1.0 Number of Homes

1.1 Policy 2 of the Aligned Core Strategy (ACS) sets out that approximately 4045 new homes will be provided in or adjacent to the urban area. This figure was based on the evidence at the time the ACS was drafted and should be seen as a minimum. As the urban area is the most sustainable location in Gedling Borough this figure should be increased if it is possible.

1.2 This means that decisions about the sites to be allocated in or adjacent to the urban area are not restricted by an upper number and sites are not in direct competition with one another. Whether a site is to be recommended for allocation is restricted by site specific circumstances and by the cumulative impact of development in the wider area. Site specific circumstances could include the need for other forms of development such as employment or open space or the site not being considered suitable for development. The cumulative impact on environmental factors (e.g. flooding and landscape/visual impact) and local infrastructure (e.g. schools, health facilities and roads) may mean that not all the sites which are considered to be appropriate for development can be allocated in the Local Planning Document. Cumulative impact will be assessed through the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).

1.3 The scale of development anticipated in the ACS and, therefore any higher figure, cannot be accommodated without Green Belt release. There are a number of non-Green Belt sites in the urban area which will be allocated where possible. In order to amend Green Belt boundaries there need to be ‘exceptional circumstances’; in considering this account will be taken of the nature and extent of the harm to the Green Belt from releasing sites.

1.4 Table 1 below sets out the situation regarding housing numbers for the urban area. The information for this has been taken from the Housing Background Paper.

1.5 Consideration is also given in this appendix to an additional development adjacent to Hucknall. Hucknall is a sub-regional centre within Ashfield District Councils area. Land adjacent to Hucknall was allocated by the Aligned Core Strategy for a total of 1300 homes (1000 at Top Wighay Farm and 300 at North of Papplewick Lane) and 8.5ha of employment land. The number of homes around Hucknall was limited to 1300 due to the impacts on infrastructure within Hucknall.

1.6 The preparation of the Development Brief has indicated that only 845 homes can be provided on the Top Wighay Farm site. This is 155 homes lower than the expected figure from the sites adjacent to Hucknall. Given the position of Hucknall within the ACS settlement hierarchy it is appropriate to consider whether additional development is possible adjacent to Hucknall prior to the homes being provided at other, less sustainable, locations. However, the total number of homes in the area will not exceed the 1300 homes identified in the ACS.

2.0 Sites Considered

2.1 Table 2 sets out the Reasonable Alternative sites in and adjacent to the urban area:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHLAA Reference</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Size (ha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In and adjacent to the Urban Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6260</td>
<td>Sol Construction Ltd</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6667</td>
<td>Sir John Robinson House</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6872</td>
<td>Killisick Lane (GBC Site 2)</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6768</td>
<td>B and Q Unit Mansfield Road</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>613</td>
<td>Lambley Lane/Spring Lane</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6479</td>
<td>Metallfacture Ltd</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>624</td>
<td>Sherbrook Road/Prior Road</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6477</td>
<td>Daybrook Laundry</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>612</td>
<td>Lambley Lane (Adj Glebe Farm)</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6860</td>
<td>Trent Valley Road A612 (Land Adj Railway)</td>
<td>1.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6671</td>
<td>Extension of Howbeck Road</td>
<td>2.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6668</td>
<td>Land Off Mapperley Plains</td>
<td>2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6767</td>
<td>Spring Lane (156)</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>650</td>
<td>Killisick Lane</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>649</td>
<td>Brookfields Garden Centre</td>
<td>3.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6671</td>
<td>Killisick Lane (GBC Site 1)</td>
<td>3.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>618</td>
<td>Rolleston Drive (NCC Offices)</td>
<td>3.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6542</td>
<td>Linden Grove</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>648</td>
<td>Lodge Farm Lane Phase 2</td>
<td>4.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6778</td>
<td>Land to the west of the A60 Redhill</td>
<td>8.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6457</td>
<td>Lambley Lane (Adj Glebe Farm View)</td>
<td>8.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6873</td>
<td>Killisick Lane (GBC Site 3)</td>
<td>8.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>651</td>
<td>Howbeck Road (Land East)</td>
<td>9.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>625</td>
<td>Brookfield Road/Rolleston Drive</td>
<td>9.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>652</td>
<td>Spring Lane</td>
<td>9.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6458</td>
<td>New Farm (Site D)</td>
<td>11.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/459</td>
<td>Lambley Lane (Willow Farm)</td>
<td>15.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/455</td>
<td>New Farm (Site B)</td>
<td>31.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 – Housing Requirement Calculations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completions (2011-2015)</th>
<th>884</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extant Planning Permissions (as of 31 March 2015)</td>
<td>1148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sites below the threshold</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS Strategic Location</td>
<td>Gedling Colliery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Figure includes the planning permission granted for the Teal Close site which is allocated for development in the Aligned Core Strategy.
The sites below are those that are being considered further for allocation:

- Developed for housing or other purposes even though it is not allocated in the Local
  Development Plan; in some cases it may be that the site is ultimately
  no longer considered suitable for development or for other reasons (such as the size of the site or the lack of
  certainty that it will be developed); in some cases it may be that the site is ultimately
  developed for housing or other purposes even though it is not allocated in the Local
  Planning Document.

- The following sites are no longer considered suitable for development or for other reasons (such as the size of the site or the lack of
  certainty that it will be developed); in some cases it may be that the site is ultimately
  developed for housing or other purposes even though it is not allocated in the Local
  Planning Document.

3.0 Sites to be allocated

3.1 It is recommended that the following sites be allocated for residential development:

- Rolleston Drive – 90 homes;
- Brookfields Garden Centre – 105 homes;
- Willow Farm – 110 homes;
- Linden Grove – 115 homes;
- Lodge Farm Lane – 150 homes;
- Spring Lane – 150 homes;
- Howbeck Road/Mapperley Plains – 205 homes;
- Killisick Lane – 215 homes; and
- Gedling Colliery/Chase Farm – 660 homes.

In addition it is recommended that the Hayden Lane site adjacent to Hucknall be
allocated for 120 homes.

Maps of the recommended allocations and our conclusions on them are provided
below. Discussion of the alternative options and why these have not been taken
forward are also provided below.

Rolleston Drive

3.2 This comprises the whole of SHLAA site 6/18. The site is previously developed and is
within the main built up area of Arnold. A flood attenuation facility lies to the north-east
of the site which connects through this site to the attenuation ponds at Daybrook and
then on to the Day Brook. This may affect the layout of the development due to the
need to avoid affecting the existing drainage and the potential need to increase
drainage capacity; as such a lower density has been assumed.

Brookfields Garden Centre

3.3 This site comprises the whole of SHLAA site 6/49. As it is a predominantly previously
developed site that makes little contribution to the purposes of the Green Belt there are
considered to be exceptional circumstances to alter the boundary of the Green Belt.
The site is adjacent to the Howbeck Road/Mapperley Plains proposed allocation and
the two sites will need to be considered together. However, given its brownfield nature
it is considered appropriate to allocate the site separately.

Willow Farm

3.4 This site comprises part of SHLAA site 6/459. The site is well connected to the urban
area and does not make a significant contribution to the purposes of the Green Belt; it is
considered that there are the exceptional circumstances necessary to amend the Green
Belt boundary. The site recommended for allocation is based on existing defensible
boundaries. Once built, the Gedling Access Road will likely become the new defensible
Green Belt boundary following a review of the Local Plan. As the Willow Farm site will
rely on the Gedling Access Road it cannot be developed until the road is completed
(currently expected in 2019).

Linden Grove

3.5 This site comprises the whole of SHLAA site 6/542. The site is bounded by the Colwick
Loop Road and does not make a significant contribution to the purposes of the Green
Belt. It is considered that there are exceptional circumstances to amend the Green Belt boundary. Development of the site will need to minimise the impact on the nearby listed building. As the site will rely on the Gedling Access Road it cannot be developed until the road is completed (currently expected in 2019).

**Lodge Farm Lane**

3.6 This site comprises the whole of SHLAA site 6/48. The site does not make a significant contribution to the purposes of the Green Belt and it is considered that there are the exceptional circumstances necessary to amend the Green Belt boundary. An area to the north of the site will be set aside as a landscape buffer. The proposed second phase of the site (Site A2) is not being allocated due to the lack of clear defensible boundaries.

**Spring Lane**

3.7 The site proposed to be allocated is substantially different to that included in the SHLAA. This reflects the discussions held through the planning application to identify the most appropriate site taking into account a wide range of factors. This site has planning permission for 150 homes (2014/0740); potential constraints and infrastructure requirements were considered as part of the determination of the application. The site is to be allocated to ensure that the residential use of the site is protected in case the planning permission were to lapse.

**Howbeck Road/Mapperley Plains**

3.8 This site comprises the whole of SHLAA Sites 6/51 and 6/671, however, the area of 6/51 which is already developed will be excluded from the allocation. These sites are both within the Green Belt but as they do not make a significant contribution to the purposes of the Green Belt it is considered that there are the exceptional circumstances required to alter the Green Belt boundary. Development of this site would 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.

**Killisick Lane**

3.9 This site includes parts of four SHLAA sites (6/50, 6/871, 6/872 and 6/873) and additional land which is understood to now be available. Although the site is within the Green Belt it does not contribute significantly to the purposes of the Green Belt and it is considered that there are exceptional circumstances to alter the boundary of the Green Belt. Access to the site requires the loss of a small part of an adjacent nature reserve; a replacement area will be provided in compensation. It has been decided that the eastern part of site 6/873 is not to be allocated; this part is more sensitive in landscape terms and access is restricted by a thick band of trees alongside a small valley.

**Gedling Colliery/Chase Farm**

3.10 Gedling Colliery/Chase Farm was identified as a strategic location in the ACS but no specific site boundary was allocated. A planning application has been submitted for 1050 homes (2015/1376). However, as set out in the Housing Background Paper, only 660 are expected to be built in the plan period (2011 to 2028). Those built after 2028 cannot contribute to the housing supply for this plan period. It is recommended that the area that is the subject of the planning application is allocated. A map of this site is located below.

**Site or Options not being allocated**

3.11 Of the reasonable alternatives considered a number have not been allocated as they are currently being used as open space (e.g. sites 6/260 and 6/668) or are not considered suitable for residential development (e.g. sites 6/13 and 6/12). Mapperley Golf Course is not available for residential development and is to be protected for recreational use. While there are no significant constraints to the development of sites 6/477 and 6/768, site 6/477 is below the threshold for allocation in the urban area. Discussions with the owners of site 6/768 indicate they are considering a number of options for the site, including residential; there is not considered sufficient certainty of homes being delivered to justify the site being allocated.

3.12 Development of the New Farm site was considered through the ACS; while sustainably located access to the site is problematic and a number of the owners are no longer promoting residential development at this time. The allocation of the land west of the A60 (site 6/777) is not currently being considered as this will remove potential access solutions from consideration and would prejudice the ability of the larger site to be developed in the future.

**Hayden Lane**

3.13 This site includes part of site 6/460. 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 is sustainably located adjacent to a settlement with a good range of facilities. As the site adjoins Ashfield District careful consideration will need to be given to the impact on local infrastructure and most appropriate way to use contributions. The open area to the east of the site (north of Alison Avenue and Marion Avenue) was included as part of the adjacent North of Papplewick Lane site allocated by the ACS.

3.14 Consideration was given to extending the Top Wighay Farm site as an alternative to the Hayden Lane site. This would also use safeguarded land and be sustainably located. Given the size of the safeguarded land (46.8ha) Top Wighay Farm the additional development would come forward later in the plan period and consideration would need to be given to which part of the safeguarded land would be released without exceeding the 1300 homes identified in the ACS. It is considered that the Hayden Lane site better delivers a range and choice of sites in the area and will be developed earlier in the plan period.

