

# **Local Planning Document Workshops**

## **Topic Schedules of Options and Notes**

**May 2016**

# Climate Change

## What national policy says

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) provides a context for delivering sustainable development, planning and climate change, planning for renewable energy and development and flood risk.

Paragraph 94 of the NPPF states local planning authorities should adopt proactive strategies to mitigate and adapt to climate change, taking full account of flood risk, coastal change and water supply and demand considerations. Paragraph 97 includes requirements to have a positive strategy and design policies to maximise renewable and low carbon energy development while ensuring adverse impacts are addressed. It goes on to say that authorities should consider identifying areas as suitable where this would help secure the development of such sources. Local Plans should take account of climate change over the longer term, including factors such as flood risk, coastal change, water supply and changes to biodiversity and landscape. New development should be planned to avoid increased vulnerability to the range of impacts arising from climate change.

## What the Core Strategy says

Policy 1 of the ACS seeks to ensure that all development proposals mitigate against and adapt to climate change. Development will be expected to take account of:

- a) how it makes effective use of sustainably sourced resources and materials, minimises waste, and water use. For residential development, planned water use should be no more than 105 litres per person per day;
- b) how it is located, laid out, sited and designed to withstand the long and short term impacts of climate change, particularly the effect of rising temperatures, sustained periods of high temperatures and periods of intense rain and storms;
- c) that the building form and its construction allows for adaptation to future changes in climate; and
- d) that the building form and its construction permits further reduction in the building's carbon footprint, where feasible and viable.

It also requires that development demonstrates how carbon dioxide emissions have been minimised in accordance with the energy hierarchy. Further guidance will be set out in part 2 Local Plans. Appropriate decentralised, renewable and low-carbon energy generation schemes will be encouraged.

## What the Responses to the Issues & Options say

There was a split between respondents who supported proposals to identify areas of the Borough as suitable for renewable energy and those opposed. Those in favour considered that this would ensure the protection of sensitive areas. Those opposed considered that such an area would lead to adverse cumulative impact. Alongside this there were a number of respondents, mainly local residents opposed in principle to wind turbines in the Green Belt.

In terms of reducing carbon emissions there was a small majority opposed to identify a specific target for the Borough. This was seen to be impractical and should only be addressed at the national level. Those in favour considered it would help meet the legal requirements.

Full details can be found in the Report of Consultation.

Key Question	Option	Comment	Notes
<p>Whether to identify areas suitable for commercial scale renewable energy.</p> <p>Reason – to provide guidance on NPPF paragraph 97 3rd bullet</p>	<p><u>Option A – allocate areas</u> Include a policy to identify and designate areas as suitable for renewable energy; different areas for different technologies.</p> <p><u>Option B – No policy</u> Rely on NPPF.</p>	<p><u>Option A</u> Pros – positive, responds to requirements to maximise renewable energy Cons – areas would be in the Green Belt, may not result in more renewable energy development</p> <p><u>Option B</u> Pros – protects the Green Belt as only schemes which demonstrate VSCs will be permitted Cons – not positive and doesn't maximise renewable generation</p>	
<p>How to determine applications for renewable energy schemes.</p> <p>Reason – to provide guidance on NPPF paragraph 98 2nd bullet</p>	<p><u>Option A – include a criteria based policy</u> Include a criteria based policy setting out the factors against which schemes will be assessed; what are the impacts and how it will be assessed if they are acceptable or not.</p> <p><u>Further Option</u> Identify a threshold for small scale (domestic) schemes which can be accommodated within the Green Belt.</p> <p><u>Option B – No policy</u> Rely on NPPF and ACS.</p>	<p><u>Option A</u> Pros – clear requirements, ability to identify upfront any local factors, opportunity for SPD Cons – largely repeats national policy</p> <p><u>Further Option</u> Pros – allows for some renewable energy schemes without need to demonstrated VSCs Cons – difficulty in establishing scale, may be inflexibly applied, impact on Green Belt</p> <p><u>Option B</u> Pros – flexible as can use other factors, Cons – uncertainty</p>	<p>With Option A an SPD could be produced to provide further guidance</p>

<p>Whether to set a carbon reduction target.</p> <p>Reason – to support aims of NPPF and to give guidance on ACS Policy 1.3.</p>	<p><u>Option A – include a policy</u> Establish a baseline for the carbon dioxide emissions produced in the Borough and targets for reduction.</p> <p><u>Option B – No policy</u> Rely on NPPF and general policies in support of schemes which lead to reduced carbon dioxide emissions.</p>	<p><u>Option A</u> Pros – allows CO2 reductions to be monitored, helps identify relative scale of CO2 reductions associated with schemes and the weight that can be given Cons – difficult to assess (both baseline and proposed reductions)</p> <p><u>Option B</u> Pros – flexible, little additional work Cons – no guidance on weight to give to CO2 reductions, doesn't allow CO2 reductions to be monitored.</p>	<p>Tie in with Air Quality Guidance</p>
--	---	---	---

## Matters not being debated

Issues	Comments
<p>Whether to identify any District Heating Schemes or include a policy on them.</p> <p>Reason – respond to ACS Policy 1.5</p>	<p>The potential for a district heating scheme at Gedling Colliery will be explored. ACS and NPPF considered to provide sufficient general policy on the matter to allow an application to be considered.</p>

# Natural Environment

## What national Planning policy says:

The planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by:

- Protecting and enhancing valued landscapes;
- Recognising the wider benefits of ecosystem services;
- Minimise impacts on the biodiversity networks and seek to achieve a net gain;
- Include criteria based policies to protect wildlife or geodiversity sites.

## What the Core Strategy says:

The ACS provides a vision and strategy that takes a strategic approach to the delivery, protection and enhancement of regional and sub-regional green infrastructure assets. ACS Policy 16 states that Green Infrastructure Corridors and assets of a more local level will be defined in local development documents and that Non-strategic sites contributions to GI will be assessed through local development documents.

ACS Policy 16 also requires landscape character to be protected, conserved and enhanced using the recommendations in the Greater Nottingham Landscape Character Assessment (GNLCA). Open space and parks should be protected from development and deficiencies addressed through the Local Plan Part 2.

ACS Policy 17 seeks to ensure biodiversity will be increased by protecting, enhancing existing areas and networks listed in the UK and Nottinghamshire Biodiversity Action Plan and that designated assets will be protected in line with the established hierarchy of designations. Non designated assets will also be protected.

## What the Responses to the Issues & Options say

The Woodland Trust considered that trees and woodland should be included as a key component of green infrastructure. Natural England suggested the inclusion of semi natural green space in and around urban areas. The Woodland Trust also suggested additional criteria for proposals affecting green Infrastructure to include irreplaceable habitats such as ancient woodland and veteran trees should be protected in all but the most exceptional circumstances. In addition respondents argued for all areas of ancient woodland to be identified and protected. The use of woodland access standards was also put forward as follows:

- Woodland of 2 ha within 500 m
- Woodland of 20 ha within 4 km

Currently, it is considered that only 12 % of Gedling residents are able to meet these standards.

Natural England and Nottinghamshire County Council recommended a precautionary approach to the prospective Special Protection Area (SPA) for the north of the Borough be taken. There was overwhelming support to continue to protect local wildlife sites.

In terms of landscape, there was strong support (particularly from Woodborough residents) for continuing the current approach retaining mature landscape areas identified on the proposals map. Other respondents, including Natural England, supported the use of the landscape character approach.

In general, people felt that ridgelines should continue to be protected.

Full details can be found in the Report of Consultation.

Key question	Option	Comment	Notes
<p>How to assess, enhance and protect locally significant Green Infrastructure.</p> <p>Reason – to meet guidance in NPPF 117 and 118 and Aligned Core Strategy Policy 16 and to meet local concerns in the Local Planning Document.</p>	<p><u>Option A – include a policy</u> Include a policy to protect and enhance local Green Infrastructure and designate them on the Policies Map (Proposals Map).</p> <p><u>Option B – do nothing</u> Aligned Core Strategy protects strategic Green Infrastructure only.</p>	<p><u>Option A</u> Pros - Could add detailed local GI assets</p> <p>Cons - Most of Gedling is covered by strategic GI corridors including the River Trent, Leen and the urban fringe. Are there any local corridors?</p> <p><u>Option B</u> Pros –Consistent with adopted ACS Cons – May miss opportunities to identify local priority GI assets.</p>	
<p>Include guidance setting out criteria for judging whether development proposals would be harmful to sites of Biodiversity interest.</p> <p>Reason – to provide guidance on NPPF paragraph 113 and 118 and Aligned Core Strategy</p>	<p><u>Option A – include a policy</u> Include policies based on existing Replacement Local Plan Policies ENV36 (Local Nature Conservation Designations) and ENV37 (Mature Landscape Areas).</p> <p><u>Option B – do nothing</u> Rely on National Planning Policy</p>	<p><u>Option A</u> Pros - Would provide detailed guidance protecting Local wildlife and geological sites Cons - Repeats national policy</p> <p><u>Option B</u> Pros – Relies on established NPPF and adopted ACS Cons –May miss opportunity to increase</p>	

Policy 17.	Framework and Aligned Core Strategy.	protection of biodiversity.	
<p>Include local landscape designations.</p> <p>Reason – NPPF paragraph 109 seeks to protect valued landscapes and ACS Policy 16 e) allows for identification of locally valued landscape in Local Plan Part 2.</p>	<p><u>Option A – include a policy</u> Include a policy to identify and protect local landscape designations (Mature Landscape Areas or other).</p> <p><u>Option B – no policy</u> Rely on the Landscape Character Assessment (LCA).</p>	<p><u>Option A</u> Pros - Would clearly delineate local landscape areas for protection. Cons - May dilute LCA approach which values all landscapes and which identifies the key landscape characteristics for protection and enhancement.</p> <p><u>Option B</u> Pros – Relies on robust evidence set out in GNLCA Cons – may miss opportunity to apply specific policy protection to local landscapes.</p>	

**Not to be debated**

Issues	Comments
Semi natural green space	Can be sought as part of contributions to green infrastructure networks dealt with adequately by ACS Policy 16.
Ancient woodland	Protected by the NPPF. If further areas of Ancient Woodland are identified they can be designated on the Policies Map. There is no case for increasing the level of protection for ancient woodlands above that of the NPPF and ACS which protect ancient woodland unless it can be demonstrated that the benefits outweigh the loss or harm caused.
Use of Landscape Character Assessment	Established in the ACS.
GI assets	<p>GI assets are already protected there is an option to identify local GI corridors on the Policies Map. Will also need to liaise with adjoining Councils</p> <p>The strategic GI corridors (Trent and Leen) and the urban fringe enhancement areas are protected under ACS Policy 16. The GI for Greater Nottingham Strategy volume 6 does not identify any other local GI corridors within the Gedling urban area. However, volume 6 does refer to demand for networks to link up major open spaces within the Borough and demand for additional</p>

	<p>cycleways (GI for GN volume 6 page 12). The former Gedling Colliery rail line is being promoted as a multipurpose recreational route. This route was safeguarded under RLP T3 b) as a potential rail scheme but this has not been saved.</p> <p>The Gedling Colliery/Chase Farm site will need to provide a link to this route which will need to be addressed in the development brief.</p> <p>Option – safeguard the route as a recreational route with potential for future rail use and identify on the Policies Map.</p>
Protection of the best and most versatile Agricultural land.	Covered by the NPPF.
Increasing the percentage of population with access to GI assets	Largely a question of access to existing provision and a management issue. Requires a partnership approach involving various partners including land owners. The ACS requires accessibility to GI to be monitored.
Protect and enhance public rights of way and access	Addressed in paragraph 75 of the NPPF.



# Open Space

## What national policy says

Paragraph 73 of the National Planning Policy Framework states new open space, sports and recreation facilities and opportunities for new provision should be based on robust and up-to-date assessments of the needs. Public rights of way and access should be protected and enhanced (paragraph 75). Local communities through Local Plans should be able to identify for special protection green areas of particular importance (“Local Green Spaces”) (paragraph 76). Any approved Community Forest plan may be a material consideration in preparing development plans (paragraph 92).

## What the Core Strategy says

Policy 16 (Green Infrastructure, Parks and Open Space) states new or enhanced Green Infrastructure corridors and assets should be as inclusive as possible and multifunctional. Parks and open space should be protected from development and deficiencies addressed in the Local Planning Document or other documents.

## What the Responses to the Issues and Options say

In terms of the types of open space that will be identified and protected, Ashfield District Council considered that civic spaces such as squares are also important for well-being while Nottinghamshire County Council recommended that categories of open space identified elsewhere in the Local Planning Document should also be covered by this policy. This would include local nature reserves, ancient woodland and the Calverton Mineral Line. The need for a policy on allotments was identified by Nottingham City Council.

Sport England commented that Gedling Borough’s Open Space Sport and Recreation Strategy 2012 – 2017 was not robust or up to date in relation to the needs for playing pitch provision.

In relation to a policy for Local Green Spaces, Linby and Papplewick Parish Councils considered that any policy should recognise the value of separation between urban and rural areas; enhance connectivity; establish management plans; safeguard areas from flooding; and safeguard access for the community for recreational and educational use. The NFU East Midlands Region opposed the possibility of land being designated as Local Green Space without the support of the landowner and recommended that landowners be consulted before the process begins. As for criteria required in a policy there was a consensus that the Aligned Core Strategy and NPPF contained sufficient guidance.

There was strong support for the need for the Local Planning Document to identify both Greenwood Community Forest and the proposed Sherwood Forest Regional Park.

Full details can be found in the Report of Consultation

(<http://www.gedling.gov.uk/media/documents/planningbuildingcontrol/localplanningdocument/Appendix%20B%20-%20LPD%20Report%20of%20Consultation%20-%20Topics.pdf>).

