the site is on a relatively steep slope and will require good sustainable drainage systems to prevent flood risk elsewhere from surface water runoff.

Q9. Has full consideration been given to the impact of the development of housing on this site on agricultural land?

9.23 The Sustainability Appraisal of Site Allocations (**LPD/REG/19**) considered the likely impact of the proposal on agricultural land. The site scored minor negative because it would involve the loss of agricultural land grade 3. It is unknown whether the site comprises best and most versatile (BMV) land i.e. grade 3a. However, the amount of land lost is not significant being substantially below the 20ha threshold for notification to Natural England as a statutory consultee and is outweighed by the benefit of providing houses in accordance with the Aligned Core Strategy. The Sustainability Appraisal recommends an agricultural land classification survey should be required and the design of the development should seek “soft” uses for best and most versatile soils.

Q10. What are the exceptional circumstances which justify the removal of this site from the Green Belt?

9.24 The Council’s response to Matter 6 (question 6) sets out the exceptional circumstances justifying the removal of sites from the Green Belt. Paragraph 7.3 of the LPD (**LPD/REG/02**) confirms that the Orchard Close site has been allocated following a site selection process set out in the Site Selection Document (**LPD/GRO/10**) which considered sites both within and adjacent to Burton Joyce. The same paragraph indicates that for the Orchard Close site it is considered that there were exceptional circumstances required to amend the boundary of the Green Belt. The Site Selection Document summarises the likely impact of the allocation against a range of factors. The assessment has not identified any significant impacts and considers the Orchard Close site as suitable for allocation.

Q11. Has sufficient regard been had to flood risk?

9.25 The Sustainability Appraisal of Site Allocations (**LPD/REG/19**) considered the issue of flood risk. Site H21 does not fall within Flood Zones 2 and 3 and is on relatively steep sloping catchment. The site requires good sustainable drainage systems in place to ensure surface water runoff does not occur to neighbouring downstream properties.

- 9.26 The Report of Responses (**LPD/REG/04**) states that a site specific flood risk assessment should be prepared at the detailed planning stage focussing on surface water drainage together with a sustainable drainage strategy that will ensure that the development does not increase the risk of flooding elsewhere and if possible reduces water runoff rates.
- 9.27 The Site Selection Document (LPD/GRO/10) concludes that the development of the site will require good sustainable drainage systems to prevent flood risk elsewhere from surface water runoff.

Q12. Has full consideration been given to unstable land?

- 9.28 This issue was raised as part of the Inspector's initial questions. The Council has confirmed that the Coal Authority has been consulted and has raised no objections (**EX/08**). The report of Responses (**LPD/REG/04**) states that confirmation has been received from the British Geological Survey that there is no fault marked beneath the land at Orchard Close.

Issue 9d: Newstead

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

- 9.29 The Housing Background Paper (**LPD/BACK/01**) explains why the level of housing at the other villages has been reduced from that set out in the ACS as it had been assumed that the current Local Plan allocation at Newstead for 80 homes would be rolled forward. The response to question 14 below explains why there are issues with the access that means the site is not certain of delivery. Consequently no housing target is identified for Newstead. However, it is considered that development would assist in regeneration objectives and why an allocation is being pursued by the Council.

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

Q14. Is the proposed allocation justified and appropriate in terms of the likely impacts of development?

- 9.30 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 and the deliverability of the housing sites has been considered through the SHLAA and the housing trajectory. The Site Selection Document Main Report (**LPD/GRO/05**) and Appendix H (**LPD/GRO/13**) in relation to the housing sites provide the details. The assessment has not identified any significant impacts but considers that there are significant issues with achieving access meaning delivery is uncertain (see site selection document **LPD/GRO/13**). Whilst considered suitable for allocation delivery issues are identified.

Q15. Is the proposed allocation deliverable? In particular, is it:

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

9.31 Appendix E of the Housing Background Paper Addendum (**EX/22**) states that due to uncertainty as to whether the site will deliver 40 homes within the Plan period it has been assumed that the site will be delivered after Year 15.