**4.0 Next Steps**

4.1 The sites identified for allocation will be included in the Publication Draft of the Local Planning Document. This will be issued for a six week period so that local residents, landowners, developers, business, organisations and any other individual or group can make representations on whether they support or object to the sites proposed to be allocated; comments can include support for the allocation of other sites not proposed for allocation. Further details of the next steps can be found in Section 6 of the Main Report.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6/260</th>
<th>Sol Construction Ltd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>0.69 ha Number of Dwellings 44 homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brownfield or Greenfield</td>
<td>Brownfield site Current use: Offices, car park and storage areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHLAA Conclusion</td>
<td>It is understood that the applicant has gone out of business. Site is being used for non-residential use; assume no longer being developed for housing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infrastructure</th>
<th>Utilities</th>
<th>No requirements identified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Services</td>
<td>No requirements identified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>9 primary and 7 secondary school places would be generated. Estimated total financial contribution £223,900.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Contribution to primary health care likely based on standard multiplier. Estimated cost £21,120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Infrastructure</td>
<td>Use open space standard of minimum 10% of site area (0.068ha)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Facilities</td>
<td>No requirements identified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>No requirements identified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal</th>
<th>Housing</th>
<th>+</th>
<th>Flooding</th>
<th>--</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>Waste</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage and Design</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Energy and Climate Change</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>++</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment, Biodiversity and GI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Economic Structure</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resources</td>
<td>++</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Green Belt | 0/20 | The site is not within the Green Belt and therefore accords with ACS Policy 3.2. |
| Compliance with the ACS | The site is located within the main urban area of Nottingham and is therefore consistent with Policy 2.3a of the ACS. The principle of development of this site does not conflict with other policies in the ACS. |
| Highways | Access to the site is achievable from Vale Road. The site has previously had planning permission for residential development. |
| Historic Environment | No Effect - it is considered that the site has no impact upon the significance of heritage assets (including their setting). |
| Consultation Response | This site has extant planning permission. As such it has not specifically been identified for consultation. Consultee concerns or comments about the site have been addressed through the grant of planning permission. |
| Conclusion | The site is suitable for residential development and has had planning permission. Although the site is within Flood Zone 2 or 3 it is not at risk during the highest level of flood risk assessed in the SFRA. The loss of the offices space is not considered significant. The site is not currently available as it is being used for non-residential use and is below the 50 dwelling threshold for allocation. The site it is not being considered for allocation. |
### Sir John Robinson House

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th>0.74 ha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Dwellings</td>
<td>50 homes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Brownfield or Greenfield
- **Brownfield site**
  - Current use: County Council offices

#### SHLAA Conclusion
- Development of the building would need to be consistent with listed status. The site is protected by Policy E3 of the Replacement Local Plan - evidence of marketing would be required prior to the site being assessed as suitable for alternative purposes.

#### Infrastructure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Utilities</th>
<th>No requirements identified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Services</td>
<td>No requirements identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>11 primary and 8 secondary school places would be generated. Estimated total financial contribution £264,100.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Contributions to primary health care based on the multiplier of £551 per dwelling cost estimate £27,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Infrastructure</td>
<td>Use open space standard of 10% minimum of development site (i.e. 0.073).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Facilities</td>
<td>No requirements identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>No requirements identified</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Sustainability Appraisal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing</th>
<th>++</th>
<th>Flooding</th>
<th>--</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>Waste</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage and Design</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Energy and Climate Change</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment, Biodiversity and GI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Economic Structure</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resources</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Green Belt
- 0/20
- Site is not within the Green Belt and therefore accords with ACS Policy 3.2.

#### Compliance with the ACS
- The site is located within the main urban area of Nottingham and is therefore consistent with Policy 2.3a of the ACS. The impact on the listed building would need to be assessed to consider compliance with Policy 11. The site is currently protected by Policy 4; consideration would need to be given to whether it could be released.

#### Highways
- Access is onto an existing roundabout and will likely be acceptable especially given existing use of the site. Consideration will need to be given to any conflict with the adjacent car showroom.

#### Historic Environment
- Major impact on Historic Asset - There would be a major impact on the design, appearance and character of a major landmark Grade II Listed Building if the existing car park was developed. Sensitive conversion of the Listed Building could retain it for the future as it has been a difficult building to sell on.

#### Consultation Response
- The site has not been specifically identified through previous consultation. Objections are likely to relate to the impact on heritage, highways and local infrastructure. There may be some support for the site as it is located within the urban area and involves brownfield land.

#### Conclusion
- The site is sustainably located and is previously developed. As the building is Listed a sensitive conversion would be required. The site forms part of a protected employment site which is well occupied. The site itself is in active use by a number of organisations (including NCC and GBC) and its use for residential purposes would result in the loss of office space. The site is within flood zone 2 and proposals would need to address the sequential and exceptions tests. Given the need for sensitive conversion and the active employment use it is considered that the site should not be allocated. A scheme is best considered through a planning application which can consider the employment, heritage and flooding issues in more detail.

- **The site is not being considered for allocation.**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6/872</th>
<th>Killisick Lane (GBC site 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size</strong></td>
<td>1.01 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Dwellings</strong></td>
<td>30 homes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Brownfield or Greenfield**
- Greenfield site
- Current use: Agricultural land

**SHLAA Conclusion**
The site is within a Mature Landscape Area and would result in the loss of Grade 3 agricultural land. The MLA issue is best considered through a Local Plan or Planning Application. No significant other constraints other than access arrangements. Due to the MLA issue the site will be classed as suitable if policy changes.

**Infrastructure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Utilities</th>
<th>No requirements identified.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Services</td>
<td>No abnormal requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>6 primary and 5 secondary school places would be generated. Estimated total financial contribution £155,000. LEA advises will need to consider cumulative impact on primary school places and potential new primary school if adjacent sites allocated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Contributions to primary health care based on the multiplier of £551 per dwelling cost estimate £16,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Infrastructure</td>
<td>Use open space standard of 10% of development site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Facilities</td>
<td>No requirements identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>No requirements identified.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sustainability Appraisal**

| Housing | + | Flooding | 0 |
| Health | + | Waste | - |
| Heritage and Design | 0 | Energy and Climate Change | 0 |
| Crime | 0 | Transport | ++ |
| Social | + | Employment | 0 |
| Environment, Biodiversity and GI | - | Innovation | 0 |
| Landscape | - | Economic Structure | 0 |
| Natural Resources | - | | |

**Green Belt**
Forms part of Urban Area Site 10 8/20

**Compliance with the ACS**
The site is located adjacent to the main urban area of Nottingham and is therefore consistent with Policy 2.3a of the ACS. The site is located within the Green Belt; Policy 3.3 of the ACS requires consideration of non-Green Belt sites before Green Belt sites. The site is within a Mature Landscape Area and will need to be considered against Policy 10.4

**Highways**
The site is not deliverable in highways terms in isolation; consideration will need to be given to the combination of sites proposed in this location including sites 6/50, 6/871 and 6/873.

**Historic Environment**
No Effect - it is considered that the site has no impact upon the significance of heritage assets (including their setting).

**Consultation Response**
The site has not been specifically identified through previous consultation. Objections are likely to relate to the loss of green belt and greenfield land, the impact on the adjacent Local Nature Reserve, the impact on the MLA and impact on highways and other infrastructure. There may be some support for the site as it is adjacent to the urban area.

**Conclusion**
The site is located adjacent to the urban area and does not make a valuable contribution to the purposes of the Green Belt. Development would cause some landscape and visual impact. The loss of agricultural land is not considered significant and would be outweighed by the benefits of providing houses in accordance with the ACS. The site could only be developed in connection with an adjacent site (6/871).

The site can be considered for allocation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>B and Q Unit Mansfield Road</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size</strong></td>
<td>1.03 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brownfield or Greenfield</strong></td>
<td>Brownfield site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHLAA</strong></td>
<td>The site is located within the urban area and will be sustainable. Issues of flooding, highway capacity and the AQMA to be considered but are not thought to be significant. Due to the existing retail units on site it is assumed that the site will come forward during Years 6-10.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Infrastructure</strong></th>
<th>Utilities</th>
<th>No requirements identified.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emergency Services</strong></td>
<td>No requirements identified.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td>13 primary and 10 secondary school places would be generated. Estimated total financial contribution £321,500.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health</strong></td>
<td>Contributions to primary health care based on the multiplier of £551 per dwelling cost estimate £33,100.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Green Infrastructure</strong></td>
<td>Use open space standard of 10% of development site (i.e. 0.103ha).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Facilities</strong></td>
<td>No requirements identified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td>Day Brook passes beneath the site in a main river culvert – a minimum 4 m access route should be kept free of development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Sustainability Appraisal</strong></th>
<th><strong>Housing</strong></th>
<th>++</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health</strong></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Waste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Heritage and Design</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Energy and Climate Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Crime</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social</strong></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environment, Biodiversity and GI</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landscape</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Economic Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Natural Resources</strong></td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Green Belt** | 0/20 | Site is not within the Green Belt and therefore accords with ACS Policy 3.2. |

| **Compliance with the ACS** | The site is located within the main urban area of Nottingham and is therefore consistent with Policy 2.3a of the ACS. Although the site is currently identified for Out of Centre Retail use this is not protected by the ACS. |

| **Highways** | The existing access is considered suitable for the proposed development especially given existing use. Incorporation of the access with the adjacent signalised junction (serving the opposite retail park) would be required. |

| **Historic Environment** | No Effect - it is considered that the site has no impact upon the significance of heritage assets (including their setting). |

| **Consultation Response** | The site has not been specifically identified through previous consultation. Objections are likely to relate to the loss of employment and impact on highways and local infrastructure. There may be some support for the site as it is located within the urban area and involves brownfield land. |

| **Conclusion** | The site is sustainably located (although within an Air Quality Management Area hence the major negative for Natural Resources) and would use non-Green Belt, previously developed land. The site is currently partly in use for out-of-centre retail (the former B&Q store is now closed) and a solely residential development would result in a small number of job losses; a mixed use scheme may be possible. Development of the site would not impact on the landscape or heritage and ensure that account is taken of the route of the Day Brook. |

**The site can be considered for allocation.**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6/13</th>
<th>Lambley Lane/Spring Lane</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size</strong></td>
<td>1.28 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brownfield or Greenfield</strong></td>
<td>Greenfield site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHLAA Conclusion</strong></td>
<td>Site is in an isolated location outside existing settlements. It is unsuitable for residential development. The site was designated in the Gedling Borough Council Replacement Local Plan as safeguarded land. It is not envisaged that this site would be released for development in a future development plan document. The safeguarded land designation is being used as a planning tool to protect land that is not in the Green Belt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Infrastructure Utilities</strong></td>
<td>No requirements identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emergency Services</strong></td>
<td>No abnormal requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td>9 primary and 7 secondary school places would be generated. Estimated total financial contribution £223,900.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health</strong></td>
<td>Contribution to primary health care likely based on multiplier. Cost estimate £21,100.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Green Infrastructure</strong></td>
<td>Use open space standard of 10% of site area (0.128ha).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Facilities</strong></td>
<td>No requirements identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td>No requirements identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustainability Appraisal Housing</strong></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health</strong></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Heritage and Design</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Crime</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social</strong></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environment, Biodiversity and GI</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landscape</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Natural Resources</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Green Belt** | 0/20 | The site is not within the Green Belt and therefore accords with ACS Policy 3.2. |

**Compliance with the ACS** | The site does not accord with Policy 2 or Policy 14 as it is neither within or adjacent to the urban area or other settlements and is in an inaccessible location. The principle of development of this site does not conflict with other policies in the ACS. |

**Highways** | While access to the site can be achieved, subject to improvements to footways, the site is not considered to be sustainably located in transport terms. |

**Historic Environment** | **No Effect** - it is considered that the site has no impact upon the significance of heritage assets (including their setting). |

**Consultation Response** | The site has not been specifically identified through previous consultation. Respondents would likely be concerned about the loss of greenfield land and coalescence between Lambley and the Urban Area. There may be some support for the site as it would form part of the Gedling Colliery redevelopment. |

**Conclusion** | The site does not form a logical extension to the urban area or other settlement and would increase development along Spring Lane reducing the gap between the urban area and Lambley. While the site has good access to public transport there are few facilities nearby and residents would have to travel for even basic services. |

**The site is not being considered for allocation.**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Green Belt</th>
<th>0/20</th>
<th>Site is not within the Green Belt and therefore accords with ACS Policy 3.2.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compliance with the ACS</td>
<td>The site is located within the main urban area of Nottingham and is therefore consistent with Policy 2.3a of the ACS.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highways</td>
<td>The site has had outline planning permission in the past (2011/1055). Details of access to be provided but considered no issues given previous use of site; access is sufficiently wide enough for scale of development. Consideration should be given to the need for a signalised junction given speed of level of traffic on Mansfield Rd.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Environment</td>
<td>No Effect - it is considered that the site has no impact upon the significance of heritage assets (including their setting).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation Response</td>
<td>This site has had planning permission in the recent past. Consultee concerns or comments about the site have been addressed through the grant of planning permission. The site was identified in the Issues &amp; Options stage but no specific comments were received. There was support for development to the North of Redhill although there were general objections to the loss of greenfield and green belt land, the environmental impact and impact on local services.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td>The site is located on the edge of Arnold and involves the use of previously developed land. Whilst the site was last used for employment purposes it has not provided jobs for a number of years and is not protected for employment use. The site has previously had planning permission for residential use. The site can be considered for allocation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# brownfield site

**Current use:** industrial/employment land.

### SHLAA Conclusion

The site is currently protected for employment purposes and is well used. There would be no significant constraints to the redevelopment of site for residential purposes. Given that there is no evidence of the site being available for residential use and that the site is well used for employment purposes, it is not considered suitable or available for development.