## Options

Key Question	Option	Comment	Notes
<p>How to provide new open space, sports and recreational facilities and new provision based on up-to-date assessment.</p> <p>Reason – to address paragraph 73 of National Planning Policy Framework. Policy 16 of the Aligned Core Strategy refers to increasing the quality of open spaces and increasing the percentage of population with access to Green Infrastructure assets.</p>	<p><u>Option A – include a policy (current approach)</u>            Include a policy based on existing Replacement Local Plan Policy R3 to require the provision of 10% open space to serve new residential development.</p> <p><u>Option B – include a policy (different percentages for different types)</u>            Provide different percentages for other types of open space based on local needs e.g. open space, allotments, sport pitches, parks, playing area, landscaping etc.</p>	<p><u>Option A</u>            Pros – clear policy position.            Cons – only open space protected.</p> <p><u>Option B</u>            Pros – flexible approach to meet local needs.            Cons – may need to justify different figures.</p>	<p>Sporting facilities are covered by Aligned Core Strategy Policy 13.</p>

Key Question	Option	Comment	Notes
<p>How to protect open space.</p> <p>Reason – Aligned Core Strategy Policy 16. Evidence for the Aligned Core Strategy confirms the Council's intention to set out detailed policy in the Local Planning Document, Open Space Supplementary Planning Document and Leisure documents.</p>	<p><u>Option A – include a policy (current approach)</u>  Include a policy based on existing Replacement Local Plan Policies R1 and R2 to protect existing open space.</p> <p><u>Option B – no policy</u>  Use Aligned Core Strategy Policy 16.4 and refer to the Policies Map (Proposals Map) incorporating Green Infrastructure.</p>	<p><u>Option A</u>  Pros – clear policy position.  Cons –</p> <p><u>Option B</u>  Pros – determine applications on site by site basis.  Cons – lack of certainty over areas protected.</p>	<p>Should we combine public open space and private open space or have separate policies?</p>

Key Question	Option	Comment	Notes
<p>How to define open space.</p> <p>Reason – consultation response says we should consider including civic spaces (e.g. squares), local nature reserves, ancient woodland, Calverton Mineral Line and allotments.</p> <p>Aligned Core Strategy defines open space as "all open space of public value, including not just land, but also areas of water (such as rivers, canals, lakes and reservoirs) which offer important opportunities for sport and recreation and can act as a visual amenity".</p>	<p><u>Option A – no change to existing definition</u> Retain existing definition of open space as set out in the Aligned Core Strategy.</p> <p><u>Option B – amend existing definition</u> Revisit definition of open space to include civic spaces, local nature reserves, ancient woodland, allotments and recreational routes.</p>	<p><u>Option A</u> Pros – no change to definition. Cons – does not cover all types of open space.</p> <p><u>Option B</u> Pros – clearer definition of open space. Cons – may cause interpretation issue. Inconsistency with Aligned Core Strategy.</p>	<p>Definition of open space in the Aligned Core Strategy does not specify types of open space.</p> <p>If preference is for Option A, are separate policies needed for civic spaces, local nature reserves, ancient woodland, recreational routes and allotments?</p> <p>Definition of Green Infrastructure in the Aligned Core Strategy states green space include "parks, open spaces, playing fields, woodlands, wetlands, grasslands, river and canal corridors, allotments and private gardens".</p> <p>May need to protect golf courses as Policy R4 of the Replacement Local Plan not being replaced by the Aligned Core Strategy.</p>

Key Question	Option	Comment	Notes
<p>Whether to continue with existing Replacement Local Plan Policy R7 to provide leisure uses within the existing Greenwood Community Forest and the proposed Sherwood Forest Regional Park.</p> <p>Reason – Replacement Local Plan Policy R7 not being replaced by the Aligned Core Strategy.</p>	<p><u>Option A – include a policy (current approach)</u>  Include a policy based on existing Replacement Local Plan Policy R7 to support the principles of the existing Greenwood Community Forest and the proposed Sherwood Forest Regional Park and show on the Policies Map (Proposals Map).</p> <p><u>Option B – no policy</u>  No policy. Express support in lower case text.</p>	<p><u>Option A</u>  Pros – clear policy position.  Cons – provides broad support but no more.</p> <p><u>Option B</u>  Pros – streamlined plan.  Cons – no policy position.</p>	

#### Matters not being debated

Issue	Comment
<p>Approach to identification of Local Green Spaces by local communities.</p> <p>Reason – to address paragraph 76 of the National Planning Policy Framework</p>	<p>Question regarding the approach has been asked in the Issues and Options document.</p>

# Key Issues from Climate Change, Natural Environment and Open Space Workshop 26.01.2015

## Present:

Stephen Walker (Friends of Moor Pond Woods)  
Emily Quilty (Calverton Parish Council)  
John Charles-Jones (Woodborough Parish Council)  
Patrick Smith (Woodborough Parish Council)  
JanTurton (Woodborough Parish Council)  
Gill Costello (Friends of Bestwood Country Park)  
Catherine Seaton (WACAT)  
Ben Driver (Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust)  
Mark Glover (Gedling Conservation Trust)  
Kira Besh (Mansfield District Council)  
Faye McElwain (Broxtowe Borough Council)  
Neil Oxby (Ashfield District Council)

Dawn Alvey (Nottingham City Council)  
Terry Pennick (WAG)  
Mike Rowan (WAG)  
Les Warner (WAG)  
Nick Crouch (Nottinghamshire County Council)  
Tom Dillarstone (Gedling Borough Council)  
Graeme Foster (Gedling Borough Council)  
Alison Gibson (Gedling Borough Council)  
Ian McDonald (Gedling Borough Council)  
Mel Cryer (Gedling Borough Council)  
WAG – Woodborough Action Group  
WACAT – Woodborough and Calverton  
Against Turbines

## Climate Change

### **Areas Suitable for Renewable Energy / General Renewable Policy**

- A Supplementary Planning Document considering size and location of wind turbines would be helpful.
- Questioned whether by not having suitable areas for renewable energy identified has proved a problem for the determination of planning applications.
- Questioned whether there is a need for renewable energy in Gedling Borough and specifically a need for wind energy.
- No clear definition between domestic and commercial supply but confirmed the way to assess impacts in the green belt is the same – need to demonstrate “very special circumstances”.
- Considered that including a policy would be a huge undertaking with the need to consider all types of renewables of differing scale and design.
- Questioned whether there would be a mechanism to bring together different overlays such as local sensitive areas, wildlife areas, sensitive views. Importance of identifying which landscape areas are important/sensitive now as the focus should not just be on windy areas.
- Questioned whether there has been collaboration with adjoining areas as view Borough is too small an area for zonation.
- It was considered that the suitable areas were “few and far between”.
- Viewed that the Land Use Consultants mapping was very simplistic and that many factors need to be incorporated.
- Viewed it would be difficult to define areas as site specifics need to be considered and also the influence of commercial need and viability.
- Considered that higher quality agricultural land should be safeguarded for food production not energy.
- Potential energy opportunities from water courses should be explored.

- Considered appropriate to continue with the guidelines used in the Papplewick report for the assessment of applications.
- Confirmed that draft policy wording for wind turbine developments is not written in order of importance.
- Considered the criteria, which are only headings, need further clarification as to under what circumstances an impact would be acceptable.
- Noted that Newark and Sherwood have an adopted SPD on Wind Turbines.
- Noted that blanket separation distances from turbines is outside national guidance.
- Surprise expressed that there is a clause on decommissioning but it was confirmed that currently turbines lifespan is approximately 20/25 years.
- Confirmed the need to reapply for permission if renewable development requires replacement.

## **Carbon Reduction**

- Requirement for Borough wide baseline assessment to help develop a target as noted that if emissions are not measured then they can't be managed.
- The number of solar panels could be a measurable input, but not all solar panels require planning permission (so the figure is not considered reliable).
- Confirmed government target of zero carbon homes by 2016. The focus is on domestic dwellings. Thoughts on introducing allowable solutions where as part of ensuring new development is zero carbon CO2 emissions savings are secured off site.
- Importance of encouraging the reduction in carbon dioxide emissions as highlighted in national policy and the energy hierarchy in the ACS; a target would focus elected members' minds.

## **Natural Environment**

### **Local Green Infrastructure Corridors**

- Importance of local provision and their identification was noted.
- Strategic and local corridors should be shown on the Local Plan.
- Considered the current system is not working as wildlife sites have been destroyed with no meaningful mitigation.
- Nottinghamshire County highlighted the biodiversity opportunity mapping process which is seeking to identify new areas which has involved experts and local people. Partially covers Gedling Borough but there is no deadline for completion.
- Need to consider the effectiveness of existing policy for example TPO's and need to ensure up to date assessments.
- Importance of not just concentrating on strategic corridors as those areas not identified will be vulnerable to degradation. Wildlife corridors need more integration and development of connections. Need a more holistic approach and identify areas that are of importance to local people.
- Impact on the potential Special Protection Area was raised.
- Questioned whether just considering publicly owned spaces as the countryside should not be viewed as a playground. Potential conflict with public rights of way over private land was noted.
- Value of redundant mineral lines was noted.

## **Local Wildlife and Geological Sites**

- NPPF considers the introduction of a criteria based policy but difficult to distinguish between sites.
- Viewed biodiversity opportunity mapping is required as there are a number of sites which are not designated or identified. For Gedling Borough we have one SSSI and three LNRs.
- Point c) of the draft policy was considered essential in terms of habitats.
- Importance of gaining landowner support for local designation was raised.
- Local green space overlaps with sites of importance for nature conservation. Mansfield DC asked their local population to nominate sites and this has given a number of locally important sites a high level of protection.
- Importance of compiling a local list of important sites was stressed.
- Important to note that local sites include biological and geological sites.
- Appropriate mitigation ensuring that it is taken seriously and use of biodiversity offsetting was raised.
- Mitigation measures for the pSPA will be very dependent on public behaviour.
- Importance of talking to local parishes particularly as Natural England do not have the resources to respond to local applications.
- Concern over need to monitor and police unauthorised removal of trees.
- Noted that local green space can be introduced at a local level through Neighbourhood Plans.
- Importance of the Green Space Strategy was raised which identifies key green spaces.
- Working with the County Council was seen as a good way to identify the networks.

## **Local Landscape Designations**

- Questioned whether suggestions were made on an informed basis as descriptions are open to value judgements.
- Views of local people are important.
- Need to consider historic landscapes and how landscapes evolve with time and not just designated assets.
- Importance of understanding connectivity.
- Protection of hedgerows was raised as a concern.

## **Open Space**

### **Providing New Open Space**

- Public open space should be more accessible. Noted that 10% provision in line with planning applications is not always truly accessible – eg swales.
- Starting point should be a comprehension of the deficiencies in particular types of open space with consideration of intensity of use and quality. Policy should allow for improvements to open space.
- Current 10% policy on applications of 0.4ha is considered clear and helps to improve quality of developments although some reservations were expressed over the use of a blanket %
- Current policy allows for offsite provision.
- Potential of including a % as a minimum target but it was noted that by using a clear % developers can build this into their viability assessments of sites.
- Taylors Croft was raised as an important green space in Woodborough.
- Green flag parks were considered and the need to have a management plan in place.



## Protecting Open Space

- Provides clarity and considered a welcome inclusion in a Local Plan.
- Questioned whether rolling forward existing protected areas.
- Protection of allotments was seen as an important issue.
- Questioned whether areas of new open space provided in planning permissions would be subsequently protected – require policy confirmation.
- Questioned whether there should be a distinction between private and public open space and that separate policies would be preferable. Although limited access private space provides a visual amenity function.

## Definition of Open Space

- Importance of existing and proposed civic space was noted.
- Interpretation is key and whether considered part of the public landscape and public amenity.
- Thoughts on the use of a framework and then ability to insert additional spaces.
- Use of the old definitions in PPG 17 was considered.

## Greenwood Community Forest/Sherwood Forest Regional Park

- Inclusion of a policy was considered more preferable than no policy.
- Information subsequently provided on the Greenwood Community Forest, see below:-



Greenwood  
Community Forest sur

- See also the following link:-  
[http://www.greenwoodforest.org.uk/images/content/pdfs/greenwood\\_strategic\\_plan.pdf](http://www.greenwoodforest.org.uk/images/content/pdfs/greenwood_strategic_plan.pdf)

## Matters not being debated

- Importance of engaging more closely with local community was raised.
- Concern that people are not fairly represented. Need to be inventive and ensure a true cross section of the population are involved – eg engagement with local schools, churches.
- Viewed that the parish councils have an obligation to be more actively involved.
- Contact with Local Friends groups would be beneficial – Gill Costello is an important contact.
- Need for up to date survey of TPOs in Woodborough Conservation Area was raised.

## **Economic and Employment Development**

### **What national policy says**

Paragraph 18 – 19 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states the Government is committed to securing economic growth and that the Planning system does everything it can to support sustainable economic growth. Paragraph 22 advises that planning policies should avoid the long term protection of employment land which has little prospect of being used for that purpose.

As set out at paragraph 21 of the NPPF Local Planning Authorities should:

- Set out a clear vision and economic strategy for the area;
- Set criteria or identify strategic sites;
- Support existing business sectors;
- Plan for clusters;
- Identify priority areas for economic regeneration; and
- Facilitate flexible working practices such as integration of live work units.

#### **Rural areas**

Paragraph 28 of the NPPF states that planning policies should support economic growth in rural areas

- Support expansion of rural business through conversion of rural buildings and well-designed new buildings
- Promote diversification of agricultural and land based rural business
- Support rural tourism
- Promote retention of local services and community facilities in villages

### **What the Core Strategy says**

The ACS provides a vision and strategy that seeks to strengthen and diversify the local economy through the allocation of strategic sites in the ACS and through the provision of a wide range of sites in Part 2 Local Plans. The strategy seeks to build on Greater Nottingham's strength as a science city and core city. Emphasis is placed on supporting knowledge based sectors in particular through the provision of commercial floorspace.