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

9.32 The Site Selection Document Appendix H – Linby, Newstead, Papplewick and Stoke Bardolph (**LPD/GRO/13**) summarises that access would need to come from Tilford Road as Station Road is privately owned. Width and visibility are marginal and complicated by the nearby level crossing. There are significant issues with achieving access, meaning that delivery is uncertain

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

9.33 The Site Selection Document Appendix H – Linby, Newstead, Papplewick and Stoke Bardolph (**LPD/GRO/13**) and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan Addendum October 2016 (**LPD/GRO/15**) has considered infrastructure and apart from access issues no significant infrastructure constraints have been identified.

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

9.35 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.

Q14. Why do the homes allocated on this site not count towards achieving the OAN for the Borough as set out in Policy LPD 63? Should the site be allocated in the Local Plan?

9.36 The Housing Background Paper (**LPD/BACK/01**) explains that it had been assumed that the current Local Plan allocation at Newstead for 80 homes would be rolled forward following reassessment as part of the Site Selection process. However, there are delivery issues relating to access. Whilst the Council remains committed to help assist delivery of this site and its regeneration benefits it cannot be assumed to deliver within the Plan period.

Issue 9f: Woodborough

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

9.37 The Housing Background Paper (**LPD/BACK/01**) explains how the housing figure for Woodborough 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 Woodborough and compares this to the proposed housing target for Woodborough as set out in Policy LPD63. A similar question has been raised in the Inspector's Initial Questions (**EX/01**) which relates to the distribution of housing differs in the Plan 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 9g: Ash Grove (H23) and Broad Close (H24) [Policy LPD 70]

Q16. Are the proposed allocations justified and appropriate in terms of the likely impacts of development?

9.38 The housing allocations have been subject to a site selection process that has considered the likely impact of the allocations against a range of factors. The assessments have not identified any significant impacts (see Site Selection Document **LPD/GRO/12**). The deliverability of the housing sites is demonstrated through the SHLAA and the housing trajectory. Appendix E of the Housing Background Paper Addendum (**EX/22**) provides the list of housing allocations in Woodborough and includes the source of information on delivery.

Q17. Are the proposed allocations deliverable? In particular, are they:

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

9.39 The landowners of both sites have confirmed through their responses to the 2016 SHLAA that the sites are available for the use proposed and free from constraints. Appendix E of the Housing Background Paper Addendum (**EX/22**) sets out the projected completions for the sites starting in 2016/17 for the Ash Grove site (the plot is currently under construction) and 2017/18 for the Broad Close site.

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

9.40 The transport assessment is summarised in the Site Selection Document Appendix G – Woodborough (**LPD/GRO/12**). For site 6/196 (which makes up site allocation H23 Ash Grove), the highways comments state that the site has

planning permission and access requirements have been considered and deemed acceptable. For sites 6/776 and 6/840 (which makes up site allocation H24 Broad Close), the highways comments state satisfactory access to the site can be achieved from Broad Close. Appendix 3 of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and Addendum (**LPD/GRO/15**) duplicates the information.

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

- 9.41 The Site Selection Document Appendix G – Woodborough (**LPD/GRO/12**) and Appendix 3 of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and Addendum (**LPD/GRO/15**) have considered infrastructure and conclude that no significant infrastructure constraints have been identified.
- 9.42 Contributions to the provision of infrastructure will be achieved through the granting of planning permissions subject to a S106 agreement. The S106 agreement for the Ash Grove site (H23) includes contributions toward infrastructure totalling nearly £26,000 including:
- £10,176 towards the provision of off site open space; and
 - £15,822 maintenance contribution toward open space.
- 9.43 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.
- 9.44 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. No significant environmental constraints have been identified.
- 9.45 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 Broad Close site was assessed as viable for the 0-5 year period and the Ash Grove site was assessed as viable for both the 0-5 and 6-10 year periods.

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

- 9.46 Yes, it is considered that these matters have been addressed through the planning application process. Plot 1 on the Ash Grove site was granted permission (2016/0888) in November 2016.

Conclusion

- 9.47 The Council has explained in the Housing Background Paper (**LPD/BACK/01**) how the housing figures for the other villages have been provided for and accord with the Aligned Core Strategy. See also the Council's response to initial questions (**EX/08**) pages 8-11.
- 9.48 In meeting the housing requirement, 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.
- 9.49 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 environment or infrastructure constraints have been identified.
- 9.50 The site selection process has taken into account a wide range of factors and the impacts 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

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