### Infrastructure

**Utilities**

No requirements identified.

**Emergency Services**

No requirements identified.

**Education**

9 primary and 7 secondary places would be generated. Estimated total financial contribution £233,900.

**Health**

Contributions to primary health care based on the multiplier of £551 per dwelling cost estimate £23,700.

**Green Infrastructure**

Use open space standard of minimum of 10% of site area (i.e. 0.14 ha).

**Community Facilities**

No requirements identified.

**Other**

No requirements identified.

### Sustainability Appraisal

#### Housing

- Flooding: 0

#### Health

- Waste: -

#### Heritage and Design

- Energy and Climate Change: 0

#### Crime

- Transport: ++

#### Social

- Employment: --

#### Environment, Biodiversity and GI

- Innovation: 0

#### Landscape

- Economic Structure: --

#### Natural Resources

- Economic Structure: --

### Green Belt

9/20

Site is not within the Green Belt and therefore accords with ACS Policy 3.2.

### Compliance with the ACS

The site is located within the main urban area of Nottingham and is therefore consistent with Policy 2.3a of the ACS. The site is currently protected by Policy 4; consideration would need to be given to whether it could be released.

### Highways

The site is located within an existing built-up area. Access is achievable but should be moved from the current location opposite Sherbrook Terrace. Alternative access is likely to be achievable along the length of the site facing Sherbrook Road.

### Historic Environment

No Effect - it is considered that the site has no impact upon the significance of heritage assets (including their setting).

### Consultation Response

The site has not been specifically identified through previous consultation. Objections are likely to relate to the impact on high streets and local infrastructure. There may be some support for the site as it is located within the urban area and involves brownfield land.

### Conclusion

The site is sustainability located and would involve the use of non-green belt brownfield land. However, the site is well used for employment purposes by a range of businesses, as shown in the Employment Background Paper, and has not been promoted for alternative uses by a landowner or developer.

The site is not being considered for allocation for residential use.
## Daybrook Laundry

### Size
- 1.72 ha

### Number of Dwellings
- 46 homes

### Brownfield or Greenfield
- Brownfield site
- Current use: Retail and vacant

### SHLAA Conclusion
- Planning permission for non-residential development (2012/1373) on part of the site which is currently under construction. The planning report states "details of a potential residential development scheme on the remainder of the site has been provided". An illustration in the Design and Access Statement shows 46 dwellings on the remainder of the site. Assume residential development come forward within Years 6-10.

### Infrastructure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Utilities</th>
<th>No requirements identified.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Services</td>
<td>No requirements identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>10 primary and 7 secondary school places would be generated. Estimated total financial contribution £235,400.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Contributions to primary health care based on the multiplier of £551 per dwelling cost estimate £25,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Infrastructure</td>
<td>Use open space standard of minimum 10% of development site (i.e. 0.172ha).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Facilities</td>
<td>No requirements identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>No requirements identified</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sustainability Appraisal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing</th>
<th>+</th>
<th>Flooding</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>Waste</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage and Design</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Energy and Climate Change</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment, Biodiversity and GI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Economic Structure</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resources</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Green Belt
- 0/20
- Site is not within the Green Belt and therefore accords with ACS Policy 3.2.

### Compliance with the ACS
- Site is located within the main urban area of Nottingham and is therefore consistent with Policy 2.3a of the ACS. Although the site is protected for employment an appeal has examined this issues and permitted alternative uses on site.

### Highways
- The signalised junction was constructed to allow additional development on site. Access is considered appropriate for scale of development proposed.

### Historic Environment
- No Effect - The site is visually not imposing on heritage asset because of existing development between the site and the asset.

### Consultation Response
- This site has had planning permission in the recent past. Consultant concerns or comments about the site have been addressed through the grant of planning permission.

### Conclusion
- The site is in a sustainable location and involves previously developed land. The employment protection has been explored through an appeal and the site has not been in active use for a number of years although retail development on part of the site has provided a number of jobs. Due to topography the vacant part of the site is unlikely to provide a suitable location for retail or employment use.

The vacant part of the site can be considered for allocation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>6/12</strong></th>
<th>Lambley Lane (Adj Glebe Farm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size</strong></td>
<td>1.85 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Dwellings</strong></td>
<td>55 homes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Brownfield or Greenfield**
- Greenfield site
- Current use: agricultural land

**SHLAA Conclusion**
- Site was assessed as unsuitable after Part A Assessment in the SUE Study.
- The site is not suitable for residential development.

**Infrastructure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Utilities</th>
<th>No requirements identified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Services</td>
<td>No requirements identified</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Education**
- 12 primary and 9 secondary school places would be generated. Estimated total financial contribution £292,800.

**Health**
- Contribution to primary health care likely based on standard multiplier of £551 per dwelling. Cost estimate £30,305

**Green Infrastructure**
- Use open space standard of minimum 10% of site area (0.185ha).

**Community Facilities**
- No requirements identified

**Other**
- No requirements identified

**Sustainability Appraisal**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing</th>
<th>++</th>
<th>Flooding</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Waste</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage and Design</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Energy and Climate Change</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment, Biodiversity and GI</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Economic Structure</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resources</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Green Belt**
- 0/20
- The site is not within the Green Belt and therefore accords with ACS Policy 3.2.

**Compliance with the ACS**
- The site is located adjacent to the main urban area of Nottingham and is therefore consistent with Policy 2.3a of the ACS. The site is adjacent to the Gedling Colliery/Chase Farm Strategic Location identified by Policy 2.3a(v) of the ACS and would form part of the development of that site. The principle of development of this site does not conflict with other policies in the ACS.

**Highways**
- The site is not considered to be acceptable in highway terms. Visibility along Lambley Lane is affected by the bend and would need to be widened and have footways provided on its western side to be acceptable. Additionally, the approved route of the Gedling Access Road runs to the south of the site; this will affect the ability to access sites along Lambley Lane.

**Historic Environment**
- Major impact on Historic Asset - Impact by loss of setting of heritage asset and buildings (non-designated).

**Consultation Response**
- The site has not been specifically identified through previous consultation. Respondents would likely be concerned about the loss of greenfield land and coalescence between Lambley and the Urban Area. There may be some support for the site as it would form part of the Gedling Colliery redevelopment.

**Conclusion**
- The site is not being considered for allocation.
### 6/860

**Trent Valley Road A612 (Land Adj Railway)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th>1.98 ha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Dwellings</strong></td>
<td>60 homes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Brownfield or Greenfield**
- Greenfield site
- Current use: Natural and semi-natural land

**SHLAA Conclusion**
- No significant constraints subject to Highways and EA comments. Site does not relate well to rest of urban area and is not of sufficient size to generate its own facilities. Impact of neighbouring uses may affect viability. Assume site not available for development.

**Infrastructure**
- **Utilities**: No requirements identified
- **Emergency Services**: No requirements identified
- **Education**: 13 primary and 10 secondary school places would be generated. Estimated total financial contribution £321,500.
- **Health**: Contribution to primary health care likely based on standard multiplier of £551 per dwelling £33,100.
- **Green Infrastructure**: Use open space standard of 10% of site area (0.198ha).
- **Community Facilities**: No requirements identified
- **Other**: No requirements identified

**Sustainability Appraisal**
- **Housing**: ++
- **Flooding**: -
- **Health**: +
- **Waste**: -
- **Heritage and Design**: 0
- **Energy and Climate Change**: 0
- **Crime**: 0
- **Transport**: ++
- **Social**: +
- **Employment**: 0
- **Environment, Biodiversity and GI**: -
- **Innovation**: 0
- **Landcape**: 0
- **Economic Structure**: 0
- **Natural Resources**: -

**Green Belt**
- 0/20
- Although the site is partly within the Green Belt the A612 forms a strong defensible boundary and a minor alteration will occur to realign the Green Belt boundary. As such it is considered that the site accords with ACS Policy 3.2.

**Compliance with the ACS**
- The site is located adjacent to the main urban area of Nottingham and is therefore consistent with Policy 2.3a of the ACS. The principle of development of this site does not conflict with other policies in the ACS.

**Highways**
- Additional access onto Trent Valley Way for this level of development would be required. Trent Valley Way is significantly higher than the site and it is considered that access to the site from here is not possible.

**Historic Environment**
- **No Effect** - it is considered that the site has no impact upon the significance of heritage assets (including their setting).

**Consultation Response**
- The site has not been specifically identified through previous consultation. Respondents would likely be concerned about the loss of greenfield land and proximity to the sewage works. There may be some support for the site as it is located adjacent to the urban area and is not Green Belt land.

**Conclusion**
- The site is adjacent to the urban area and does not contribute to the openness of the Green Belt. However, there will be difficulties in accessing the site due to height differences between the road and the site. The site is cut off from the rest of the urban area and would not be large enough to generate its own services. The site is not considered to be available for development.