More specific to Gedling are the requirements set out in the ACS for:

- A minimum of 10 ha for B1,2,8
- A minimum of 23,000 sq. m office

#### The Employment Land Study 2015 (ELFS)

New evidence on employment prospects, labour demand and need for employment space has been commissioned from consultants NLP. This work justifies the level of office floorspace set out in the various Core Strategies adopted across Greater Nottingham but estimates more industrial and warehousing land would be required above the minimum targets set in the various Core Strategies. There is sufficient employment land identified in Gedling to meet likely need.

#### **What the Responses to the Issues & Options say**

Most respondents supported continuing the approach to the protection of existing employment sites although some respondents did consider some could be released for other uses especially housing. There was unanimous support for permitting existing businesses to expand on site where appropriate and for flexibility to allow non-traditional employment uses on industrial sites. The reuse of rural buildings for employment was also strongly supported.

Full details can be found in the Report of Consultation.

#### **Options**

Key questions	Options	comments	conclusion
Is there a sufficient range and portfolio of employment sites?  Reason – to meet the requirement of the paragraph 22 of the NPPF.	<b>Discussion</b> Is the right type of site available in Gedling Borough by size, type, quality, location? For e.g. starter units, grow on space, small sites, or more sites at Key Settlements?		Strategic sites are allocated through the ACS and the LPD may allocate smaller non-strategic employment sites. In terms of quantity the supply of industrial land is sufficient.

<p>Do we make specific provision for non-business class sectors including on existing employment areas?</p> <p>Reason – to meet the requirement of paragraphs 18 to 19.</p>	<p><b>Option A</b> Continue with policy E3 a) which allows for expansion, conversion or redevelopment of existing employment sites for employment uses (other than main town centre uses).</p> <p><b>Option B</b> Include other non-employment uses in Policy E3 a) including: Industrial or commercial training facilities; community facilities; specialised leisure uses which cannot be accommodated in centres because of their scale and /or operational impacts; essential public utilities development; and ancillary facilities and services which support the functioning of the site including child care facilities, for example nurseries.</p> <p><b>Option C</b> Include a criteria based policy to judge non business class on merit.</p>	<p><i>Pros</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• protects employment land and retains local employment</li> </ul> <p><i>Cons</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• inflexible and does not reflect trends towards a more service based local economy</li> </ul> <p><i>Pros</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• would increase certainty</li> <li>• May encourage job growth</li> </ul> <p><i>cons</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• can't produce a definite or exhaustive list of specified uses</li> </ul> <p><i>Pros</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• more flexible than 1B</li> </ul> <p><i>Cons</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• less certainty</li> </ul>	<p>The ACS is more flexible about accommodating non B1 uses such as day care nurseries and also because of changes to the Use Classes Order which permits change of use from business class to childcare, nurseries, free schools and also B1 a) (office) to residential.</p> <p>Note the business class is defined in the Use Classes Order and it includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• B1 a) office</li> <li>• B1 b) research and development</li> <li>• B1 c) light industry</li> <li>• B2 manufacturing</li> <li>• B8 warehousing and distribution</li> </ul>
---	--	---	---

<p>How do we protect and retain attractive and good quality employment sites?</p> <p>What evidence should be provided in order to release sites from employment use?</p> <p>Reason - to meet the requirements of NPPF paragraph 22 and ACS Policy 4.</p>	<p><b>Discussion</b></p> <p>How should we determine market attractiveness?</p> <p>Request evidence based on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• an extensive marketing exercise – but for how long?</li> </ul> <p>What evidence is required to determine whether a site is of good quality or not? Request evidence based on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• site characteristics</li> <li>• whether the site is capable of economic reuse?</li> </ul> <p>How do we judge if a site has potential to support regeneration? Request evidence based on accessibility to areas in need of regeneration; and/or based on site characteristics.</p>		<p>NPPF states that LPAs should avoid the long term protection of employment sites that are unlikely to be used for their intended purpose.</p> <p>ACS Policy 4 seeks to protect and retain employment sites that are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Attractive to the market</li> <li>• good quality</li> <li>• Sites that support regeneration and start-ups.</li> </ul>
<p>How do we secure local labour agreements?</p> <p>Reason – GBC economic development priority.</p>	<p><b>Option: A</b></p> <p>Specify in policy a requirement to secure local labour agreements through S106 planning obligations on new employment developments.</p> <p><b>Option: B</b></p> <p>Rely on ACS Policy 19</p>	<p><i>Pros</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• supports business growth</li> </ul> <p><i>Cons</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a potential burden on business</li> </ul>	<p>May require thresholds to be defined. Should policy be in a supplementary planning document?</p> <p>S106 planning obligations are legally binding agreements between the LPA and developer under the Planning Act.</p>

<p>Should we have a policy to control working from home?</p> <p>Reason – to meet the requirements of NPPF paragraph 21.</p>	<p><b>Option: A</b> Include policy permitting working from home similar to Replacement Local Plan E6 to address amenity issues.</p> <p><b>Option B</b> Rely on NPPF and other general policy.</p>	<p><i>Pros</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• promotes home working. Gives more certainty.</li> </ul> <p><i>Cons</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• may be repetitive of other policies.</li> </ul> <p><i>Pros</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• would not repeat other policies</li> </ul> <p><i>Cons</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• less certainty</li> </ul>	
<p>Is there a need for a specific policy on agricultural and other land based rural businesses?</p> <p>Reason – to meet the requirement of NPPF paragraph 28.</p>	<p><b>Option: A</b> Include a general criteria based policy to support agricultural and other rural land based diversification</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Must relate to the farming enterprise</li> <li>• Compatible with Green Belt</li> <li>• Utilise existing buildings</li> </ul> <p><b>Option: B</b> Rely on NPPF and other general policy?</p>	<p><i>Pros</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• supports rural economy</li> <li>• would provide guidance towards achieving acceptable land based schemes.</li> </ul> <p><i>Cons</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• overlaps Green Belt policy.</li> </ul> <p><i>Pros</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• provides positive support in principle</li> </ul> <p><i>Cons</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• provides little detail on acceptability of schemes</li> </ul>	<p>Please note: all rural areas in Gedling Borough are in the Green Belt.</p>

## Matters not being debated

Key Questions	Comments
Strategic employment allocations	This is addressed in the GBC ACS
Bad neighbour uses	There are considered to be no significant areas resulting in nuisance
Hazardous industries	Potentially polluting developments are to be addressed by a separate development management policy. Also separate legislation governs hazardous processes and planning policy should not duplicate such controls.
Expansion of firms on the same site	No significant issues were raised at the Issues and Options Stage. However, draft Policy wording based on E5 is provided for discussion.
Windfall employment sites not located in Green Belt	No significant issues were raised at the Issues and Options Stage. However, draft Policy based on E4 is provided for discussion.
Overall quantity of employment land	Existing supply is sufficient to meet quantitative needs
Protecting and retaining employment sites	The ACS requires Local Plan Part 2 to have a policy protecting attractive and good quality sites.

## **Town Centres**

What national planning policy says:

The National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 23) states that planning policies should be positive, promote competitive town centre environments and set out policies for the management and growth of centres across Gedling Borough.

- Support vitality and viability of town centres;
- Define the network and hierarchy of centres;
- Define the extent of town centres and primary shopping areas;
- Set policies that make clear which uses will be permitted in primary and secondary centres;
- Encourage a diverse retail offer;
- Retain enhance existing markets;
- Allocate a range of suitable sites; and
- Allocate appropriate edge of centre sites.

### **What the Core Strategy says**

The Aligned Core Strategy sets out the network and hierarchy of centres. Within Gedling Borough the following centres are identified:

- Arnold as a Town Centre
- Carlton Square as a District Centre
- Burton Joyce, Calverton, Carlton Hill, Gedling Village, Gedling Colliery/Chase Farm, Mapperley Plains, Netherfield and Ravenshead as Local Centres

The Core Strategy seeks to protect the viability and vitality of centres and this includes widening the range of uses whilst maintaining a strong retail character. The City Centre will be the main focus for office development however; office development of a lesser scale will be promoted in the town centres which include Arnold.



## Responses to Issues and options

Most people supported the continuation of existing town centre boundaries. People also expressed support for continuing the policy of limiting non A1 uses in centres although there was some support for using separate percentage thresholds for each use.

Generally people considered that the threshold of 2,500 sq. m for requiring retail impact assessment for out-of-centre development proposals was correct although the City Council suggests 1,000 sq. m as being more appropriate.

Other comments referred to the need for improvements to centres such as Arnold and Calverton.

Key questions	Options	Comments	Notes
<p>What should the boundaries of the town centres be? Should any include secondary shopping areas? Should any sites (in or edge of centre) be allocated for development</p> <p>Reason – to meet requirement of NPPF paragraph 23 3<sup>rd</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> bullet.</p>	<p><u>Option A</u> Maintain existing town centre boundaries</p> <p><u>Option B</u> Make alterations to existing boundaries</p>	<p><u>Option A</u> Pros - maintains the existing centre, gives certainty. Cons - may not reflect current situation, no opportunities for new sites</p> <p><u>Option B</u> Pros - allows centre to evolve, may provide opportunity for more investment</p> <p>Cons – sites may not be available or deliverable.</p>	<p>The Retail Study provides recommendations on changes to some boundaries. It also identifies a level of growth that should be accommodated in town centres during the plan period.</p> <p>Maps of town centres to be provided.</p>
<p>What uses should be permitted in town centres?</p>	<p><u>Option A</u> Maintain the current 35% limit and no grouping of four or</p>	<p><u>Option A</u> Pros – clear and understood policy, easy to establish</p>	

Reason – to meet requirement of NPPF paragraph 23 3 <sup>rd</sup> bullet.	<p>more non-A1 frontage.</p> <p><u>Option B</u> Policy to ensuring that a single non-A1 use class does not exceed x% of the centre and there is no grouping of four or more non-A1 frontage.</p> <p><u>Option C</u> Set different percentages for non-A1 uses for each centre individually and ensure is no grouping of four or more non-A1 frontage.</p> <p><u>Alternative</u> Drop policy on non-A1 grouping or replace with more flexible criteria based approach.</p>	<p>Cons - 35% limit has been exceeded in some centres, potentially too restrictive</p> <p><u>Option B</u> Pros - could maintain a balanced variety of uses, more flexible Cons - may be difficult to implement in practice, could lead to reduction in A1 uses in centres</p> <p><u>Option C</u> Pros - flexible and recognises the individuality of centres. Cons – complicated and no consistency between centres</p> <p><u>Alternative</u> Pros – less restrictive, criteria could reflect nature of use rather than use class Cons – dropping could break up centres reducing compact nature, criteria subjective and could be inconsistently applied</p>	
<p>Should we set our own impact assessment threshold?</p> <p>Reason – to better reflect local circumstances. Permitted to</p>	<p><u>Option A</u> Use the 2,500 sq. m threshold in the NPPF.</p> <p><u>Option B</u></p>	<p><u>Option A</u> Pros - Established limit in the NPPF, many proposals below this have provided anyway Cons – many stores which</p>	

do so by NPPF para 26.	<p>Use 500sqm as recommended by the Retail Study</p> <p><u>Option C</u> Use another figure justified by evidence.</p>	<p>may have an impact on centres not covered</p> <p><u>Option B</u> Pros – reflects local circumstances, better protects town centres Cons – extra requirement on developers</p> <p><u>Option C</u> Pros – may reflect local circumstances, may protect town centres Cons – needs to be justified by evidence, extra requirement for developers</p>	
<p>How should we approach proposals for out-of-town stores?</p> <p>Reason – to meet requirement of NPPF Para 23 8<sup>th</sup> bullet.</p>	<p><u>Option A</u> Continue existing approach from Policy S12 including restrictions on goods to be sold (i.e. only ‘bulky’ goods) and size of units.</p> <p><u>Option B</u> No policy and rely on sequential and impact tests from NPPF</p>	<p><u>Option A</u> Pros – adds protection to town centres Cons – condition wording needs to be reviewed, change in policy since S12 drafted means has not been successful in limiting out of centre uses</p> <p><u>Option B</u> Pros – clear and understood requirements, flexible and focusses on actual proposal Cons – lack of available sites</p>	<p>Legal advice in respect of a certificate of lawful use relating to unit 1B at Victoria Retail Park is that conditions restricting non-food to primarily bulky goods are not sufficiently concise although it was clear that food sales are not permitted. The condition cannot exclude the provisions of the UCO which allows other types of A1 retail uses to be undertaken without the need for planning permission but food is clearly excluded. The</p>

		could lead to greater impact on town centres	Policy S12 wording is though quite clear about what goods can be sold.
<p>What planning policies are required to retain/enhance Arnold Market? How could other markets be encouraged?</p> <p>Reason – requirement of NPPF Para 23 5<sup>th</sup> bullet.</p>	<p><u>Option A</u> A general policy supporting proposals that retain/enhance Arnold Market or lead to the creation of new markets elsewhere.</p> <p><u>Option B</u> Include a more detailed policy designating sites for markets and schemes of improvement/creation</p>	<p><u>Option A</u> <u>Pros</u> – flexible approach, supports appropriate schemes <u>Cons</u> – missed opportunity?</p> <p><u>Option B</u> <u>Pros</u> – strong support for new/improved markets <u>Cons</u> – significant work, inflexible, perhaps unrealistic</p>	
<p>What approach should be taken to development within small parades of shops?</p> <p>Reason – respond to issues raised by DM. Adopt a less restrictive approach</p>	<p><u>Option A</u> Require evidence of sequential and impact assessment.</p> <p><u>Option B</u> Set policy that exempts small scale, convenience stores (A1, A3 and A5) in small parades from the sequential and impact test</p> <p><u>Alternative</u> Apply exemption more generally to small scale convenience retail development (A1, A3 and A5)</p>	<p><u>Option A</u> <u>Pros</u> – consistent approach, high level of protection for town centres, application of sequential approach allows for out of centre locations <u>Cons</u> – adds costs and complexity for small businesses</p> <p><u>Option B</u> <u>Pros</u> – less restrictive, allows development in smalls parades <u>Cons</u> – unclear if permitted by NPPF, increased competition for town centres</p>	

		<u>Alternative</u> Pros – less restrictive, allows development in small parades, NPPF already takes this approach for ‘rural’ development. Cons – unclear if permitted by NPPF, increased competition for town centres	
Should we restrict the opening of new A5 (Fast Food Takeaway) near schools?  Reason – respond to comments from public health teams.	<u>Option A</u> Include a policy stating that planning permission will not be granted for new A5 uses within 400 metres of secondary schools.  <u>Option B</u> No policy. Each case to be treated on its own merits.	<u>Option A</u> Pros – reduces opportunity for unhealthy eating and littering by pupils Cons – limited evidence that a significant issue, overly restrictive, A5 use does not always mean unhealthy, may need to be worded to allow within town centres and small parades  <u>Option B</u> Pros – healthy eating still a material consideration in planning applications Cons – no presumption that proposals close to schools would be refused	400 metres is around a 5 minute walk.
What approach should we take to security shutters?  Reason – consider existing	<u>Option A</u> Continue existing approach as set out in S17.	<u>Option A</u> Pros – consistent and understood approach, Cons – may not provide	

policy S17. Respond to issues from DM	<u>Option B</u> Make changes to S17  <u>Option C</u> No policy and rely on general design policies.	sufficient detail in all cases  <u>Option B</u> Pros – able to reflect DM requirements Cons – may add complexity to policy  <u>Option C</u> Pros – straightforward, flexible Cons – uncertainty, may result in inappropriate shutters	
---------------------------------------	---	---	--

### Matters not to be debated

Issue	Reason	Conclusion
Define a network and hierarchy of centres	Requirement of NPPF Para 23 2 <sup>nd</sup> bullet	This is established in ACS Policy 6. Consideration will be given to change to the status of Carlton Sq. recommended by the Retail Study.
Role of residential and upper floors	Requirement of NPPF Para 23 9 <sup>th</sup> bullet	Will role forward Policy S3 which adopts a flexible approach.

# **Key Issues from Employment and Retail Workshop**

## **31.07.15**

### **Present:**

Wayne Scholter (Aldergate Properties)  
Mike Hope (Calverton PC)  
Jack Ashworth (Bestwood PC)  
Mike Robinson (Bestwood PC)  
Dave Lawson (Broxtowe BC)

Neil Oxby (Ashfield DC)  
Julie Beresford (Gedling BC)  
Tom Dillarstone (Gedling BC)  
Graeme Foster (Gedling BC)

### **Employment**

#### **Quality/Location of Employment Land**

- Without details of the existing sites it is difficult to comment<sup>1</sup>.
- A general view that amount of land available is sufficient but may not be in the best possible location.
- Start sites, small and medium units generally required. Gedling unlikely to be popular for warehousing/distribution due to relative lack of transport links
- Need to ensure that sites allocated for employment do come forward for that use
- But if market not providing then either not required or not viable. If not coming forward for employment question should GBC become involved to ensure does come forward?
- Concern that land released from the Green Belt for employment purposes will not be used for employment but for housing by the backdoor.

#### **Uses on employment sites**

- Consensus view that need to be flexible and allow a wide range of uses on employment sites.
- Those uses identified (training facilities, certain leisure uses, child care) are an appropriate start and may help overcome barriers to work.
- Potential policy approaches include
  - Identifying principles as to when a use is acceptable on employment sites;
  - Specifying uses which are unacceptable on employment sites.

#### **Protection of existing uses**

- Should only be protecting good quality sites in appropriate locations to start with. Need to ensure that assessments of the quality of employment sites are up to date and robust.
- In terms of information need to ensure that site has been adequately marketed for a range of uses at a reasonable price. Difficult to set specific requirements upfront as will depend on market and site specific factors

---

<sup>1</sup> The Retail Study and Employment Land Forecasting Study will be available on the GBC web site and workshop attendees will be alerted about their availability.

### **Local Labour Agreements**

- Generally supportive of aims as can be used to help 'sell' development to the public
- Policy needs to ensure that approach is viable and proportionate and does not hold up development commencing
- Current thresholds of 0.5 ha or 10 dwellings may be need to be raised to ensure that only the largest developments are covered;
- Alternatively do not have as a policy requirement but use on an informal basis.

### **Working from home**

- Need to confirm whether a material change in use has occurred. If not a planning application may not have been required
- A general view that other policies (e.g. on amenity) and enforcement action should prove sufficient to mean a specific policy on working from home is not needed.
- Similarly, while generally supportive of live-work units, there was not seen to be a need for a specific policy.

### **Rural Land Based Diversification**

- General support for the aims of allowing diversification
- Difficulties in applying this in Green Belt areas. Does development harm the openness and does diversification constitute the 'very special circumstances' to allow inappropriate development.
- Concerns that agricultural workers dwelling policy is being used as a backdoor to allow general residential use
- Unclear if specific policy is required in LPD.

### **Town Centres**

#### **Town Centre Boundaries**

- Without details from the Retail Study being available it was difficult to comment on the need for any necessary town centre boundary changes.
- For information, it was explained that the Retail Study generally concludes that the boundaries of the GBC centres are fine apart from Carlton Square where there is a recommendation to review whether retail units on Burton Road are included within the Centre.
- GBC should consider extending Arnold primary zone to the north.
- Arnold town centre is a GBC priority and in the Labour manifesto.
- The linear nature and length of the shopping area is not conducive to encouraging linked trips from the southern end.

#### **What uses should be permitted in Town Centres**

- The view was expressed that frontage policies were originally brought in to control A2 financial uses in the 1980s which is not so much of an issue now.
- Policies should allow a wider mix of retail uses in both primary and secondary shopping areas with the latter including office.



- It was clarified that the Retail Study considered that Arnold Town Centre was performing fairly well.
- A3 hot food takeaways uses were not considered to be a problem in Arnold as the Centre tends to have cafes catering for shoppers.
- There were mixed views about setting percentage limits to control particular uses. In general percentage limits would be acceptable provided there was strong justification to back up the actual figure. A totally laissez faire approach was not supported.
- Grouping – generally agreed that any policy would have to be flexible and not too rigid in terms of preventing unacceptable groupings of non-A1 frontages.

### **Retail Impact**

- It was noted that the Retail Study was recommending that a threshold of 500 sq. m or more of retail floorspace would be a sound limit for requiring a retail impact assessment to be prepared for retail proposals that are not in a town centre.
- There was a consensus that 500 sq. m would be acceptable in principle provided it is justified.

### **Out-of-Town**

- There was some support for having no policy and relying on National Planning Policy Framework to control out-of-centre proposals.
- The point was made that there might be a case to go beyond National Planning Policy to add more protection although it was noted that GBC would need to allocate in centre and edge of centre sites to meet any identified need for retail floorspace if a more restrictive approach to out-of-town retail proposals was opted for. In this context it was felt that no firm conclusions could be drawn on this particular issue in advance of the publication of the Retail Study.

### **Markets**

- Discussion took place on how to retain and enhance Arnold Market which could include themed markets such as “Farmers Markets” although this had been tried with limited success and such themed markets were in any case occasional.
- Whilst noting that Arnold market is in private ownership GBC is seeking to engage with the landowner. A Nottingham Post survey had indicated that local people want to retain the market in Arnold. The market space could also be used more flexibly to include “events”.
- There was general support for a general policy supportive of retaining and enhancing Arnold Market although it was questioned whether this should be a “standalone” policy.

### **Small Parades**

- The change of use of A1 shops in small parades to A3/A4/A5 uses requires the application of the sequential approach which can be fairly onerous for small businesses.
- Generally people thought that applying the sequential approach was too restrictive and it was suggested that GBC consider rolling forward the Local

Shopping Needs Policy or permit changes from A1 to A3/A4/A5 in small parades without the need to demonstrate compliance with the sequential test.

- Applying the sequential test to A2 financial services was felt by some to be justifiable on the basis that the catchment area of such businesses would be far wider than the immediate locality although others disagreed.
- It was debated whether this more flexible approach should apply to “corner shops” although the wording would have to be very concise to prevent abuse of the policy.

### **Fast Food near schools**

- The workshop heard that at the recent East Midlands Council seminar on Planning and Health representatives of the health sector had suggested local planning authorities impose strict planning controls on fast food outlets within 400 m of schools.
- The general consensus was that imposing planning controls on hot food takeaways near schools in Gedling Borough would be impractical given the location of existing centres close to schools.

### **Security Shutters**

- All agreed it was preferable to have open shutters as opposed to externally mounted solid shutters which are unattractive and unwelcoming. This supports a continuation of Policy S17.

## **Development within the Green Belt**

### **What national policy says**

Paragraph 79 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) says the fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence.

As set out at paragraph 80 of the NPPF the Green Belt serves five purposes:

- To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
- To prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;
- To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;
- To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and
- To assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

The NPPF is clear that construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the Green Belt (with exceptions listed in paragraph 89). However, the replacement or reuse of buildings and extension to them may not be inappropriate depending on their scale and use.

Paragraph 55 of the NPPF states local planning authorities should avoid new isolated homes in the countryside unless there are special circumstances such as:

- The essential need for a rural worker to live permanently at or near their place of work in the countryside; or
- Where such development would represent the optimal viable use of a heritage asset or would be appropriate enabling development to secure the future of heritage assets; or
- Where the development would re-use redundant or disused buildings and lead to an enhancement to the immediate setting; or
- The exceptional quality or innovative nature of the design of the dwelling.

### **What the Core Strategy says**

The Core Strategy states the principle of the Nottingham Derby Green Belt will be retained. Development Plan Documents will review Green Belt boundaries to meet the other development land requirements of the Core Strategy, in particular in respect of the strategic locations and the Key Settlements.

Paragraph 3.3.4 of the Core Strategy states in Gedling Borough some areas of land are excluded from the Green Belt (as safeguarded land) to allow for long term (i.e. beyond the Core Strategy period) development needs. Areas of safeguarded land will remain, and elsewhere consideration will be given as to the appropriateness of excluding other land from the Green Belt as part of boundary review to allow for longer term development needs, as advised by government policy. This can aid the 'permanence' of the Green Belt, and prevent the need for further early review of its boundaries.

### **What the Responses to the Issues & Options say**

There was strong support from local residents and Parish Councils for the need to protect the Green Belt. In response to many of the questions these groups sought to strengthen Green Belt policy and make more development 'inappropriate'. Developers on the other hand generally sought to maintain the current approach.

Full details can be found in the Report of Consultation.

## Options

Key Question	Option	Comment	Notes
<p>How to define 'disproportionate additions' in relation to extensions to a building.</p> <p>Reason – to provide guidance on NPPF paragraph 89 3<sup>rd</sup> bullet.</p>	<p><u>Option A – continue current policy</u> Allow for extensions up to 50% of the existing floor space. Extensions beyond this are deemed to be disproportionate and therefore inappropriate in the Green Belt.</p> <p><u>Option B – include a criteria based policy</u> Set out a series of criteria against which extensions can be assessed. Decision makers will need to make a judgement about whether an extension is disproportionate taking account of the criteria.</p>	<p><u>Option A</u> Pros – provides clarity, easy to establish Cons – narrowly based and could be applied too rigidly,</p> <p><u>Option B</u> Pros – flexible, allows wide range of factors to be taken into account Cons – creates uncertainty</p>	<p>Existing floor space of building as originally constructed or as existed in 1<sup>st</sup> July 1948</p> <p>Other Green Belt LPAs use range of different figures (25% to 70%) – 50% most popular. Many have no figure. Only one uses volume.</p>
<p>How to define 'materially larger' in relation to a replacement building in the same use.</p> <p>Reason – to provide guidance on NPPF paragraph 89 4th bullet</p>	<p><u>Option A – continue current policy</u> Allow for a replacement building up to 15% larger than the existing floor space (50% if not substantially extended). Replacements larger than this are deemed to be materially larger and therefore inappropriate in the Green Belt.</p> <p><u>Option B – include a criteria based policy</u> Set out a series of criteria against</p>	<p><u>Option A</u> Pros – provides clarity, easy to establish Cons – narrowly based and could be applied too rigidly,</p> <p><u>Option B</u> Pros – flexible, allows wide range of factors to be taken into account Cons – creates uncertainty, may not achieve desired outcome –</p>	<p>Existing floor space of building as originally constructed or as existed in 1st July 1948</p> <p>Other Green Belt LPAs use range of different figures (10% to 50%) - 50% most popular. Many have no figure. Only one uses volume.</p>

	which replacement buildings can be assessed. Decision makers will need to make a judgement about whether an extension is materially larger taking account of the criteria.	whether something is materially larger primarily relates to size (Heath & Hampstead Judicial Review)	
<p>How to approach the reuse/ replacement of buildings in the Green Belt when not in the same use.</p> <p>Reason – to provide guidance on NPPF paragraph 90 4th bullet and to avoid loophole i.e. appropriate development being converted to inappropriate use shortly after being built.</p>	<p><u>Option A – include a time period policy</u> Include a policy to require that buildings granted for appropriate uses must be used for a period of at least 10 years prior to reuse/redevelopment for inappropriate uses i.e. the period it would need to be genuinely used for.</p> <p><u>Option B – include a criteria based policy</u> Set out a series of criteria against which the reuse/redevelopment of buildings is to be judged. Proposals which do not comply with the majority of the criteria are considered to not preserve the openness of the countryside and are therefore inappropriate development in the Green Belt but could be granted if there are 'very special circumstances'.</p> <p><u>Option C – no policy</u></p>	<p><u>Option A</u> Pros – clear requirement, easily confirmed, Cons – could be applied too rigidly</p> <p><u>Option B</u> Pros - Flexibly, more widely based Cons – subjective, lack of certainty</p> <p><u>Option C</u> Pros – understood position Cons – leaves loophole</p>	<p>Class MB of General Permitted Development Order sets out that the change of use of agricultural buildings to residential is not permitted development for a 10 year period following construction if built after 20<sup>th</sup> March 2013.</p>