The site is not being considered for allocation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6/671</th>
<th>Extension of Howbeck Road</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size</strong></td>
<td>2.02 ha</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brownfield or Greenfield</th>
<th>Greenfield site</th>
<th>Current use: Natural and semi-natural land</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| SHLAA Conclusion | Adjacent to the urban area. The site is within the green belt and on a ridgeline. Sensitive development will be required due to the ridgeline. A decision will be needed to amend the green belt boundaries and the site will be assessed as 'suitable if policy changes'. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infrastructure</th>
<th>Utilities</th>
<th>No requirements identified.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Services</td>
<td>No requirements identified.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Education | 13 primary and 10 secondary school places would be generated. Estimated total financial contribution £321,500. LEA advises will need to consider cumulative impact on primary school places and potential new primary school if adjacent sites allocated. |

| Health | Contributions to primary health care based on the multiplier of £551 per dwelling cost estimate £33,100 |

| Green Infrastructure Use open space standard of 10% of development site (i.e.0.202ha). |
| Community Facilities | No requirements identified |
| Other | No requirements identified. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal</th>
<th>Housing</th>
<th>++</th>
<th>Flooding</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Waste</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage and Design</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Energy and Climate Change</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment, Biodiversity and GI</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Economic Structure</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resources</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Green Belt</th>
<th>Forms part of Urban Area site 14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Compliance with the ACS</strong></td>
<td>The site is located adjacent to the main urban area of Nottingham and is therefore consistent with Policy 2.3a of the ACS. The site is located within the Green Belt; Policy 3.3 of the ACS requires consideration of non-Green Belt sites before Green Belt sites.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Highways | Access onto Mapperley Plains will require improvements to visibility or a reduction in speed to 40mph. Consideration will need to be given to cumulative impact if developed alongside adjacent sites; a signalised junction may be appropriate. |

| Historic Environment | No Effect - it is considered that the site has no impact upon the significance of heritage assets (including their setting). |

| Consultation Response | The site was identified in the Issues & Options stage and was supported by the landowners who considered that there were no constraints to development. There were concerns regarding the impact on highways and risk of flooding increasing in Woodborough and Lambley |

<p>| Conclusion | 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. The site can be considered for allocation. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6/668</th>
<th>Land Off Mapperley Plains</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size</strong></td>
<td>2.11 ha</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brownfield or Greenfield</th>
<th>Greenfield site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current use: open space and has previously been protected for a new road - this is no longer being progressed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| SHLAA Conclusion | The site is protected open space and not suitable for residential development. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infrastructure</th>
<th>Utilities</th>
<th>No requirements identified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Services</td>
<td>No requirements identified.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Education | 6 primary and 5 secondary school places would be generated. Estimated total financial contribution £155,000. LEA advises will need to consider cumulative impact on primary school places and potential new primary school if adjacent sites allocated. |

| Health | Contributions to primary health care based on the multiplier of £551 per dwelling cost estimate £16,500 |

| Green Infrastructure | Use open space standard of 10% of development site (i.e. 0.21ha). |

| Community Facilities | No requirements identified |

| Other | No requirements identified |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal</th>
<th>Housing</th>
<th>++</th>
<th>Flooding</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Waste</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage and Design</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Energy and Climate Change</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>++</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment, Biodiversity and GI</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Economic Structure</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resources</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Green Belt</th>
<th>0/20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site is not within the Green Belt and therefore accords with ACS Policy 3.2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Compliance with the ACS | The site is located within the main urban area of Nottingham and is therefore consistent with Policy 2.3a of the ACS. The site is protected as Open Space and any development would need to accord with Policy 16.4. |

| Highways | Given that the site is likely to make use of existing roads/interests with limited additional development off any single access it is considered that arrangements are acceptable. Access from Gedling Road may require alterations to the signalised junction. |

| Historic Environment | No Effect - it is considered that the site has no impact upon the significance of heritage assets (including their setting). |

| Consultation Response | The site has not been specifically identified through previous consultation. Objections are likely to relate to the impact on highways and local infrastructure and loss of open space. There may be some support for the site as it is located within the urban area. |

<p>| Conclusion | The site is sustainably located and is not within the Green Belt. The site was previously protected for the route of a new road and is now designated as open space; it is understood that this scheme is no longer going ahead. Given the shape of the site it is likely to only achieve 30 to 40 homes which is below the threshold identified for allocation in the urban area. The site is not being considered for allocation. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spring Lane (156)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size</strong></td>
<td>2.21 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Dwellings</strong></td>
<td>51 homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brownfield or Greenfield</strong></td>
<td>Greenfield site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current use:</strong></td>
<td>Agricultural land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHLAA Conclusion</strong></td>
<td>The site is in a isolated location in area that is unlikely to be released from the Green Belt. A proposed layout has been submitted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Infrastructure</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Utilities</strong></td>
<td>No requirements identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emergency Services</strong></td>
<td>No requirements identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td>11 primary and 8 secondary school places would be generated. Estimated total financial contribution £264,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health</strong></td>
<td>Contribution to primary health care likely based on standard multiplier £551 per dwelling £26,100.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Green Infrastructure</strong></td>
<td>Use open space standard of 10% of site area (0.22ha).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Facilities</strong></td>
<td>No requirements identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td>No requirements identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustainability Appraisal</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing</strong></td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Flooding</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Waste</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Heritage and Design</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Energy and Climate Change</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Crime</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transport</strong></td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social</strong></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environment, Biodiversity and GI</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Innovation</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landscape</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic Structure</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Natural Resources</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Green Belt</th>
<th>Forms part of Urban Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site 16</strong></td>
<td>Site 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>13/20</strong></td>
<td>13/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Compliance with the ACS</strong></td>
<td>The site is neither within or adjacent to the urban area or other settlement and does not accord with Policy 2 or Policy 14. The site is located within the Green Belt; Policy 3.3 of the ACS requires consideration of non-Green Belt sites before Green Belt sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highways</strong></td>
<td>While access to the site can be achieved, subject to improvements to footways, the site is not considered to be sustainably located in transport terms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Historic Environment</strong></td>
<td>No Effect - it is considered that the site has no impact upon the significance of heritage assets (including their setting).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consultation Response</strong></td>
<td>The site has not been specifically identified through previous consultation. Respondents would likely be concerned about traffic movement, the increase in surface water runoff and the impact on the Green Belt. There may be some support as the site is located close to urban area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conclusion</strong></td>
<td>The site does not adjoin the urban area or other settlement and forms part of the gap between Lambley and the urban area where ribbon development is prevalent. While the site has good access to public transport there are few facilities nearby and residents would have to travel for even basic services. The site is not being considered for allocation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Killisick Lane

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th>2.60 ha</th>
<th>Number of Dwellings</th>
<th>110 homes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Brownfield or Greenfield**
- Greenfield site
- Current use: Agricultural land

**SHLAA Conclusion**
The site is adjacent to the urban area and within a MLA. At present it would need to demonstrated that the need for development outweighs the value of the MLA. This is best considered as part of a DPD or planning application and not through the SHLAA process. There may also be highways issues with the site. Work is underway on landscape and highways issues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infrastructure</th>
<th>Utilities</th>
<th>No requirements identified.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Services</td>
<td>No requirements identified.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>23 primary and 18 secondary school places would be generated. Estimated total financial contribution £574,200. LEA advises will need to consider cumulative impact on primary school places and potential new primary school if adjacent sites allocated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Contributions to primary health care based on the multiplier of £551 per dwelling cost estimate £60,600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Infrastructure</td>
<td>Use public open space standard minimum of 10% of site area (0.26 ha).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Facilities</td>
<td>No requirements identified.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>No requirements identified.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sustainability Appraisal**

| Housing | ++ | Flooding | 0 |
| Health | + | Waste | - |
| Heritage and Design | 0 | Energy and Climate Change | 0 |
| Crime | 0 | Transport | ++ |
| Social | + | Employment | 0 |
| Environment, Biodiversity and GI | 0 | Innovation | 0 |
| Landscape | - | Economic Structure | 0 |
| Natural Resources | - | |

### Green Belt

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forms part of Urban Area</th>
<th>Site 11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11/20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Compliance with the ACS**
The site is located adjacent to the main urban area of Nottingham and is therefore consistent with Policy 2.3a of the ACS. The site is located within the Green Belt; Policy 3.3 of the ACS requires consideration of non-Green Belt sites before Green Belt sites.

| Highways | Strathmore Road is wide enough to accommodate the level of development although its gradient is substandard. Access to site would need to be through adjoining sites (6/871, 6/872, 6/873). |
| Historic Environment | No Effect - it is considered that the site has no impact upon the significance of heritage assets (including their setting). |

**Consultation Response**
The site has not been specifically identified through previous consultation. Objections are likely to relate to the loss of green belt and greenfield land, the impact on the MLA and impact on highways and other infrastructure. There may be some support for the site as it is adjacent to the urban area.

**Conclusion**
The site makes a contribution to the purposes of the Green Belt and development would have some landscape and visual impact. However, subject to access issues being addressed and some landscape mitigation, it is considered that the benefits of development adjacent to the urban area outweigh the loss of Green Belt and harm to the landscape.

The site can be considered for allocation.
### Brookfields Garden Centre

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Number of Dwellings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.52 ha</td>
<td>106 homes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Brownfield or Greenfield**
- Brownfield site
- Current use: Garden Centre

**SHLAA Conclusion**
- Site is adjacent to the urban area and on a primary ridgeline. Provided development takes account of the ridgeline it may be suitable. Due to the ridgeline and Green Belt location it will be marked as Suitable if Policy Changes.

**Infrastructure**
- **Utilities**: No requirements identified.
- **Emergency Services**: No requirements identified
- **Education**: 20 primary and 15 secondary places would be generated. Estimated total financial contribution £488,000. LEA advises will need to consider cumulative impact on primary school places and potential new primary school if adjacent sites allocated.
- **Health**: Contributions to primary health care based on the multiplier of £551 per dwelling cost estimate £52,300
- **Green Infrastructure**: Use open space standard of minimum 10% of site area (i.e. 0.352ha)
- **Community Facilities**: No requirements identified
- **Other**: No requirements identified.

**Sustainability Appraisal**
- **Housing**: ++
- **Health**: +
- **Heritage and Design**: 0
- **Crime**: 0
- **Social**: +
- **Environment, Biodiversity and GI**: 0
- **Landscape**: 0
- **Natural Resources**: ++

**Green Belt**
- Forms part of Urban Area
- Site 14

**Compliance with the ACS**
- The site is located adjacent to the main urban area of Nottingham and is therefore consistent with Policy 2.3a of the ACS. The site is located within the Green Belt; Policy 3.3 of the ACS requires consideration of non-Green Belt sites before Green Belt sites.

**Highways**
- The current access is sufficient to support the level of development proposed; 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.

**Historic Environment**
- **No Effect** - it is considered that the site has no impact upon the significance of heritage assets (including their setting).

**Consultation Response**
- The site was identified in the Issues & Options stage and was supported by the landowners who considered that there were no constraints to development and involved brownfield land. There were concerns regarding the impact on highways and risk of flooding increasing in Woodborough and Lambley

**Conclusion**
- 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.

The site can be considered for allocation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6/871</th>
<th>Killisick Lane (GBC site 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brownfield or Greenfield</strong></td>
<td>Greenfield site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current use:</strong></td>
<td>part local nature reserve and part agricultural land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHLAA Conclusion</strong></td>
<td>Site is located within the Green Belt and a Mature Landscape Area. The MLA issue is best considered through a planning application or Local Plan review. No constraints other than confirmation of access arrangements. Due to the MLA issue the site is classed as non-deliverable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Infrastructure</strong></td>
<td>Utilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emergency Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Green Infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustainability Appraisal</strong></td>
<td>Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heritage and Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environment, Biodiversity and GI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Landscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Natural Resources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Green Belt** | Forms part of Urban Area |
| | Site 10 8/20 |
| **Compliance with the ACS** | The site has three boundaries with the urban area, a degree of containment and reasonably strong defensible boundaries. There is no encroachment but development would not reduce the gap to a settlement and or impact on historic character. |
| **Highways** | 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. |
| **Historic Environment** | No Effect - it is considered that the site has no impact upon the significance of heritage assets (including their setting). |
| **Consultation Response** | The site has not been specifically identified through previous consultation. Objections are likely to relate to the loss of green belt and greenfield land, the impact on the adjacent nature conservation site, the impact on the MLA and impact on highways and other infrastructure. There may be some support for the site as it is adjacent to the urban area. |
| **Conclusion** | The site is located adjacent to the urban area and does not make a valuable contribution to the purposes of the Green Belt. Development would cause some landscape and visual harm although mitigation can be provided. There is likely to be some loss of the adjacent LNR due to the need for access; this would need to be mitigated. The loss of agricultural land is not considered significant and would be outweighed by the benefits of providing houses in accordance with the ACS. |
| | The site can be considered for allocation. |
### SHLAA Conclusion

The site is still subject to Policy E3 of the Local Plan. It is thought that this part of the site is suitable in line with the recommendation to reduce the size of the protected employment area. Highways have no objection in principle. As there needs to be a policy decision to allow development site it will be classed as Suitable if Policy Changes.

### Infrastructure

**Utilities**

No requirements identified.

**Emergency Services**

No requirements identified.