	Rely on NPPF and case law.		
<p>How to define 'infill'.</p> <p>Reason – to provide guidance on NPPF paragraph 89 5th and 6th bullets</p>	<p><u>Option A – define infill</u> Include a policy to define limited infilling as the development of small gaps within the wider development or village of no more than xx square metres or xx dwellings. Anything larger or not part of a gap is therefore inappropriate development in the Green Belt.</p> <p><u>Option B – include a criteria based policy</u> Set out a series of criteria against which planning applications for 'infill' type development can be assessed to establish if they are infill and are limited.</p> <p><u>Option C – no policy</u> Rely on the NPPF and judgements as to whether proposals constitute 'infilling' and are 'limited'.</p>	<p><u>Option A</u> Pros – provides clarity, Cons – could be applied too rigidly, difficulty in establishing figures</p> <p><u>Option B</u> Pros- balance between clarity and flexibility, allows local character to be built into decision Cons - subjective</p> <p><u>Option C</u> Pros – flexible as to what is meant, allows definitions to be built up over time with reference to case law Cons – creates uncertainty</p>	<p>Gap = an empty space or opening in the middle of something or between two things</p>
<p>Whether to identify 'safeguarded land'.</p> <p>Reason – to accord with NPPF paragraph 85 3<sup>rd</sup> bullet and respond to paragraph 117 of the Inspector's Report on the</p>	<p><u>Option A – identify safeguarded land</u> Include a policy to identify safeguarded land.</p> <p><u>Option B – have no safeguarded land</u></p>	<p><u>Option A</u> Pros – offers flexibility if sites do not deliver as expected, allows longer term needs to be met Cons – more green belt released, leads to assumptions that sites will be developed.</p>	

Aligned Core Strategies	No safeguarded land.	<p>Difficulty of justifying inconsistency with NPPF.</p> <p><u>Option B</u></p> <p>Pros – protects a greater area of the Green Belt in the shorter term,</p> <p>Cons – inflexible as release only through Green Belt review, issue over what to do with existing safeguarded land</p>	
-------------------------	----------------------	---	--

## Matters not being debated

Issue	Reason	Conclusion
Approach to non-residential buildings in terms of extensions and replacement.	Address gaps left by wording of ENV28 and ENV29.	Apply policy on disproportionate additions and replacements to all buildings. Provides more certainty and better aligns with NPPF.
Approach to Rural Workers dwellings.	Address gap left by loss of PPS7 Annex A and provide guidance on NPPF para 55 1 <sup>st</sup> bullet	<p>Include a policy to identify different types of rural workers and adapt PPS7 Annex A criteria into GBC specific policy. Provides guidance and clarity.</p> <p>Include references to importance of design of dwellings and need for condition to restrict use.</p>
Approach to ‘exceptional quality or innovative nature’, enabling development and enhancements to settings	Address NPPF para 55 2 <sup>nd</sup> , 3 <sup>rd</sup> and 4 <sup>th</sup> bullets.	<p>These are considered to be clear policy requirements and no local policy is required.</p> <p>Consideration may be given to preparing non-statutory guidance, providing links to national documents or providing signposts to relevant</p>



		guidance prepared by others.
Approach to 'permanent and substantial construction'	Provide guidance on NPPF para 90 4 <sup>th</sup> bullet	No policies necessary but include detail on information required to demonstrate that building is of permanent and substantial construction; ensure that this is a validation requirement for planning applications.
Use of volume rather than floorspace in relation to replacement buildings and extensions.	Update requirements to better assess impact on openness.	<p>While volume is considered a better way of assessing the impact on openness than floorspace it is more complicated to assess. Additionally the use of volume has been removed from the PD rights.</p> <p>Height and volume can be considered as part of the design through inclusion in supporting text to these policies.</p>

## **Key Issues from Green Belt Workshop 2.2.2015**

### **Present:**

Roger Foxall (Langridge Homes)  
Peter Walster (Aldergate Properties)  
Wayne Scholter (Aldergate Properties)  
Emily Quilty (Calverton Parish Council)  
Denise Ireland (Linby Parish Council)  
Patrick Smith (Woodborough Parish Council)  
JanTurton (Woodborough Parish Council)  
Gill Costello (Friends of Bestwood Country Park)  
Catherine Seaton (WACAT)  
Nick Grace (Grace Machin)  
Andrew Galloway (Savills)  
Cllr John Boot (Gedling Borough Council)  
David Lawson (Broxtowe Borough Council)

Julie Clayton (Ashfield District Council)  
Matthew Grant (Nottingham City Council)  
Terry Pennick (WAG)  
Mike Rowan (WAG)  
Les Warner (WAG)  
Nina Wilson (Nottinghamshire County Council)  
Tom Dillarstone (Gedling Borough Council)  
Alison Gibson (Gedling Borough Council)  
Peter Baguley (Gedling Borough Council)  
WAG – Woodborough Action Group  
WACAT – Woodborough and Calverton Against Turbines

### **Disproportionate Additions**

- Current policy allowing for floorspace extension up to 50% appears fine. Important to use clear, transparent policy. Use of volume is difficult to assess
- Concern expressed that it may be applied too stringently, need to ensure buildings can be extended to meet current requirements.
- Ashfield DC confirmed that they are aiming to introduce a policy of 30% with exceptional circumstances eg very small cottages.
- 50% is acceptable as long as clear that relates to original building or as was on 1<sup>st</sup> July 1948.
- Considered need to build in design and how sympathetic the extension is/how materially different.
- Developer viewed that % should be more flexible eg a 52% scheme may be viewed more attractive than a 49% scheme.
- Considered that majority of applications are likely to be from householders.
- Confirmed that flexibility could be built into supporting text if demonstrate very special circumstances and takes into account openness.
- Each scheme should be considered on its own merits as dependent on location/screening.

### **Replacement Buildings**

- Importance of site specifics was addressed eg a small house on a large plot could accommodate more and still fit in well and be seen as a positive enhancement.
- Important to consider the impact on the purposes and openness of the Green Belt.
- Need to also consider exceptional quality or innovative nature of the design of the dwelling – NPPF para 55. Eg Nat Puri decision in Borough.

### **Reuse of Buildings**

- Parish offered support for a time limited policy.
- Concern expressed that may be open to litigation eg building of eight years and then appeal.
- Importance of ensuring precise and relevant conditions.
- Seeking to ensure right development in the right location. Key driver is to increase the supply of housing.
- Need to ensure application meets the tests of the guidance and link to forth bullet point in para 90 of NPPF.
- It was viewed that 10 years is a deterrent with stables which are normally of a basic construction.
- Issue of change to permitted development guidelines and if not in agricultural use on 20<sup>th</sup> March 2013 then need to abide by the 10 year rule. Also noted the impact of change of use of industrial use.
- Concern expressed by developer that it may not be appropriate to use Tandridge policy as an example for Gedling, as it was viewed that the Green Belt in Tandridge is seen as a buffer to London.
- Parish concern that it is important not to dilute the impact on the Green Belt as it should not be seen as a reservoir for building plots.
- Concern that barns can easily be converted into dwellings.
- Noted the importance of clarity over what is “structurally sound and capable of reuse without major alterations” as highlighted in the guidance.
- Parish considered importance of reviewing the 5 purposes of Green Belt and need to consider the sustainability and economic imperatives as farm buildings are integral to their agricultural purpose, quite different to a dwelling.

### **Infill Development**

- Need to consider whether infill is detracting from the openness of the Green Belt
- Concern that Woodborough village would not be able to rely on Conservation Area policies without a current conservation area review and management plan.
- Noted the reference in NPPF para 86 of use of conservation area and development management policies.

- Viewed even within an up to date conservation area review for Linby that applications still jar with the character of the village.
- Important to consider how to define limited infilling - is it up to 2, 3 or 4 dwellings and questioned the benefits of a village boundary.
- Current Replacement Local Plan policy provides more guidance in justification text consisting of one or two dwellings in a built up frontage. Consider character of the street scene.
- Reiterated the importance of having a restrictive policy to direct development to the right locations.
- Purpose to having boundaries on a plan.
- Questioned whether there was anything to restrict repeated applications.
- Concern over applications which have commenced and not completed.
- Considered it would be important to have a session with parishes to discuss individual infill boundaries.

### **Safeguarded Land**

- Promoted in NPPF and para 117 of the Inspectors Report, look to identify in Part II Local Plan and postpone the need for further Green Belt reviews.
- Noted that where there is not a 5 year land supply the presumption in favour of sustainable development will come into effect.
- Parish concern that safeguarded land is seen as the easy option.
- Parish consider it is easy to conjure up changes to the 5 year supply. View is there are sufficient sites across the three districts of the HMA to meet supply. There should be a need to have a full review and not the fall back option of presumption in favour of sustainable development. Concern over the global minimum figure for housing supply and, if met, it will put additional pressure to meet the key settlement maximum figures. Concern that the figures have been decided without consideration of the area. Green Belt review should come first and then housing supply figure should be reduced if it can't be achieved in the urban area.
- Council confirmed regional Green Belt review in 2006 which was considered broad brush but is being followed by a more detailed review which is ongoing. Noted that if legal challenge is unsuccessful then the housing figures are set.
- Parish view that it is not necessarily the quantum of development but more about where the housing goes which is the problem. Disagreement over whether Top Wighay Farm could be viewed a sustainable urban extension. Confirmed Strata homes application for 38 executive dwellings on the Top Wighay Farm site was deferred at planning committee. Concern expressed that the 2008 Top Wighay Farm development brief is out of date.
- Principle of safeguarded land is disliked without true due diligence and full assessment as to whether it should be in the plan.
- Concern that master planning only considered the reduced figure for Calverton and not considered the scenario if the housing supply for the rest of the Borough is not met in the urban area and a higher figure for the village is required. Viewed these sites are vulnerable. Honesty and transparency should have been employed at the master planning stage.

- Consider that exceptional circumstances need be demonstrated to allow the flexibility to take land out of the Green Belt.
- Importance of certainty was stressed and if land is removed from the Green Belt then require confirmation as to what would happen if there was slippage with the housing supply.
- Need to consider the sensitive landscape areas and historic context.
- An understanding as to what proportion of the supply is due to natural population growth and what is due to the constraints of the city centre. Questioned whether Gedling has reached its natural level for its economy.
- Council confirmed Green Belt review is focussed on Green Belt purposes. Areas to the north and west of Calverton were highlighted in the Tribal Study as being less sensitive in terms of Green Belt.
- Parish considered there had been no honest discussion regarding the sustainability of sites and considered that was the reason there had been conflicts with Ashfield District Council. The essence of the NPPF is that building should take place on brownfield sites. Concern that the Community Infrastructure Levy should be focussed solely on Gedling Colliery and not include the secondary school at Top Wighay Farm on the R123 list.
- Noted the importance of meeting long term needs but not at the expense of the Green Belt.
- Developer view that safeguarded land does not harm the plan and should be viewed as a safety net.
- Viewed there is no legal justification in the small villages when meeting local need.
- Parish view that all existing safeguarded land should be reviewed but council noted that to return land to the Green Belt there would be a need to demonstrate exceptional circumstances.
- Developer reiterated that the NPPF confirms that it is appropriate to identify safeguarded land. Also supported by ACS inspector.
- Concern not got the appropriate infrastructure to support growth.
- Developer confirmed that aim of safeguarded land is to achieve some permanence to Green Belt and avoid an early review.
- Request that the link to the Green Belt Framework consultation responses and outcomes be forwarded to the parishes
- Ashfield District requested that the remaining safeguarded land at Top Wighay should be reviewed as part of the Green Belt Review/Assessment of Safeguarded Land.

# Housing

## What national policy says

Paragraph 47 of the National Planning Policy Framework states to boost significantly the supply of housing, local planning authorities should ensure their Local Plan meets the full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing in the housing market area; identify five year supply of deliverable housing sites with additional buffer of 5% or 20% and developable sites or broad locations for growth for years 6-10 and years 11-15; and set out their own approach to housing density to reflect local circumstances.

Paragraph 50 requires Local Plans to deliver a wide choice of high quality homes, to widen opportunities for home ownership and to create sustainable, inclusive and mixed communities. Local planning authorities should identify and bring back into residential use empty homes and buildings (paragraph 51). Local planning authorities should consider new settlements or extensions to existing villages and towns (paragraph 52). Local planning authorities should also consider the case for setting out policies to resist inappropriate development of residential gardens (paragraph 53).

In rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. Local planning authorities should avoid new isolated homes in the countryside unless there are special circumstances (paragraph 55).

Paragraph 8 of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (2012) states local planning authorities should set pitch targets for gypsies and travellers and plot targets for travelling showpeople which address the likely permanent and transit site accommodation needs of travellers in their area, working collaboratively with neighbouring local planning authorities.

## What the Core Strategy says

Policy 2 (The Spatial Strategy) sets a strategy of urban concentration and consists of the main built up area of Nottingham, adjacent to the Sub Regional Centre of Hucknall and Key Settlements identified for growth. Up to 260 homes to be distributed in other villages not specially identified solely to meet local needs.

Policy 8 (Housing Size, Mix and Choice) states all residential developments should contain adequate internal living space and a proportion of homes should be capable of being adapted to suit the lifetime of its occupants. Consideration should be given to the needs and demands of the elderly as part of overall housing mix, in particular in areas where there is significant degree or under

occupation and an ageing population. The appropriate mix of house size, type, tenure and density within housing development will be informed by the criteria listed in Policy 8.4.

Affordable housing percentage targets are set at 10%, 20% or 30% depending on the location. Any locational variation in affordable housing requirements and the mix and threshold for affordable housing will be set out in Local Development Document. In the case of larger phased developments the level of affordable housing will be considered on a site by site basis taking into account of localised information and set out in Local Planning Document.

Where there is robust evidence of local need, rural exception sites or sites allocated purely for affordable housing may be permitted within or adjacent to rural settlements.

Policy 9 (Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople) states sufficient sites for permanent Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople accommodation will be identified in line with a robust evidence base in the Local Planning Document. The criteria listed in Policy 9.2 will be used to identify suitable Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople sites and associated facilities. Existing permanent provision will also be safeguarded from alternative development.

### **What the Responses to the Issues and Options say**

Affordable Housing: A majority of respondents were in favour of continuing with the existing approach set out in the Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document to provide for affordable housing in Gedling Borough. The Co-Operative Group considered that an affordable housing policy is not required as it would be repeating policy already contained in Policy 8 which sets percentage targets based upon location. Harworth Estates recommended a degree of flexibility in the proportion of affordable housing sought is important to help ensure the development is viable and deliverable.

Affordable Housing in Rural Areas: A majority of respondents were not in favour of allocating sites in rural areas purely for affordable housing. Langridge Homes commented that rural exception sites for affordable housing are rarely viable and do not make significant contribution to housing supply in rural area. Schemes which included a mix of affordable and open market houses should be encouraged in rural villages and be more in line with paragraph 50 of the National Planning Policy Framework. These schemes should be considered as exceptions to inappropriate development in the Green Belt.

Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Sites: One respondent considered that both North of Papplewick Lane and Top Wighay Farm strategic sites identified in the Core Strategy do not have access to the infrastructure required by the travelling

community and suggested Calverton or Carlton as they have facilities. Ashfield District Council considered that additional traveller sites may need to be allocated in order to satisfy the requirements of the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (2012). The National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups considered that Policy 9 of the Core Strategy gives adequate guidance.

Mix of Housing: A majority of respondents were in favour of using the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy 8 of the Core Strategy to plan for a mix of housing based on demographic and market trends and the need of different groups. Ashfield District Council stated assessing need on a site by site basis would allow for flexibility but would need to be supported by an up to date and sound assessment of local need. The Co-Operative Group thought there was no need for the Local Planning Document to repeat the national policy and Core Strategy.

Live-Work Units and Self-Build Homes: The criteria based policy to assess the development of new live-work units was the most popular option whilst there was strong opposition to require live-work units on large sites and the use of Local Development Orders. There was a preference for the use of the criteria based policy to assess self-build homes whilst there was opposition to require proportion of self-build plots on large housing sites and to the use of Local Development Orders.

New Homes Space Standards: The majority of respondents would like to see minimum standards for all listed elements of new homes: floor space; garden size; the distance to the windows of neighbouring properties; car parking and bin storage. Developers were generally opposed to the introduction of minimum standards. Langridge Homes identified that these standards are already covered in the national and existing local standards.

New Homes Adaptability: Langridge Homes commented it was not necessary and not viable for the developer or housebuyer to ensure that all new homes are built to Lifetime Home standards. They suggested a maximum of 25% of homes on new developments should be designed to meet these standards. Davidsons Developments commented there should be minimum size / plot number threshold before the requirement is triggered.

Unallocated Sites: There was significant support for continuing with the current approach of permitting windfall sites within the urban area and village envelopes of inset villages subject to site specific issues. Those who wanted to adopt a different approach were generally seeking to strengthen the policy highlighting concerns over Green Belt, design and the views of local residents.

Allocated Sites: There was a mixed response with regards to the size of site that should be allocated. There were comments that allocating sites of 10 dwellings and above might be appropriate in the Key Settlements for growth and other villages. Linby and Papplewick Parish Councils identified that many sites of between 10 to 50 dwellings are likely to be available in the urban area and



failure to allocate them would not accord with the strategy of urban concentration. Developers state that allocating sites of 50 or more dwellings would ensure a sufficient supply of houses while allowing smaller sites to come forward as windfall.

Thresholds: In terms of thresholds for planning obligations, 20 dwellings and 100 sq m of floorspace were the most common identified.

The need for a plan wide viability assessment was identified by the Home Builders Federation and developers. Use of the Local Housing Delivery Groups 'Viability Testing Local Plans' was recommended as a basis for the assessment. There was also a request that any policy include a provision that states that contributions will only be sought where the scheme is viable.

Full details can be found in the Report of Consultation

(<http://www.gedling.gov.uk/media/documents/planningbuildingcontrol/localplanningdocument/Appendix%20B%20-%20LPD%20Report%20of%20Consultation%20-%20Topics.pdf>).

## **Options**

(see page overleaf)

Key Question	Option	Comment	Notes
<p>What approach should a policy take on affordable housing.</p> <p>Reason – paragraph 50 of the National Planning Policy Framework. Evidence for the Aligned Core Strategy confirms more detailed guidance on affordable housing will be produced in the Local Planning Document.</p>	<p><u>Option A – do nothing (current approach)</u> Use existing approach set out in Aligned Core Strategy Policy 8 (i.e. 10%, 20% and 30% depending on location) and Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document (specific percentages for sub-market areas).</p> <p><u>Option B – include a policy</u> Use existing approach set out in Aligned Core Strategy Policy 8 and include a new policy based on refresh of evidence.</p> <p><u>Option C – revisit Supplementary Planning Document</u> Use existing approach set out in Aligned Core Strategy Policy 8 and revisit Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document.</p>	<p><u>Option A</u> Pros – clear policy position. Cons – inflexibility.</p> <p><u>Option B</u> Pros – flexible policy approach. Cons – lack of certainty, likely to lead to lower delivery of affordable housing.</p> <p><u>Option C</u> Pros – clear policy position using up-to-date assessment. Cons – inflexibility.</p>	

Key Question	Option	Comment	Notes
<p>Should we review the current threshold of 15 dwellings for request for affordable housing.</p> <p>Reason – consultation response indicates we should change the current threshold which seeks the provision of affordable housing on sites of 15 dwellings or greater (as set out in the Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document).</p>	<p><u>Option A – use higher threshold</u> Use higher threshold (e.g. 20 dwellings).</p> <p><u>Option B – do nothing (current approach)</u> Use current threshold i.e. 15 dwellings.</p> <p><u>Option C – use lower threshold</u> Use lower threshold (e.g. 10 dwellings).</p>	<p><u>Option A</u> Pros – Cons – no contributions for most developments under 20 dwellings and 100 sq m. Would need to justify revised figures.</p> <p><u>Option B</u> Pros – current position unchanged. Cons – no contributions for most developments under 15 dwellings.</p> <p><u>Option C</u> Pros – more affordable homes provided. Cons – may affect viability issue. Would need to justify revised figures.</p>	

Key Question	Option	Comment	Notes
<p>How to ensure a mix of housing.</p> <p>Reason – to provide guidance on National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 50 which states "... Local planning authorities should: plan for a mix of housing based on current and future demographic trends, market trends and the needs of different groups in the community...; identify the size, type, tenure and range of housing that is required in particular locations, reflecting local demand". Evidence for the Aligned Core Strategy confirms more detailed guidance on approaches to housing mix will be considered in the Local Planning Document.</p>	<p><u>Option A – include a policy</u> Include a policy to ensure a mix of housing i.e. different types of housing based on demographic and market trends and the need of different groups.</p> <p><u>Option B – no policy</u> Use National Planning Policy Framework and Aligned Core Strategy Policy 8 on site by site basis.</p>	<p><u>Option A</u> Pros – clear position. Cons – inflexibility.</p> <p><u>Option B</u> Pros – determine applications on site by site basis. Cons – uncertainty when applications come in.</p>	

Key Question	Option	Comment	Notes
<p>What approach should be taken on 'new homes space standards'.</p> <p>Reason – Aligned Core Strategy Policy 8. The Government's Housing Standards Review went out on consultation in September 2014 and states the Government is intending to develop a nationally described space standard to offer a consistent set of requirements. Local authorities are not required to adopt a space standard and where they choose to do so it should be nationally described space standard. If local authorities wish to adopt a policy they will need to assess and evidence the impact and effect of policy on development in their area which includes local need, viability, affordability and timing. (<a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/housing-standards-review-technical-consultation">https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/housing-standards-review-technical-consultation</a>)</p>	<p><u>Option A – include a minimum based policy</u> Includes minimum based policy on floor space, garden size, window distance, car park and bin storage. (NB: Assume there is a nationally described space standards in place, then floor space not included in this option.)</p> <p><u>Option B – no policy</u> Use National Planning Policy Framework and Aligned Core Strategy Policy 8 on site by site basis.</p> <p><u>Option C – include a national space standards policy</u> Use nationally described space standards (when adopted).</p>	<p><u>Option A</u> Pros – clear policy position and consistent set of requirements. Cons – lack of flexibility. If to adopt a new policy then would need to assess the impact and effect of policy (local need, viability, affordability and timing).</p> <p><u>Option B</u> Pros – current position unchanged. Cons – uncertainly when applications come in.</p> <p><u>Option C</u> Pros – use of national standard. Cons – does not cover other issues e.g. window distance, car parking etc.</p>	

Key Question	Option	Comment	Notes
<p>How to ensure that new homes are 'adaptable'.</p> <p>Reason – Aligned Core Strategy Policy 8. The Government's Housing Standards Review went out on consultation in September 2014 and states that, subject to Parliamentary approval of amendments to the Building Act 1984, the Building Regulations will be amended to include optional requirements which set out alternative provisions for accessibility and adaptability to help meet the needs of older and disabled people. If local authorities wish to adopt a policy to provide enhance accessibility or adaptability this will need to be based on housing needs assessment and taking into account other relevant factors which include likely future need for housing for older and disabled people, sizes and types to meet specifically evidenced needs, accessibility and adaptability of existing housing stock and overall impact on viability.</p> <p>(<a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/housing-standards-review-technical-consultation">https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/housing-standards-review-technical-consultation</a>)</p>	<p><u>Option A – include a policy</u> Include a policy based on housing needs assessment and other factors listed in the Government's consultation document.</p> <p><u>Option B – no policy</u> Use National Planning Policy Framework and Aligned Core Strategy Policy 8 on site by site basis.</p>	<p><u>Option A</u> Pros – clear policy position. Acknowledge future needs for housing for older and disabled people Cons – lack of flexibility. If adopting a new policy then would need to be based on housing needs assessment for older and disabled people.</p> <p><u>Option B</u> Pros – current position unchanged. Cons – uncertainty when applications come in.</p>	

Key Question	Option	Comment	Notes
<p>What approach should be taken on live-work units.</p> <p>Reason – to provide guidance on National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 21 states "... local planning authorities should: ... facilitate flexible working practices such as the integration of residential and commercial uses within the same unit".</p>	<p><u>Option A – include a criteria based policy</u> Include a criteria based policy for live-work units.</p> <p><u>Option B – no policy</u> Use National Planning Policy Framework and Aligned Core Strategy on site by site basis.</p>	<p><u>Option A</u> Pros – clear policy position. Cons – inflexibility.</p> <p><u>Option B</u> Pros – current position unchanged. Cons – uncertainty when applications come in.</p>	
<p>What approach should be taken on custom-build and self-build homes.</p> <p>Reason – consultation response's preference for the use of the criteria based policy to assess custom-build and self-build homes.</p>	<p><u>Option A – include a criteria based policy</u> Include a criteria based policy for custom-build and self-build homes.</p> <p><u>Option B – no policy</u> Use National Planning Policy Framework and Aligned Core Strategy on site by site basis.</p>	<p><u>Option A</u> Pros – clear policy position and greater clarity over how and when to achieve custom-build and self-build homes. Cons – inflexibility.</p> <p><u>Option B</u> Pros – current position unchanged. Cons – uncertainty when applications come in.</p>	<p>Government's Housing Strategy for England in 2011 introduced the term 'custom build housing'. The definitions are as follows: 'Self build' = tends to describe projects where the people involved help organise the project. 'Custom build' = tends to be more of a 'hands off' approach where a developer co-ordinates the whole process for the people involved. (<a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/7532/2033676.pdf">https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/7532/2033676.pdf</a>)</p>

Key Question	Option	Comment	Notes
<p>Whether to guide development of elderly/retirement homes.</p> <p>Reason – to provide guidance on Aligned Core Strategy Policy 8.3 which states "... consideration should be given to the needs and demands of the elderly as part of overall housing mix, in particular in areas where there is a significant degree of under occupation and an ageing population".</p>	<p><u>Option A – include a criteria based policy</u> Include a criteria based policy to encourage elderly/retirement homes.</p> <p><u>Option B – no policy</u> Use National Planning Policy Framework and Aligned Core Strategy on site by site basis.</p>	<p><u>Option A</u> Pros – clear policy position. Cons – inflexibility.</p> <p><u>Option B</u> Pros – current position unchanged. Cons – uncertainly when applications come in.</p>	

### Matters not being debated

Issue	Comment
<p>Whether to establish a threshold for allocating sites for housing.</p> <p>Reason – question raised in the Issues and Options document</p>	<p>There will be different figures for urban area (50 homes and over) and rural area (10 homes and over).</p>
<p>Approach to rural exception sites.</p> <p>Reason – to provide guidance on Aligned Core Strategy Policy 8. Evidence for Aligned Core Strategy confirms the needs studies will be undertaken for parishes below 3,000 residents where this is a desire for such parishes to accommodate rural exception housing.</p>	<p>Allocated sites in the rural area will have mix of affordable and open market homes.</p>
<p>Approach to empty homes/buildings into residential use.</p> <p>Reason – to provide guidance on National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 51.</p>	<p>The Council will be supportive on bringing empty homes/buildings back into residential use.</p>



<p>Approach to residential development on unallocated sites and conversion/change of use to residential.</p> <p>Reason – consultation response. There was significant support for continuing with the current approach of permitting residential development on unallocated sites (windfall sites).</p>	<p>Similar to Policy H7 and Policy H11 of the Replacement Local Plan.</p>
<p>Approach to residential extensions in non-Green Belt land.</p> <p>Reason – there is a need for a policy on extensions outside the Green Belt.</p>	<p>Similar to Policy H10 of the Replacement Local Plan.</p>
<p>Safeguard allocated sites from piecemeal development.</p> <p>Reason – there is a need to protect allocated sites.</p>	<p>Similar to Policy H15 of the Replacement Local Plan.</p>

## **Community Facilities**

### **What national policy says**

Paragraph 28 of the National Planning Policy Framework states Local Plans should promote the retention and development of local services and community facilities in villages, such as local shops, meeting places, sports venues, cultural buildings, public houses and places of worship.