**Education**

23 primary places and 17 secondary places would be generated. Estimated total financial contribution of £556,900.

**Health**

Contributions to primary health care based on the multiplier of £551 per dwelling cost estimate £60,000.

**Green Infrastructure**

Use open space standard of minimum 10% of site area (i.e. 0.364ha)

**Community Facilities**

No requirements identified

**Other**

Site specific flood risk assessment required to focus on surface water flood risk. May be a need for surface water attenuation capacity on site.

### Sustainability Appraisal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing</th>
<th>++</th>
<th>Flooding</th>
<th>-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Waste</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage and Design</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Energy and Climate Change</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment, Biodiversity and GI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Economic Structure</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resources</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Green Belt

| Policy | 9/20 | Site is not within the Green Belt and therefore accords with ACS Policy 3.2. |

### Compliance with the ACS

The site is located within the main urban area of Nottingham and is therefore consistent with Policy 2.3a of the ACS. The land is currently protected for employment use and alternative uses would need to accord with ACS Policy 4.

### Highways

Access to the site can be achieved via access point 1 (opposite Darlton Drive) although a new single point of access away from this location may be more appropriate. Alternative access is possible along the length of the sites frontage to Rolleston Drive. Rolleston Drive is a straight road with good visibility in both directions.

### Historic Environment

No Effect - it is considered that the site has no impact upon the significance of heritage assets (including their setting).

### Consultation Response

The site was identified in the Issues & Options stage but the only comment related to managing surface water from the site. Objections are likely to relate to the impact on highways and local infrastructure. There may be some support for the site as it is located within the urban area and involves brownfield land.

### Conclusion

The site is previously developed and located within the main built up area of Arnold; as such it is sustainably located and accords with policy. Whilst the site will lead to the loss of land allocated for employment use it was previously occupied by Nottinghamshire CC and has not provided jobs for a number of years. The site is not well used as shown in the Employment Background Paper. Careful consideration will need to be given to designing a scheme that minimises the risk of flooding.

The site can be considered for allocation.
Linden Grove
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Current use: Agricultural land

SHLAA
Conclusion
The site is located adjacent to the PUA and has defensible boundaries due to the new A612 Link Road. The site is within the Green Belt and a decision would need to be taken through a DPD to allocate the site. As such the site is suitable if policy changes.

Infrastructure
Utilities
No requirements identified

Emergency
Services
No requirements identified

Education
24 primary and 18 secondary school places would be generated. Estimated total financial contribution £585,600.

Health
Contribution to primary health care likely based on standard multiplier of £551 per dwelling £62,814.

Green Infrastructure
Use open space standard of 10% of site area (0.379ha).
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The Site adjoins the urban area to the south and west. There are strong defensible boundaries. Given the nature of the site it is not considered to be open countryside and, although there is no inappropriate development, there would only be limited encroachment. The site forms part of the setting of Gedling House but development would not impact on the historic character of a settlement.

Compliance
with the ACS
The site is located adjacent to the main urban area of Nottingham and is therefore consistent with Policy 2.3a. The impact on the nearby listed building would need to be assessed to consider compliance with Policy 11. The site is located within the Green Belt; Policy 3.3 of the ACS requires consideration of non-Green Belt sites before Green Belt sites.

Highways
Access to the site can be achieved from the existing access. Consideration will need to be given to the operation of the adjacent signal controlled one way system and to the nearby school. Land required for the GAR may reduce capacity of the site slightly.

Historic
Environment
Impact on Historic Asset - The development of the site would have an impact on the wider setting of the Listed Building (Grade II) but not directly on its immediate setting. 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.

Consultation
Response
The site was identified in the Issues & Options consultation. Notts CC objected to the site as it was considered to be a visually important area of separation with Burton Joyce and linked to other nearby open space. A developer identified that the site had been rejected in the past as it would reduce the gap with Burton Joyce and nothing had changed. The landowner, however, considered that the construction of the Relief Road had severed the site from the wider Green Belt.

Conclusion
The site forms a logical extension to the urban area and does not contribute substantially to the Green Belt. Whilst the site is within Flood Risk Zone 2 or 3 it is protected by the Left Bank Flood Alleviation Scheme at the highest level of risk assessed. The impact on the Listed Building can be mitigated through planting and ensuring that homes are no more than 2 stories high.

The site can be considered for allocation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A2</th>
<th>Lodge Farm Lane Phase 2 Redhill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size</strong></td>
<td><strong>Number of Dwellings</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.88 ha</td>
<td>150 homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brownfield or Greenfield</strong></td>
<td>Greenfield – currently agricultural land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHLAA Conclusion</strong></td>
<td>The site has not been assessed through the SHLAA. Given its location the site would likely be assessed as ‘maybe suitable subject to policy change’. Access would be identified as a constraint.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Infrastructure** | **Utilities** | No requirements identified. |
| **Emergency Services** | No requirements identified. |
| **Education** | 32 primary and 24 secondary school places would be generated. Estimated total financial contribution £507,700. |
| **Health** | Contributions to primary health care based on the multiplier of £551 per dwelling cost estimate £82,700. |
| **Green Infrastructure** | Use open space standard of minimum 10% of site area (i.e. 0.5 ha). |
| **Community Facilities** | No requirements identified. |
| **Other** | No requirements identified. |

**Sustainability Appraisal**

| Housing | ++ Flooding | - |
| Health | + Waste | - |
| Heritage and Design | 0 Energy and Climate Change | 0 |
| Crime | 0 Transport | + |
| Social | + Employment | 0 |
| Environment, Biodiversity and GI | - Innovation | 0 |
| Landscape | - Economic Structure | 0 |
| Natural Resources | -- | |

**Green Belt**

The site forms part of two sites looked at in the Green Belt Assessment.

**Urban Area Site 6 – 12/20**
The site has only one boundary with the urban area and extends beyond the ridge line. There is no encroachment but development would not reduce the gap to a settlement and or impact on historic character.

**Urban Area Site 7 – 11/20**
There is only one boundary with the urban area but the ridge line to the north west provides some containment. There is no encroachment but development would not reduce the gap to a settlement or impact on historic character.

**Compliance with the ACS**
The site is located adjacent to the main urban area of Nottingham and is therefore consistent with Policy 2.3a of the ACS. The site is located within the Green Belt; Policy 3.3 of the ACS requires consideration of non-Green Belt sites before Green Belt sites.

**Highways**
Site 6/462 includes this site in the level of development considered. Development of site A2 alongside 6/48 would increase the level of development to 300. It is considered that access onto Mansfield Road (A60) with a secondary access through the adjacent Stockings Farm site is acceptable.

**Historic Environment**
No Effect - It is considered that the site has no impact upon the significance of heritage assets (including their setting).

**Consultation Response**
The site was not identified at the Issues & Options stage. There may be support for the site due to its urban edge location as this could result in the level of development being reduced in other locations. There may be objections to the loss of Green Belt land and the impact on local infrastructure.

**Conclusion**
The site has some Green Belt value and development would have a limited landscape and visual impact. It is sustainably located adjacent to the urban area but would involve the loss of Grade 2 or 3 agricultural land and does not have strong defensible boundaries for the Green Belt (the northern boundary is a contour line). Access to the site would be required through the adjacent site to the A60 (6/48) or the existing built up area to Calverton Road. The site should be considered for allocation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lodge Farm Lane</th>
<th>Green Belt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>Forms part of Urban Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Site 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.31 ha</td>
<td>7/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Dwellings</td>
<td>The Site has two boundaries with the urban area and the ridgeline to the north provides containment. The A60 to the west is a strong defensible boundary. Development would not reduce the gap to Calverton or impact on historic character and does have some encroachment in the form of ribbon development along the A60.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150 homes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brownfield or Greenfield</td>
<td>Compliance with the ACS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenfield site</td>
<td>The site is located adjacent to the main urban area of Nottingham and is therefore consistent with Policy 2.3a of the ACS. The site is located within the Green Belt; Policy 3.3 of the ACS requires consideration of non-Green Belt sites before Green Belt sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current use: Agricultural land</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SHLAA Conclusion**

While the larger site was rejected through the SUE Study it is considered a smaller site may be suitable. Highways have no in principle objections. The site will be classed as ‘suitable if policy changes’.

**Infrastructure Utilities**

No requirements identified.

**Emergency Services**

No requirements identified

**Education**

32 primary and 24 secondary places would be generated. Estimated total financial contribution £780,800.

**Health**

Contributions to primary health care based on the multiplier of £551 per dwelling cost estimate £82,700

**Green Infrastructure**

Use public open space standard minimum of 10% of site area. (i.e. 0.73ha)

**Community Facilities**

No requirements identified

**Other**

No requirements identified.

**Sustainability Appraisal**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing</th>
<th>++</th>
<th>Flooding</th>
<th>-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Waste</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage and Design</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Energy and Climate Change</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment, Biodiversity and GI</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Economic Structure</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resources</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Compliance with the ACS**

The site is located adjacent to the main urban area of Nottingham and is therefore consistent with Policy 2.3a of the ACS. The site is located within the Green Belt; Policy 3.3 of the ACS requires consideration of non-Green Belt sites before Green Belt sites.

**Highways**

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.

**Historic Environment**

No Effect - it is considered that the site has no impact upon the significance of heritage assets (including their setting).

**Consultation Response**

The site was identified for consultation in the Issues & Options stage. Development of the site was supported by the landowner and residents who considered that development here could reduce development at the villages. There were general objections to the loss of greenfield and green belt land, the environmental impact and impact on local services.

**Conclusion**

The site does not make a valuable contribution to the Green Belt and mitigation can be put in place to address the proximity of the AQMA. Whilst the site would involve the loss of Grade 2 & 3 agricultural land the amount lost is not significant and is outweighed by the benefit of providing houses in accordance with the ACS. An area to the east is recommended in the Landscape & Visual Analysis to be retained as a landscape buffer.

**The site can be considered for allocation.**
### Land to the west of the A60 Redhill

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Size</strong></th>
<th>8.07 ha</th>
<th><strong>Number of Dwellings</strong></th>
<th>120 homes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Brownfield or Greenfield**
- Greenfield site
- Current use: Agricultural land

**SHLAA Conclusion**
- Subject to the identified requirements and a detailed assessment through a planning application, the site is considered suitable from a highways perspective. No other significant constraints. Due to the Green Belt location the site is considered to be suitable if Policy Changes.

**Infrastructure**
- **Utilities**: No requirements identified.
- **Emergency Services**: No requirements identified.
- **Education**: 25 primary and 19 secondary school places would be generated. Estimated total financial contribution £614,300.
- **Health**: Contributions to primary health care based on the multiplier of £551 per dwelling cost estimate £66,100.

**Green Infrastructure**
- Use open space standard of 10% of development site (i.e. 0.807ha).

**Community Facilities**
- No requirements identified

**Other**
- No requirements identified

### Sustainability Appraisal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Housing</strong></th>
<th>++</th>
<th><strong>Flooding</strong></th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health</strong></td>
<td>+</td>
<td><strong>Waste</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Heritage and Design</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td><strong>Energy and Climate Change</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Crime</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td><strong>Transport</strong></td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social</strong></td>
<td>+</td>
<td><strong>Employment</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environment, Biodiversity and GI</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>Innovation</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landscape</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td><strong>Economic Structure</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Natural Resources</strong></td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Green Belt**
- Forms part of Urban Area Site 1
- The Site has two boundaries with the urban area and topography offers some containment. Boundaries to the north and west are strong or moderate. There is some encroachment from the New Farm buildings but development would not reduce the gap to a settlement and no impact on historic character.

**Compliance with the ACS**
- The site is located adjacent to the main urban area of Nottingham and is therefore consistent with Policy 2.3a of the ACS. The site is located within the Green Belt; Policy 3.3 of the ACS requires consideration of non-Green Belt sites before Green Belt sites.

**Highways**
- Information has been submitted by the applicant and reviewed by County Highways. It is considered that satisfactory access can be achieved to the site subject to the provision of a signalised junction and supporting information required via the planning application.

**Historic Environment**
- No Effect - it is considered that the site has no impact upon the significance of heritage assets (including their setting).

**Consultation Response**
- The site was not specifically identified but was promoted by the landowner through the ACS and the Issues & Option stage. It was considered that the site is well connected to the City Centre, is contained and would not result in a significant adverse impact on the highway. There was support for additional land to be allocated here to reduce the numbers at some of the villages. There were general objections to development North of Redhill due to the loss of greenfield and green belt land, the environmental impact and impact on local services.

**Conclusion**
- The site is adjacent to the urban area but does not make an important contribution to the purposes of the Green Belt; consideration would need to be given to which defensible features to use for the Green Belt boundary. The only major negative identified through the SA is related to the loss of agricultural land (which is not considered significant) and the proximity of the AQMA (which can be mitigated). The site can be considered for allocation.
Lambley Lane (Adj Glebe Farm View)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Number of Dwellings</th>
<th>261 homes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Brownfield or Greenfield
- Greenfield site
- Current use: Agricultural land

SHLAA Conclusion
The SUE Study found that this site was unsuitable for development. For more details please see the SUE Study. Development would be prominent and would form a long limb into the countryside. Developer no longer wishes to develop this site.

Infrastructure

Utilities
- No requirements identified

Emergency Services
- No requirements identified

Education
- 55 primary and 42 secondary school places would be generated.
- Estimated total financial contribution £1,354,900.

Health
- Contribution to primary health care likely based on standard multiplier cost estimate £143,811.

Green Infrastructure
- Use open space standard of minimum 10% of site area (0.872ha).

Community Facilities
- No requirements identified

Other
- No requirements identified

Sustainability Appraisal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing</th>
<th>Flooding</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Waste</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage and Design</td>
<td>Energy and Climate Change</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime</td>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment, Biodiversity and GI</td>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>Economic Structure</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resources</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Green Belt
- Forms part of Urban Area
- Site 17
- 12/20
- The Site is somewhat contained by topography and there are some strong defensible boundaries. The Site has no inappropriate development (although there is some outside the site to the North) and would not impact on historic character. Development of the Site would result in a moderate reduction of the gap to Lambley.

Compliance with the ACS
- The site is located adjacent to the main urban area of Nottingham and is therefore consistent with Policy 2.3a of the ACS. The site is adjacent to the Gedling Colliery/Chase Farm Strategic Location identified by Policy 2.3a(v) of the ACS and would form part of the development of that site. The principle of development of this site does not conflict with other policies in the ACS.

Highways
- The site is not considered to be acceptable in highway terms. Visibility along Lambley Lane is affected by the bend and would need to be widened and have footways provided on its western side to be acceptable. Additionally, the approved route of the Gedling Access Road runs to the south of the site; this will affect the ability to access sites along Lambley Lane.

Historic Environment
- No Effect
- It is considered that the site has no impact upon the significance of heritage assets (including their setting).

Consultation Response
- The site has not been specifically identified through previous consultation. Respondents would likely be concerned about the loss of greenfield and impact on the Green Belt. There may be some support for the site as it would form part of the Gedling Colliery redevelopment.

Conclusion
- The southern portion of the site is affected by the Gedling Access Road (as granted planning permission) and is unlikely to be available or suitable for residential use. The area to the north would extend development along Lambley Lane reducing the gap with Lambley. Development here would be disconnected from the main housing area at Gedling Colliery. Access to the site is not considered possible.
- The site is not being considered for allocation.
Killisick Lane (GBC site 3)

| Size       | 8.87 ha | Number of Dwellings | 266 homes |

Brownfield or Greenfield
- Greenfield site
- Current use: Agricultural land

SHLAA Conclusion
- The site is located within the Green Belt and a Mature Landscape Area. The MLA is best considered through a planning application or Local Plan. Likely access and highway capacity issues given size of development. Further investigation needed.

Infrastructure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Utilities</th>
<th>No requirements identified.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Services</td>
<td>No requirements identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>56 primary and 43 secondary school places would be generated. Estimated total cost £1,383,700. LEA advises will need to consider cumulative impact on primary school places and potential new primary school if adjacent sites allocated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Contributions to primary health care based on the multiplier of £551 per dwelling cost estimate £146,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Green Infrastructure
- Use open space standard of 10% of development site.

Community Facilities
- No requirements identified

Other
- No requirements identified.

Sustainability Appraisal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing</th>
<th>++</th>
<th>Flooding</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Waste</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage and Design</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Energy and Climate Change</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment, Biodiversity and Gl</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Economic Structure</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resources</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Green Belt

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forms Part of Urban Area</th>
<th>Site 11 – 11/20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sites 11 and 12</td>
<td>There is only one boundary with the urban area and moderately strong defensible boundaries. There is no encroachment but development would not reduce the gap to a settlement or impact on historic character.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site 12 – 11/20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is only one short part of the southern boundary that adjoins the urban area and the northern boundary is weak; those to the east and west are stronger. There is no encroachment but development would not reduce the gap to a settlement or impact on historic character.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compliance with the ACS
- The site is located adjacent to the main urban area of Nottingham and is therefore consistent with Policy 2.3a of the ACS. The site is located within the Green Belt; Policy 3.3 of the ACS requires consideration of non-Green Belt sites before Green Belt sites. The site is within a Mature Landscape Area and will need to be considered against Policy 10.4

Highways
- Strathmore Road may not be suitable as the sole point of access for the combined site (6/50 and 6/873). Consideration would need to be given to alternative points of access or to a decrease in the number of homes to be served from this access point.

Historic Environment
- No Effect - it is considered that the site has no impact upon the significance of heritage assets (including their setting).

Consultation Response
- The site has not been specifically identified through previous consultation. Objections are likely to relate to the loss of green belt and greenfield land, the impact on the MLA and impact on highways and other infrastructure. There may be some support for the site as it is adjacent to the urban area.

Conclusion
- The site is located adjacent to the urban area and does not make a valuable contribution to the purposes of the Green Belt. Development would cause some landscape and visual harm although this can be mitigated by a significant reduction in the area to be developed. The loss of agricultural land is not considered significant and would be outweighed by the benefits of providing houses in accordance with the ACS. Access issues mean the site should only be considered in connection with sites to the west (6/871 and 6/872).

The site can be considered for allocation.

Site 11 – 11/20

- There is only one boundary with the urban area and moderately strong defensible boundaries. There is no encroachment but development would not reduce the gap to a settlement or impact on historic character.

Site 12 – 11/20

- There is only one short part of the southern boundary that adjoins the urban area and the northern boundary is weak; those to the east and west are stronger. There is no encroachment but development would not reduce the gap to a settlement or impact on historic character.
### Howbeck Road (Land East)

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size</strong></td>
<td>9.20 ha</td>
<td><strong>Number of Dwellings</strong> 250 homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brownfield or Greenfield</strong></td>
<td>Greenfield site</td>
<td>Current use: Agricultural land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHLAA Conclusion</strong></td>
<td>Adjacent to the urban area. Extension of existing allocation - previously rejected on landscape grounds but no formal designations. Due to length of time since Local Plan it has been agreed to reconsider the landscape issues with up to date information. Subject to satisfactory landscape impact the site may be suitable. Part of the site is the Howbeck Road Housing Allocation (site ref 205). The site will be classed as suitable if policy changes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Infrastructure

| Utilities | No requirements identified |
| Emergency Services | No requirements identified |

#### Education

- 53 primary and 40 secondary school places would be generated. Estimated total financial contribution £1,297,500. LEA advises will need to consider cumulative impact on primary school places and potential new primary school if adjacent sites allocated.

#### Health

- Contributions to primary health care based on the multiplier of £551 per dwelling cost estimate £137,800

#### Green Infrastructure

- Use open space standard of minimum of 10% of site area (i.e. 0.919ha)

#### Community Facilities

- No requirements identified

#### Other

- No requirements identified

#### Sustainability Appraisal

| Housing | ++ | Flooding | 0 |
| Health | + | Waste | - |
| Heritage and Design | 0 | Energy and Climate Change | 0 |
| Crime | 0 | Transport | ++ |
| Social | + | Employment | 0 |
| Environment, Biodiversity and GI | - | Innovation | 0 |
| Landscape | - | Economic Structure | 0 |

### Green Belt

| Urban Site 13 – 10/20 | Forms part of Sites 13 and 15 |
| Urban Site 15 – 11/20 | The site has two boundaries with the urban area; one long one to the west and a short boundary to the south. The Site rises to the east which provides some containment. There is no encroachment but development would not reduce the gap to a settlement or impact on historic character. |

**Site 15**

The site is visually disconnected from the urban area and has no boundaries with it. Boundaries to the west are weak. There is some limited encroachment but development would not impact on historic character. Development would also result in a limited reduction of the gap to Woodborough but this is not considered significant.

#### Compliance with the ACS

The site is located adjacent to the main urban area of Nottingham and is therefore consistent with Policy 2.3a of the ACS. The site is located within the Green Belt; Policy 3.3 of the ACS requires consideration of non-Green Belt sites before Green Belt sites.

#### Highways

Access onto Mapperley Plains will require improvements to visibility or a reduction in speed to 40mph. Access onto Howbeck Road would only be appropriate as a secondary access.

#### Historic Environment

**No Effect** - it is considered that the site has no impact upon the significance of heritage assets (including their setting).

#### Consultation Response

The site was identified in the Issues & Options stage and was supported by the landowners who considered that there were no constraints to development. There were concerns regarding the impact on highways and risk of flooding increasing in Woodborough and Lambley

#### Conclusion

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.

**The site can be considered for allocation.**
**6/25**

Brookfield Road/Rolleston Drive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Number of Dwellings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.46 ha</td>
<td>284 homes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Brownfield or Greenfield**

Brownfield site

Current use: industrial/employment land.

**SHLAA Conclusion**

The site is currently protected for employment purposes. There would be no significant constraints to the redevelopment of site for residential purposes. Part of the site is well used for employment purposes and there is no evidence of the site being made available for alternative purposes. Given that there is no evidence of the site being available for residential use and that the site is well use for employment purposes it is not considered suitable or available for development. Part of the site is suitable see sites 6/590 and 6/18.

**Infrastructure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Utilities</th>
<th>No requirements identified.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Services</td>
<td>No requirements identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>60 primary and 45 secondary places would be generated. Estimated total financial contribution £1,464,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Contributions to primary health care based on the multiplier of £551 per dwelling cost estimate £156,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Infrastructure</td>
<td>Use public open space standard of 10% (i.e. 0.946ha)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Facilities</td>
<td>No requirements identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>No requirements identified</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sustainability Appraisal**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing</th>
<th>++</th>
<th>Flooding</th>
<th>--</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Waste</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage and Design</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Energy and Climate Change</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment, Biodiversity and GI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Economic Structure</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resources</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Green Belt**

Site is not within the Green Belt and therefore accords with ACS Policy 3.2.

**Compliance with the ACS**

The site is located within the main urban area of Nottingham and is therefore consistent with Policy 2.3a of the ACS. The site is currently protected by Policy 4; consideration would need to be given to whether it could be released.

**Highways**

Access is generally suitable. The site would likely to be developed in small parcels with a small number of dwellings being accessed from any single point. Access from the existing Eagle Close is acceptable given likely traffic speed at that location although a change in the position of the road may be appropriate.

**Historic Environment**

Major impact on Historic Asset - Significant impact on heritage building (Grade II listed) if developed. The development of the site for apartments and other communal housing may be the most appropriate form of housing, i.e., buildings set in communal spaces, to reflect the historical grouping (from records of the site).

**Consultation Response**

The site includes a site that was included in the Issues & Options stage (6/18) although the only comment related to surface water. Objections are likely to relate to the impact on highways and local infrastructure. There may be some support for the site as it is located within the urban area and involves brownfield land.