Planning policies should aim to achieve places which promote opportunities for meetings between members of the community who might not otherwise come into contact with each other; safe and accessible environments; and safe and accessible developments (paragraph 69). Paragraph 70 states planning policies should:

- Plan positively for the provision and use of shared space, community facilities (such as local shops, meeting places, sports venues, cultural buildings, public houses and places of worship) and other local services to enhance the sustainability of communities and residential environments;
- Guard against the unnecessary loss of valued facilities and services, particularly where this would reduce the community's ability to meet its day-to-day needs;
- Ensure that established shops, facilities and services are able to develop and modernise in a way that is sustainable, and retained for the benefit of the community; and
- Ensure an integrated approach to considering the location of housing, economic uses and community facilities and services.

### **What the Core Strategy says**

Policy 12 (Local Services and Healthy Lifestyles) states community facilities should be provided in the approach as set out in Policy 12. New, extended or improved community facilities will be supported where they meet a local need.

Policy 13 (Culture, Tourism and Sports) states further provision of culture, tourism and sporting facilities will be supported with details set out in part 2 Local Plans as appropriate, in line with the approach as set out in Policy 13.

## **What the Responses to the Issues and Options say**

### Local Community Services

For local community services, there was strong support that the existing policy (C4) seeking to prevent the loss of a community facility should be retained. However the Theatres Trust considered the existing policy to be inadequate as it does not provide any criteria to support and protect existing community facilities nor give guidance to prevent their loss such as criterion requiring the provision of replacement facilities in accessible locations or contributions to existing or new facilities.

Other respondents referred to providing local authority services and facilities in vacant premises, more places of worship and the particular need to plan for increased local community services at Calverton and Ravenshead if more houses are built in these settlements.

### Tourism

A large majority considered that there should be specific policies to protect and guide future diversification of the visitor attractions at Newstead Abbey, Papplewick Pumping Station, Patchings Arts Centre and the country parks at Bestwood, Burnt Stump, Gedling Colliery and Newstead. English Heritage commented that many of the attractions listed were designated heritage assets and that their future diversification would need to be guided by Local Plan policy and appropriate in terms of them being designated assets. They also considered that there may be opportunities for tourism related projects.

Linby and Papplewick Parish Councils noted that many of the attractions were in the Green Belt and guided by relevant Green Belt policy and there was no need for further control.

Full details can be found in the Report of Consultation

(<http://www.gedling.gov.uk/media/documents/planningbuildingcontrol/localplanningdocument/Appendix%20B%20-%20LPD%20Report%20of%20Consultation%20-%20Topics.pdf>).

## **Options**

(see page overleaf)

Key Question	Option	Comment	Notes
<p>How to prevent unnecessary loss of community facilities and local services.</p> <p>Reason – to provide guidance on National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 70 which states "To deliver the social, recreational and cultural facilities and services the community needs, planning policies and decisions should: ... guard against the unnecessary loss of valued facilities and services, particularly where this would reduce the community's ability to meet its day-to-day needs".</p> <p>The Theatres Trust considered the existing Replacement Local Plan Policy C4 to be inadequate as it does not provide any criteria to support and protect existing community facilities nor give guidance to prevent their loss such as criterion requiring the provision of replacement facilities in accessible locations or contributions to existing or new facilities.</p>	<p><u>Option A – include a policy</u> Continue with existing Replacement Local Plan Policy C4 (which states planning permission will not be granted if development would lead to the loss of community facilities resulting in increased car journeys to the next available facility) incorporating the National Planning Policy Framework requirements (i.e. reduce the community's ability to meet its day-to-day needs) and further amend to address Theatres Trust's comments.</p> <p><u>Option B = no policy</u> Rely on National Planning Policy Framework.</p>	<p><u>Option A</u> Pros – clear policy position. Cons – limited criteria.</p> <p><u>Option B</u> Pros – use of national policy. Cons – uncertainly when applications come in.</p>	<p>Do we define the NPPF wording "unnecessary"?</p> <p>Need to have stronger protection in villages as they have fewer facilities.</p>

## Matters not being debated

Issue	Comment
<p>Provide new, extended or improved shared space, community facilities and local services.</p> <p>Reason – to address paragraph 70 of National Planning Policy Framework and Policy 12 of the Aligned Core Strategy monitoring box refers to improve of accessibility from residential development to key community facilities and services.</p>	<p>Already covered by Policy 12 of the Aligned Core Strategy.</p>
<p>Provide guidance on the location of new religious and cultural facilities.</p> <p>Reason – Evidence for Aligned Core Strategy confirms the Local Planning Document intention to set out policy details.</p>	<p>May need to define religious and cultural facilities as they are not defined in the Aligned Core Strategy.</p>
<p>Continue with existing Policy R8 of the Replacement Local Plan regarding tourist related accommodation concentrated in built up areas and larger villages.</p> <p>Reason – Policy R8 of the Replacement Local Plan not replaced by the Aligned Core Strategy.</p>	<p>Can apply Green Belt criteria when determining planning applications. Policy R8 of the Replacement Local Plan has been rarely used.</p>
<p>Consider a specific policy to protect and guide future diversification of existing visitor attractions.</p> <p>Reason – consultation response.</p>	<p>Already covered by Policy 13 of the Aligned Core Strategy.</p>
<p>Consider a policy which aims to achieve places to promote opportunities for meeting between members and the community, safe and accessible environments and safe and accessible developments.</p> <p>Reason – paragraph 69 of the National Planning Policy Framework.</p>	<p>Already covered by Policies 10 and 12 of the Aligned Core Strategy.</p> <p>Safe development is part of planning application requirements</p>

## **Infrastructure**

### **What national policy says**

Paragraph 43 states local planning authorities should support the expansion of electronic communications networks, including telecommunications and high speed broadband. The numbers of radio and telecommunications masts and the sites for such installations should be kept to a minimum with the existing masts, buildings and other structures used unless the need for a new site has been justified. Where new sites are required, equipment should be sympathetically designed and camouflaged where appropriate.

Paragraph 44 states local planning authorities should not impose a ban on new telecommunications development in certain areas or insist on minimum distances between new telecommunications development and existing development.

The Community Infrastructure Levy Guidance (2013) sets out the main procedures that local planning authorities need to follow when introducing and operating the Community Infrastructure Levy.

### **What the Core Strategy says**

Policy 18 (Infrastructure) states the Council will work in partnership with infrastructure providers, grant funders, the development industry and other delivery agencies in seeking the provision of necessary infrastructure to support new development. Contributions will be sought from development proposals which give rise to the need for new infrastructure.

Policy 19 (Developer Contributions) states all development will be expected to:

- a) meet the reasonable cost of new infrastructure required as a consequence of the proposal;
- b) where appropriate, contribute to the delivery of necessary infrastructure to enable the cumulative impacts of developments to be managed, including identified transport infrastructure requirements; and
- c) provide for the future maintenance of facilities provided as a result of the development.

A Community Infrastructure Levy will be introduced to secure infrastructure alongside continued use of s106 agreements to support new development. Prior to the implementation of a Community Infrastructure Levy, planning obligations will be sought to secure all new infrastructure necessary to support new development.

### **What the Responses to the Issues and Options say**

One of the questions in the Issues and Options document asked for views on the priority that should be given to different types of contributions. The list below ranks the categories identified in the question in order of average priority:

1. Drainage and flood protection
2. Open space
3. Health and social care facilities
4. Public transport
5. Education
6. Emergency facilities
7. Transport infrastructure
8. Environmental improvements
9. Green infrastructure
10. Information and communication technology
11. Community facilities
12. Waste recycling facilities
13. Shopping facilities
14. Training and employment measures for local people
15. Affordable housing
16. Travel behaviour change measure
17. Cultural facilities

Given the large number of responses regarding Woodborough village the 'drainage and flood protection' category has been ranked highly by respondents.

Full details can be found in the Report of Consultation

(<http://www.gedling.gov.uk/media/documents/planningbuildingcontrol/localplanningdocument/Appendix%20B%20-%20LPD%20Report%20of%20Consultation%20-%20Topics.pdf>).

## Options

Key Question	Option	Comment	Notes
How to set priorities for different types of contributions.  Reason – consultation response.	<p><u>Option A – rank order</u> Rank in order of priority based on Issues and Option consultation responses with scope for negotiation. Consider on a case by case basis.</p> <p><u>Option B – include a policy to set different priorities for different areas</u> Apply different priorities for different areas based on local needs/priorities.</p>	<p><u>Option A</u> Pros = clearer position. Cons = fixed order or priority in an ever-changing circumstances.</p> <p><u>Option B</u> Pros – more flexibility and contributions go towards local needs/priorities. Cons – will require frequent review of the local needs/priorities.</p>	May need to flag up where scope for negotiation (e.g. off-site provision, financial contributions, scope to reduce on viability grounds).



<p>Whether to include a policy on the expansion of electronic communications (telecommunications and high speed broadband) networks and cap the number of radio and telecommunications masts and sites.</p> <p>Reason – to provide guidance on National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 43. Evidence for Aligned Core Strategy confirms consideration will be given to introducing a policy on telecoms and broadband.</p>	<p><u>Option A – include a criteria based policy</u> Include a criteria based policy based on National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 43.</p> <p><u>Option B – no policy</u> No policy.</p>	<p><u>Option A</u> Pros = clearer position. Cons = additional work required to create a new policy.</p> <p><u>Option B</u> Pros – current approach unchanged. Cons = uncertainly when applications come in.</p>	
--	--	---	--

### Matters not being debated

Issue	Comment
<p>Consider a policy to ensure all development schemes must undertake viability assessment.</p> <p>Reason – consultation response.</p>	<p>Do not need a policy. If developer thinks a scheme is unviable then a viability assessment is needed, otherwise not needed.</p>

## **Key Issues from Housing and Facilities 19.1.2015**

### **Present:**

Patrick Smith (Woodborough Parish Council)  
JanTurton (Woodborough Parish Council)  
Catherine Seaton (WACAT)  
Steffan Saunders (Broxtowe Borough Council)  
Wayne Scholter (Aldergate Properties)  
Roger Foxall (Langridge Homes)  
Joe Lonergan (Ravenshead Parish Council)  
Ian Hains (Notts County Council Adult Social Care)  
Neil Oxby (Ashfield District Council)  
Nick Grace (GraceMachin)  
Karen Shaw (Nottingham City Council)  
John Bailey (Calverton Parish Councils)

Terry Pennick (WAG)  
Mike Chapman (WAG)  
Mike Rowan (WAG)  
Les Warner (WAG)  
Sue Green (HBF)  
Lisa Bell (Notts County Council)  
Tom Dillarstone (Gedling Borough Council)  
Alison Gibson (Gedling Borough Council)  
Ian McDonald (Gedling Borough Council)  
Lance Juby (Gedling Borough Council)  
Andy Hardy (Gedling Borough Council)  
WAG – Woodborough Action Group  
HBF – Home Builders Federation  
WACAT – Woodborough and Calverton Against Turbines

### **Housing**

#### **Affordable Housing**

- Issue of evidence was raised with many seeing the need for Housing Needs Assessment to help inform % required. GBC and Parishes may need to work together to identify need.
- Concerns over distribution with many seeing no need for affordable housing in certain villages – this was considered to be social engineering. Without information about the amount of Affordable Housing to be put into certain areas it will be difficult to see the impact. The use of the offsite contribution policy was seen as important.
- The need to update the SPD was identified as this was adopted in 2009 but the figures were seen to be based on evidence and broadly right. Regular review is important as Planning system is slow to respond to market changes
- Policy needs to be clear and flexible – two audiences – simple policy for all with detailed guidance for professionals.

#### **Threshold**

- It is difficult to see the impact of the options on different areas in the Borough.
- There are practical problems with lower thresholds – many RSLs not interested in sites of 1 or 2 dwellings. However larger than ten would miss opportunities for AH especially in Rural areas.
- A more equitable approach preferred with a contribution per dwelling.
- Ideally one clear policy.

- Confirmation by ministerial statement 28.11.14 of policy change which has removed the need to provide affordable housing on sites of fewer than 10 dwellings.

### **Mix of Housing**

- A site by site approach was supported by a number present as this can reflect local need and will be easier to adapt over the 15 years of the plan reflecting changes.
- Any policy setting figures would need to be based on evidence. Developers know the local market and use evidence to design schemes to meet need. However evidence of need for smaller properties but developers prefer larger as more profitable – not having a policy may miss an opportunity.
- A policy on the provision of facilities for adults with learning disabilities may be useful – typically a block of flats of about 10 units.