**Conclusion**

The site is sustainability located and would involve the use of non-green belt brownfield land. The part of the site accessed from Brookfield Road is well used for employment purposes by a range of businesses as shown in the Employment Background Paper and has not been promoted for alternative uses by a landowner or developer. Consideration would need to be given to how to best minimise the risk of flooding.

The part of the site previously occupied by Nottinghamshire CC is being considered for residential development under Site 6/18.

Allocation of the full site is not being considered.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6/52</th>
<th>Spring Lane</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size</strong></td>
<td>9.52 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Dwellings</strong></td>
<td>150 homes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Brownfield or Greenfield**
- Greenfield site
- Current use: former spoil tip

**SHLAA Conclusion**
- This site has planning permission for residential development (2014/0740).
- Assume delivery within years 0-5.

**Infrastructure Utilities**
- Infrastructure requirements dealt with through the grant of planning permission.

**Emergency Services**
- Ditto

**Education**
- Ditto

**Health**
- Ditto

**Green Infrastructure**
- Ditto

**Community Facilities**
- Ditto

**Other**
- Ditto

**Sustainability Appraisal**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing</th>
<th>Flooding</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Waste</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage and Design</td>
<td>Energy and Climate Change</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime</td>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment, Biodiversity and GI</td>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>Economic Structure</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Green Belt**
- 0/20
- The site is not within the Green Belt and therefore accords with ACS Policy 3.2.

**Compliance with the ACS**
- The site is located adjacent to the main urban area of Nottingham and is therefore consistent with Policy 2.3a of the ACS.

**Highways**
- Planning Permission has been granted for this site. Access arrangements have been considered and deemed acceptable.

**Historic Environment**
- No Effect - it is considered that the site has no impact upon the significance of heritage assets (including their setting).

**Consultation Response**
- The site was identified in the Issues & Options consultations. Objections related to traffic generated and coalescence with Lambley. Subsequent to the Issues & Options consultation 150 homes have been granted planning permission on a different site boundary in this location. Consultee concerns or comments about the site have been addressed through the grant of planning permission.

**Conclusion**
- Planning permission has been granted for 150 dwellings on a different site area. As such the site can be allocated in the Local Planning Document. The major negative related to landscape has been considered through the planning application which included a Landscape & Visual Impact Assessment.
- The site can be considered for allocation.
### New Farm (Site D)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Number of Dwellings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11.89 ha</td>
<td>357 homes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Brownfield or Greenfield**
- Greenfield site
- Current use: Sports Ground/Playing Field and agricultural land

**SHLAA Conclusion**
This site has been assessed as part of the SUE Study. See Site 6/466. Part of this site has been assessed as suitable for residential development by the SUE Study.

**Infrastructure**

| Utilities | Waste water – Detailed hydraulic modelling will be required once details known some local reinforcement may be required. Electricity and Gas – no abnormal requirements |
| Emergency Services | No requirements identified |
| Education | 75 primary and 57 secondary school places would be generated. Estimated total financial contribution £1,842,900. |
| Health | Contributions to primary health care based on the multiplier of £551 per dwelling cost estimate £196,700 |

**Green Infrastructure**
- Use open space minimum standard of 10% of development site (i.e. 1.189ha).

**Community Facilities**
- No requirements identified.

**Other**
- No requirements identified.

**Sustainability Appraisal**

| Housing | ++ | Flooding | 0 |
| Health | -- | Waste | - |
| Heritage and Design | - | Energy and Climate Change | 0 |
| Crime | 0 | Transport | - |
| Social | - | Employment | 0 |
| Environment, Biodiversity and GI | - | Innovation | 0 |
| Landscape | - | Economic Structure | 0 |

**Green Belt**
- Forms part of Urban Area Site 2
- The Site has two boundaries with the urban area with fairly strong defensible boundaries. There is no encroachment but development would not reduce the gap to a settlement or impact on historic character.

**Compliance with the ACS**
- The site is located adjacent to the main urban area of Nottingham and is therefore consistent with Policy 2.3a of the ACS. The site is located within the Green Belt; Policy 3.3 of the ACS requires consideration of non-Green Belt sites before Green Belt sites.

**Highways**
- Access is not possible without adjacent sites being developed. Thornton Avenue is only just wide enough for the level of development proposed and there are no clear options for improvements. A second point of access would also be required which is not possible without adjacent sites being developed.

**Historic Environment**
- Major impact on Historic Asset - The site, if developed, would have some effect on the wider setting of Bestwood Lodge (Grade II*) and listed Lodge Building (Grade II) on the approach to Bestwood Lodge. A lower density development and reduced site area would minimise the urbanisation of areas of farmland that affect the setting to Bestwood Lodge.

**Consultation Response**
- There has been extensive consultation on the New Farm site through the preparation of both the RLP and ACS. Overall there were concerns about the impact on highways and local infrastructure, loss of green belt and agricultural land and the impact on heritage. There has been support for the site as it is located adjacent to the urban area and would reduce the number of houses at the villages.

**Conclusion**
- Although the site only makes a minor contribution to the Green Belt it is not well related to the urban area with poor access via a single road. The loss of the playing pitch can be mitigated (via replacement) as could the impact on heritage assets.

  **The site is not being considered for allocation.**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6/459</th>
<th>Lambley Lane (Willow Farm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size</strong></td>
<td>15.57 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brownfield or Greenfield</td>
<td>Greenfield site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHLAA Conclusion</td>
<td>The SUE Study found that this site was unsuitable for development. For more details please see the SUE Study. Development would be prominent in an area of high landscape quality. There are issues over access as the site would require the Gedling Access Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>Utilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Services</td>
<td>No abnormal requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>72 primary and 55 secondary school places would be generated. Estimated total financial contribution £1,774,100.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Contribution to primary health care likely based on standard multiplier of £551 per dwelling estimate 187,891.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Infrastructure</td>
<td>Use open space standard of 10% of site area (1.557ha)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Facilities</td>
<td>No requirements identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>No requirements identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability Appraisal</td>
<td>Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heritage and Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environment, Biodiversity and GI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Landscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Natural Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Belt</td>
<td>Forms part of Urban Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Site 17 12/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance with the ACS</td>
<td>The site is located adjacent to the main urban area of Nottingham and is therefore consistent with Policy 2.3a of the ACS. The site is located within the Green Belt; Policy 3.3 of the ACS requires consideration of non-Green Belt sites before Green Belt sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highways</td>
<td>Both access points have the width required to accommodate the additional development. While visibility is below the required level, it is considered that the actual speed of the road at these junctions is lower than assumed and is likely to be acceptable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Environment</td>
<td>No Effect - it is considered that the site has no impact upon the significance of heritage assets (including their setting).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation Response</td>
<td>The site was not specifically identified through the Issues &amp; Options consultation. The site was promoted by a developer who identified that the site would accord with the Spatial Strategy of the ACS and considered that highway and landscape issues could be addressed. Objections are likely to relate to the loss of Green Belt, the impact on highways and the landscape and visual impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td>The GAR will form a strong defensible boundary once built; until then it is not a defensible feature that is readily recognisable. Future Green Belt reviews can consider using the route of the GAR as the defensible boundary. A small part of the site can be considered based upon existing defensible boundaries subject to the completion of the GAR. Policy could ensure that the site is not developed until after the GAR is completed (expected in 2019). Whilst there is a major negative for the Environment, Biodiversity and GI the factors at risk (LWS and TPO) can be excluded from the area to be developed and a landscape buffer included. The site can be considered for allocation on this basis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**New Farm (Site B)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th>31.81 ha</th>
<th>Number of Dwellings</th>
<th>954 homes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brownfield or Greenfield</td>
<td>Greenfield site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current use: Agricultural land</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHLAA Conclusion</strong></td>
<td>This site has been assessed as part of the SUE Study. This site is beyond the primary ridgeline and would be visually intrusive. The site is also disconnected from the existing urban area. There are also significant Highways issues with development in the New Farm area. Response dated Jan 2013 states developer no longer involved with the site.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Infrastructure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Utilities</th>
<th>No requirements identified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Services</td>
<td>No requirements identified.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Education**

- 200 primary and 153 secondary school places would be generated, Estimated total financial contribution £4,931,800.

**Health**

- Contributions to primary health care based on the multiplier of £551 per dwelling cost estimate £525,700.

**Green Infrastructure**

- Use open space standard of minimum 10% of site area (i.e. 3.18ha).

**Community Facilities**

| No requirements identified. |

**Other**

| No requirements identified. |

**Sustainability Appraisal**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing</th>
<th>++</th>
<th>Flooding</th>
<th>--</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Waste</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage and Design</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Energy and Climate Change</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment, Biodiversity and GI</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Economic Structure</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resources</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Green Belt Urban Area Site 4**

- The Site has no boundary with the existing urban area and is not visually connected to it; defensible boundaries are generally weak. There is some encroachment along the A60 but development would not reduce the gap to a settlement or impact on historic character.

**Compliance with the ACS**

- On its own the site does not accord with Policy 2 or Policy 14 as it is neither within or adjacent to the urban area or other settlements and is in an inaccessible location. If developed together with sites to the South the site could be considered to be adjacent to the main urban area of Nottingham and would therefore be consistent with Policy 2.3a of the ACS. The site is located within the Green Belt; Policy 3.3 of the ACS requires consideration of non-Green Belt sites before Green Belt sites.

**Highways**

- Access to the site is unlikely to prove problematic (subject to 3rd party land being used) as it would be from a roundabout. Consideration will need to be given to the exact works required to the roundabout.

**Historic Environment**

- Major impact on Historic Asset - Reduced site would ensure a minimum impact on the heritage assets including Grade II* Bestwood Lodge and Bestwood Pumping Station (Grade II and Scheduled Monument). Reduce site area using the topography of the land to define the site boundaries nearest the Pumping Station would ensure no impact on the heritage assets.

**Consultation Response**

- There has been extensive consultation on the New Farm site through the preparation of both the RLP and ACS. Overall there were concerns about the impact on highways and local infrastructure, loss of green belt and agricultural land and the impact on heritage. There has been support for the site as it is located adjacent to the urban area and would reduce the number of houses at the villages.

**Conclusion**

- The site is isolated from the main urban area, has high landscape sensitivity and would impact on the setting of a listed building. Although, overall, the site makes only a moderate contribution to the purposes of the Green Belt it scores highly for checking unrestricted sprawl. Consideration would also need to be given to how best to manage surface water run-off. While access can be achieved there are concerns about the impact of the level of development on the A60.

- The site is not being considered for allocation.
## Gedling Colliery/Chase Farm

### Size
- 38 ha

### Number of Dwellings
- 1120 homes

### Brownfield or Greenfield
- Predominately brownfield site
  - Current use: former colliery but includes some greenfield land

### SHLAA

#### Conclusion
- The Gedling Colliery site is included in the ACS as a Strategic Location. As such, subject to the final identification of boundaries, this site is classed as suitable. ACS Trajectory indicates expected to deliver housing during the latter part of the plan period (2022/23 to 2027/28) although it is hoped that development of the site will commence in the first five year period.

### Infrastructure

#### Utilities
- No requirements identified.

#### Emergency Services
- No requirements identified.

#### Education
- 235 primary places and 179 secondary places would be generated. The LEA considers this site and other sites in the catchment will result in pupil numbers exceeding the capacity of existing primary schools and a new primary school will be required on the site. Estimated total financial contribution towards education is £5,781,400.

#### Health
- Health Centre may be required and financial contribution based on cost multiplier of £551 cost estimate - £617,120.

### Green Infrastructure

#### Part
- Part of the site includes a Local Wildlife Site. There is scope to translocate the wildlife interest to the adjoining Country Park to compensate for any loss. 10% public open space will be required (3.3ha), potentially including contributions to adjoining off site recreation facilities.

### Community Facilities
- TBC

### Other
- No requirements identified.

### Sustainability Appraisal

#### Housing
- ++

#### Flooding
- 0

#### Health
- +

#### Waste
- 

#### Heritage and Design
- -

#### Energy and Climate Change
- 0

#### Crime
- 0

#### Transport
- ++

#### Social
- +

#### Employment
- 0

#### Environment, Biodiversity and GI
- -

#### Innovation
- 0

#### Landscape
- 0

#### Economic Structure
- 0

#### Natural Resources
- +

### Green Belt
- 0/20
  - The site is not within the Green Belt and therefore accords with ACS Policy 3.2.

### Compliance with the ACS
- The site is located adjacent to the main urban area of Nottingham and is therefore consistent with Policy 2.3a of the ACS. The site the Gedling Colliery/Chase Farm Strategic Location identified by Policy 2.3a(v) of the ACS and would form part of the development of that site. The principle of development of this site does not conflict with other policies in the ACS.

### Highways
- 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.

### Historic Environment
- Major impact on Historic Asset - The development of the site 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.

### Consultation Response
- The site was allocated by the Replacement Local Plan and forms part of a Strategic Location for Growth identified by the ACS. Consultee concerns or comments about the site have been addressed through the original allocation of the site.

### Conclusion
- The site is identified by the ACS as a strategic location. The site is to be allocated 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.

**The site can be considered for allocation.**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>6/466</strong> New Farm (SUE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Dwellings</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Brownfield or Greenfield**
- Greenfield site. Current use: largely agricultural land but includes food processing and playing pitch.

**SHLAA Conclusion**
The site has been assessed as part of the SUE Study. The site has been assessed as suitable for residential development by the SUE study provided the issue of access can be addressed. A number of overlapping sites have been put forward in this location. Only the site area indicated by the consultant is deemed potentially suitable for residential development. The site is in the Green Belt and requires access to be taken directly from Mansfield Road. County Highways have indicated they have doubts about the capacity of local roads. It is understood that the site is no longer available for development.

**Infrastructure**
- **Utilities**
  - No requirements identified
- **Emergency Services**
  - No requirements identified.
- **Education**
  - 189 primary and 144 secondary school places would be generated. Estimated total financial contribution £4,650,400.
- **Health**
  - Contributions to primary health care based on the multiplier of £551 per dwelling cost estimate £495,900
- **Green Infrastructure**
  - Use open space standard of minimum 10% of development site (i.e. 4.478ha).
- **Community Facilities**
  - No requirements identified
- **Other**
  - No requirements identified.

**Sustainability Appraisal**
- **Housing**
  - ++ Flooding
  - 
- **Health**
  - -- Waste
  - --
- **Heritage and Design**
  - -- Energy and Climate Change
  - 0
- **Crime**
  - 0 Transport
  - --
- **Social**
  - -- Employment
  - 0
- **Environment, Biodiversity and GI**
  - -- Innovation
  - 0
- **Landscape**
  - -- Economic Structure
  - 0
- **Natural Resources**
  - --

---

**Green Belt**
- This Site includes multiple Green Belt sites:
  - Site 1 – 7/20
  - Site 2 – 9/20
  - Site 3 – 12/20

**Compliance with the ACS**
The site is located adjacent to the main urban area of Nottingham and is therefore consistent with Policy 2.3a of the ACS. The site is located within the Green Belt; Policy 3.3 of the ACS requires consideration of non-Green Belt sites before Green Belt sites.

**Highways**
- Access to the site is suitable from Mansfield Road through site 6/479 as there is sufficient visibility and the required width of access can be achieved. Bestwood Lodge Drive may be suitable as an access for a small number of the homes but is unlikely to be a main access point; provision of improved footway would be required.

**Historic Environment**
- Minor impact on Historic Asset - Lesser impact than other sites proposed in this vicinity which are 6/454, 6/456 and 6/458. Reduce site area back.

**Consultation Response**
- There has been extensive consultation on the New Farm site through the preparation of both the RLP and ACS. Overall there were concerns about the impact on highways and local infrastructure, loss of green belt and agricultural land and the impact on heritage. There has been support for the site as it is located adjacent to the urban area and would reduce the number of houses at the villages.

**Conclusion**
- Development would result in the significant loss of Grade 2 and 3 agricultural land although the site makes only a limited contribution to the Green Belt and development would result in moderate landscape harm. The major negative impacts on Health and Environment in the SA can be mitigated by the provision of a replacement playing pitch and appropriate surface water management put in place to reduce the risk of flooding. Allocation of the site has previously been explored, including through the ACS. There are highway concerns about the impact of this level of development on the A60 and it is no longer being promoted for development.

The site is not being considered for allocation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6/658</th>
<th>Mapperley Golf Course</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>58 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Dwellings</td>
<td>780 homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brownfield or Greenfield</td>
<td>Greenfield site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current use: Golf Course and natural/semi-natural land</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHLAA Conclusion</td>
<td>The site is not available for development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Infrastructure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Utilities</th>
<th>No requirements identified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Services</td>
<td>No abnormal requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>164 primary and 125 secondary school places would be generated. Estimated total financial contribution £4,036,100.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Contribution to primary health care likely based on standard multiplier of £551 estimate £429,780.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Infrastructure</td>
<td>Use open space standard of 10% of site area (5.8ha) plus replacement of Golf Course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Facilities</td>
<td>No requirements identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>No requirements identified.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sustainability Appraisal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing</th>
<th>++</th>
<th>Flooding</th>
<th>-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Waste</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage and Design</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Energy and Climate Change</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment, Biodiversity and GI</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Economic Structure</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resources</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Green Belt

| 0/20 | The site is not within the Green Belt and therefore accords with ACS Policy 3.2. |

### Compliance with the ACS

| The site is located adjacent to the main urban area of Nottingham and is therefore consistent with Policy 2.3a of the ACS. The site is used as a Golf Course and proposals would need to comply with Policy 16. |

### Highways

| The main access to the site should be via Arnold Lane; a new roundabout will be built here as part of the Gedling Access Road and access from this would likely be the most appropriate solution. Further improvements to Arnold Lane may be required. Central Avenue may be suitable as a secondary access although consideration will need to be given to access to the adjacent primary school. |

### Historic Environment

| No Effect - it is considered that the site has no impact upon the significance of heritage assets (including their setting). |

### Consultation Response

| During the preparation of the ACS, there was extensive consultation regarding the development of this site; the site was also identified as an alternative site by respondents to the Issues & Options stage of the LPD. Objections included the loss of open space, the traffic and impact on infrastructure. Others however identified that the site was located adjacent to the urban area and considered that houses here would reduce the need to develop in the villages and would result in less disruption to the environment and Green Belt. |

### Conclusion

| Although the site is not within the Green Belt and adjacent to the urban area it is not available for development. If it were, mitigation would be required in the form of a replacement Golf Course and suitable protection for the LWS and TPO. The site is not being considered for allocation. |
**New Farm (Site E)**

**Size**  
70 ha  

**Number of Dwellings**  
735 homes

**Brownfield or Greenfield**  
Greenfield site  
Current use: Agricultural land

**SHLAA Conclusion**  
This site has been assessed as part of the SUE Study. See Site 6/466. This site is not suitable for residential development as it would breach the primary ridgeline which acts as a defensible boundary and include development on Grade 2 agricultural land within the green belt. Response dated Jan 2013 states developer no longer involved with the site.

**Infrastructure**

**Utilities**  
No requirements identified

**Emergency Services**  
No requirements identified.

**Education**  
154 primary and 118 secondary school places would be generated. Estimated total financial contribution £3,800,800

**Health**  
Contributions to primary health care based on the multiplier of £551 per dwelling cost estimate £405,000

**Green Infrastructure**  
Use open space minimum standard of 10% of development site (i.e., 7ha).

**Community Facilities**  
No requirements identified.

**Other**  
No requirements identified.

**Sustainability Appraisal**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing</th>
<th>++</th>
<th>Flooding</th>
<th>-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Waste</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage and Design</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Energy and Climate Change</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment, Biodiversity and GI</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Economic Structure</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resources</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Green Belt**  
The Site includes multiple Green Belt sites:  
Site 5 – 7/20  
Site 6 – 12/20  
Site 7 – 11/20  
Site 8 – 12/20

**Compliance with the ACS**  
The main part of the site is located adjacent to the main urban area of Nottingham and is therefore consistent with Policy 2.3a of the ACS. The site is located within the Green Belt; Policy 3.3 of the ACS requires consideration of non-Green Belt sites before Green Belt sites.

**Highways**  
The main access to the site is considered to be achievable from Leapool Island and/or Mansfield Road. Access from Calverton Road would require improvements to visibility or a reduction in speed limits and potential provision of footway. Vehicular access from Lime Lane likely to be acceptable via signalised junction.

**Historic Environment**  
No Effect - it is considered that the site has no impact upon the significance of heritage assets (including their setting).

**Consultation Response**  
There has been extensive consultation on the New Farm site through the preparation of both the RLP and ACS. Overall there were concerns about the impact on highways and local infrastructure, loss of green belt and agricultural land and the impact on heritage. There has been support for the site as it is located adjacent to the urban area and would reduce the number of houses at the villages.

**Conclusion**  
Landscape and Green Belt issues mean that development of the northern part of the site is not considered appropriate. Parts of the southern half are being considered for allocation subject to highways and flooding issues being addressed (see sites 6/48 and A2 for more details).  
The full site is not being considered for allocation.
**SHLAA Conclusion**

This site has been assessed as part of the SUE Study. The site is safeguarded land and requires a change in policy to come forward. The site was considered through the ACS process. May be suitable subject to policy change.

**Infrastructure**

**Utilities**
No requirements identified

**Emergency Services**
No requirements identified

**Education**
25 primary school places. Land required to extend primary school annex planned for adjoining site. 19 secondary places required. Financial contributions to education estimate £614,315.

**Health**
Potential contributions to primary healthcare likely based on the multiplier of £551 per dwelling £66,100.

**Green Infrastructure**
Public open space 10% of site area (0.59 ha)

**Community Facilities**
No requirements identified

**Other**
No requirements identified

**Sustainability Appraisal**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing</th>
<th>++</th>
<th>Flooding</th>
<th>-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Health</th>
<th>+</th>
<th>Waste</th>
<th>-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Heritage and Design</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>Energy and Climate Change</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crime</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>Transport</th>
<th>+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social</th>
<th>+</th>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environment, Biodiversity and GI</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>Innovation</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landscape</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>Economic Structure</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Natural Resources</th>
<th>---</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Green Belt**

9/20

The site is safeguarded land and is not within the Green Belt; development would, therefore, accord with ACS Policy 3.2.

**Compliance with the ACS**

The site is located adjoining the Hucknall Sub Regional Centre and is therefore consistent with Policy 2.3 3b) of the ACS. The site is not located within the Green Belt; Policy 3.3 of the ACS requires consideration of non-Green Belt sites before Green Belt sites. The principle of development of this site does not conflict with other policies in the ACS.

**Highways**

The site was assessed as part of the SUE Study and the highways assessments indicates sufficient capacity in the network. The site can be satisfactorily accessed from Hayden Lane or Papplwewick Lane.

**Historic Environment**

No Effect - it is considered that the site has no impact upon the significance of heritage assets (including their setting).

**Consultation Response**

The site was not included in the Local Planning Document Issues and Options consultation. However, there were substantial numbers objecting to the allocation of this site when it was included as part of a larger strategic site in the Publication Draft Aligned Core Strategy submitted for examination. As well as objecting to the North of Papplewick Lane strategic sites respondents generally objected to the level of housing allocated on strategic sites around Hucknall. Subsequently, this part of the Strategic site (6/460) was removed from the adopted version of the ACS following a recommendation by the Inspector to reduce impact on Hucknall due to the impact on infrastructure.

**Conclusion**

The site adjoins Hucknall and is in a sustainable location. There are no major constraints to development. The loss of agricultural land would be just under 6 ha and is not considered significant. Subject to the overall scale of development being no more than identified in the ACS the site can be considered for allocation.

The site can be considered for allocation.