### **Space Standards**

- Could conflict with national standards being brought in through the Housing Standards Review. This would allow councils to opt in to space standards where they can demonstrate there is a need and it is viable and affordable; it is likely to be very difficult for GBC to do this. The Technical Guidance to the Housing Standards Review will provide guidance as to whether this is an issue that requires policy.
- Large range of different figures would apply and flexibility would be needed to respond to different expectations between town centre locations vs suburban location and the different character of areas.
- Whether bin storage is part of Building Regulations was queried
- Need for evidence to demonstrate opting in to national space standards.
- Suggestion that would be beneficial to apply the draft national standard to past planning decisions and assess the impact.

### **Adaptable New Homes**

- Housing Standards Review will bring in options including minimum requirements through Building Regulations; LPAs can opt in to higher options if evidence of need and affordable and viable. An update of SHMA would provide this information.
- Perhaps overkill especially if looking at all dwellings. – Building Regs will be adequate.
- Considered that a large number of adaptable dwellings are currently available on market and also viewed it is relatively economical to retrofit dwellings.

### **Live Work & Custom/Self Build**

- The current approach to live work is satisfactory although the need for high speed broadband was identified.
- Opposition to including a percentage of large development to be set aside sites for self-build due to practical problems such as health and safety issues.

GBC owned sites could be used however still a need to service plots and speed of delivery can be slow – ADC have experience of this.

- Reminded of the need to compile a register of individuals who have expressed an interest in self build.

### **Elderly/Retirement properties**

- The possibility of including the provision of these in exception sites was identified.
- These types of facilities often require adequate support facilities and need to be at least 50 units to make viable.
- These types of development can't always count towards housing figures. Clarity in relation to terms might be helpful – UCO definitions will be useful.

### **Matters not being debated**

- Rural exceptions sites – cross refer to NPPF as can now include proportion of market housing.
- Policy on Aspirational Housing proposed – encourage bigger housing for wealthy (nb link to NPPF para 55 and exceptional quality and innovative design of dwellings). Central Lincs and East Staffs cited as examples.
- Noted workshops seen as a good and positive form of engagement. Further consideration could be given to a school children workshop.

### **Facilities & Infrastructure**

#### **Community Facilities**

- Requires definitions – list of what are community facilities - often a link to infrastructure. Does this cover schools, GPs and car parking.
- Can only prevent if application comes forward – can't keep facilities open and freer now through Permitted Development changes. Question if existing Replacement Local Plan Policy C4 has ever been used successfully.
- Look at ways of supporting facilities through planning and use of CIL money. Community Assets Register and links to right to buy were considered.
- Consider length of time facility is vacant.
- Confirmation over status of Green Space Strategy requested.
- Consideration of special policy to protect public houses.
- Tests within draft policy need to be precise. Key is to ensure that facility has been adequately marketed.

#### **Infrastructure**

- Each site has its own requirements and viability – can't prioritise through policy.
- Establishment of principles to help guide decisions about priority could be useful perhaps through Infrastructure Protocol which can be regularly reviewed.

## **Communications**

- High Speed Broadband important – support for coverage in rural areas. Also of relevance to a live work policy.
- Policy wording does not refer to high speed broadband – Current Govt. consultation on this.
- Mobile operators who've recently submitted applications may be helpful on this.

## **Not being debated**

- Tourist accommodation – strategy which supports Notts as destination – requires accommodation. Agree with urban area and large villages but also in association with existing facilities even if in Green Belt.

# Heritage

## What national policy says

Section 12 of the NPPF specifically refers to conserving and enhancing the historic environment. Paragraph 126 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states local planning authorities should set out a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment, including heritage assets most at risk through neglect, decay or other threats. The NPPF also identifies the approach to take when determining planning applications and the considerations to be made where there is substantial or less than substantial harm to heritage assets.

## What the Core Strategy says

Policy 11 of the Core Strategy states proposals and initiatives will be supported where the historic environment and heritage assets and their settings are conserved and enhanced in line with their interest and significance. Planning decisions will have regard to the contribution heritage assets can have to the delivery of wider social, cultural, economic and environmental objectives. It goes on to identify elements of the historic environment which contribute towards the unique identity of the area and help create a sense of place. The policy also identifies a number of different approaches that will be used and that particular attention will be given to heritage at risk.

## What the Responses to the Issues & Options say

Local residents and Parish Councils identified a number of buildings and other features which they considered have value as heritage assets. English Heritage supported the inclusion of further policies related to designated and non-designated heritage assets to provide more detail on what will or will not be permitted and provided guidance on what could be included. There was strong support for including a policy on non-designated heritage assets.

Full details can be found in the Report of Consultation.

## Options

Key Question	Option	Comment	Notes
How to identify and protect non-designated heritage assets i.e. a local interest list.  Reason – to allow NPPF paragraph 135 to be addressed with more certainty (as recommended by English Heritage).	<u>Option A – include a policy</u> Include criteria to identify assets and include policy to assess development against.  <u>Option B – no policy</u> Identify assets on an ad-hoc basis and rely on NPPF and ACS.	<u>Option A</u> Pros – clarity of what will be classed as a locally listed asset, degree of certainty over whether a building is an asset or not Cons – likely involve significant amount of work  <u>Option B</u> Pros – general approach, allows flexibility	Under Option A a process for the identification of non-designated assets will be required.

		Cons – lack of certainty, relies on good information and assessments at application stage	
<p>How to protect designated heritage assets.</p> <p>Reason – recommended by English Heritage to provide further local detail to protect designated heritage assets.</p>	<p><u>Option A – include policy</u> Include a policy to state that development which harms significance will not be acceptable unless robustly justified and to set out how harm will be assessed.</p> <p><u>Alternative</u> – separate policies for different types of designated assets (Conservation Areas, Scheduled Monuments etc.)</p> <p><u>Option B – no policy</u> Rely on NPPF paragraphs 132 to 134 which provide guidance on how to consider the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset.</p>	<p><u>Option A</u> Pros – greater clarity over requirements and approach ensures protection for assets. Cons – repeats national policy</p> <p><u>Alternative</u> Pro – fine grained approach; responds to different characteristics of asset types. Cons – potential for a lot of repetition</p> <p><u>Option B</u> Pros – consistent approach, keeps policies to a minimum Cons – no local detail, insufficient clarity on what constitutes harm</p>	

# Design

## What national policy says

Paragraph 56 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, is indivisible from good planning, and should contribute positively to making places better for people. Paragraph 58 goes on to identify that planning policies and decisions should aim to ensure that development:

- Functions well and adds to the overall quality of the area;
- Establishes a strong sense of place and creates attractive and comfortable places to live work and visit;
- Respond to local character and history;
- Create safe and accessible environments; and
- Are visually attractive

There is support for the use of design codes (para 59) and design reviews (para 62) but there should be no imposition of architectural styles or particular tastes (para 60); however it is appropriate to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness and guide the scale, density, massing, height, landscape, layout and materials of new development.. Great weight should be given to outstanding or innovative designs (para 63) while permission should be refused for poor design that fails to take opportunities to improve character.

In terms of residential properties paragraph 53 allows for local authorities to consider the case for policies to resist the inappropriate development of residential gardens

## What the Core Strategy says

Policy 11.1 of the Core Strategy states all new development should be designed to:

- a) Make a positive contribution to the public realm and sense of place;
- b) Create an attractive, safe, inclusive and healthy environment;
- c) Reinforce valued local characteristics;
- d) Be adaptable to meet changing needs of occupiers and the effects of climate change; and
- e) Reflect the need to reduce the dominance of motor vehicles.

Policy 11 goes on to identify a number of elements which development will be assessed against. These include structure and layout, density, massing, materials, impact on amenity, features to design out crime and the impact on views and heritage assets.

Policy 8.4 sets out that the appropriate density of housing will also be informed by a range of factors including, the character of areas, site specific issues and design considerations.



## What the Responses to the Issues & Options say

In relation to design there was a broad split between those who considered that more detailed policies were required and those who considered that further detail could be included in non-statutory guidance. There was a similar split in relation to whether areas of 'special character' should be identified with a majority considering that a general policy was sufficient while others thought areas should be designated.

This split was also seen in relation to the development of residential gardens (known as 'garden grabbing') with a majority in favour of adopting a borough wide policy and others in favour of using general policies.

In terms of density the majority were in favour of establishing target densities for different parts of the borough reflecting existing density. There were also a number of respondents in favour of continuing our current approach. Respondents also identified a number of issues for inclusions in an amenity policy.

Full details can be found in the Report of Consultation.

## Options

Key Question	Option	Comment	Notes
How to guide the density of residential development.  Reason – to provide guidance on NPPF paragraph 59, ACS Policy 8.4 and ACS Policy 10.2c	<u>Option A – current approach</u> Include a policy to set a requirement for 30 dwellings per hectare with a higher target in areas close to shops and public transport.  <u>Option B – different densities in different areas</u> Include a policy which sets a different density in different areas to reflect existing density of that area.  <u>Option C – No policy</u> Rely on NPPF and ACS and determine density on a case by case basis.	<u>Option A</u> Pros – straight forward, raises density leading to reduced land take Cons – 30dph not always appropriate, inflexible  <u>Option B</u> Pros – development will be in keeping with character of area, more flexible Cons – additional work to identify density, could lead to reduced densities  <u>Option C</u> Pros – flexible, responds to area and site characteristics	

		Cons – uncertainty, difficulty in making judgement as to appropriate density	
<p>How to promote distinctiveness and reinforce local valued characteristics.</p> <p>Reason - to provide guidance on NPPF paragraph 60 and ACS Policy 10.1 and 10.2.</p>	<p><u>Option A – include a detailed policy</u> Include a detailed policy setting out the different design requirements for different parts of the Borough.</p> <p><u>Option B – use of guidance</u> Rely on ACS Policy 10 and Building For Life 12 and also provide non-statutory guidance to inform developers about different requirements in different areas.</p>	<p><u>Option A</u> Pros – gives requirements ‘teeth’, Cons – significant amount of work, difficult to update/amend</p> <p><u>Option B</u> Pros – flexible, can focus work in more sensitive areas of the Borough and build up over time, enables opportunity for more community engagement Cons – guidance would be non-statutory and would carry less weight, uncertainty in short term about local distinctiveness</p>	
<p>How to ensure that development functions well and is safe, accessible and inclusive.</p> <p>Reason – to provide guidance on NPPF paragraph 58 and ACS Policy 10.1</p>	<p><u>Option A – include a criteria based policy</u> Include a policy that supports the use of Building For Life 12 along with additional general criteria for non-residential development.</p> <p><u>Option B – No policy</u> Rely on NPPF and ACS Policy 10.1.</p>	<p><u>Option A</u> Pros – further guidance and clarity Cons – unlikely to add significantly to existing policy</p> <p><u>Option B</u> Pros – keeps local policy to minimum, no potential for conflict between policies Cons – no policy requirement to use BFL 12</p>	
<p>How to protect residential gardens from inappropriate development.</p> <p>Reason – to provide guidance on NPPF paragraph 53 and to address local concerns.</p>	<p><u>Option A – include a Borough wide policy</u> Include a policy that sets out that the subdivision/loss of residential gardens for additional dwellings will be permitted where no more than 50% of the existing garden would be</p>	<p><u>Option A</u> Pros – responds to concerns, certainty as to what is acceptable/unacceptable Cons – inflexible, restricts development</p>	

	<p>lost.</p> <p><u>Option B – include a certain parts of Borough policy</u> Identify certain parts of the Borough where garden redevelopment is inappropriate.</p> <p><u>Option C – no policy</u> No policy.</p>	<p><u>Option B</u> Pros – focusses policy on areas where an issue Cons – extra work to define where these areas are, could lead to inappropriate loss where gardens not in identified area.</p> <p><u>Option C</u> Pros – allows case by case decisions Cons – lack of certainty, does not respond to local concerns</p>	
--	--	--	--

### Matters not being debated

Issue	Reason	Conclusion
Whether to continue identifying special character areas.	Existing policy ENV16 (Old Woodthorpe) and ENV17 (Ravenshead)	As there will be policy or guidance on design in different areas it is no longer considered necessary to have separate policies on these two areas.
How to protect the amenity of adjacent properties.	Provide clarity on amenity and replace ENV1b which is often used in determining applications.	A policy will be included to expand on amenity (not just residential). Other parts of ENV1 are addressed elsewhere
What arrangements to put in place for design reviews.	To address NPPF para 62.	A policy will need to be included setting out the scale of development appropriate for different levels of review

# Key Issues from Design and Heritage Workshop 12.1 2015

## Present:

Mike Rowan (WAG)  
Patrick Smith (Woodborough PC)  
Les Warner (WAG)  
Wyn Lewis (Linby Parish Council)  
Catherine Seaton (WACAT)  
Rachel Dewsbury (Newstead Abbey)  
Amanda Vernon (Broxtowe BC)  
Lynne Gadd (Arnold LHG)

Eric Dove (Arnold LHG)  
John Parker (NLHA)  
Neil Oxby (Ashfield DC)  
Nina Wilson (Notts CC)  
Jason Mordan (Notts CC)  
Tom Dillarstone (Gedling BC)  
Alison Gibson (Gedling BC)

## Heritage

### **Non designated assets**

- Information available on Historic Environment Record held by Notts CC as well as the current list held by Gedling BC.
- Government introduced guidelines on Local Interest List advising need to have broad criteria which a building should be assessed against.
- Some authorities encourage nominations or work in a “thematic” way. Work has been undertaken in Nottingham with Civic Voice
- Importance that identifying assets is not too unwieldy and should be updated regularly.
- Approach taken by Bassetlaw DC was identified as good practice
- It was questioned how “importance” is assessed and it was confirmed that it is accounted for in the decision making process, weighing up the benefit of the proposal against the harm.
- Confirmed that case law is the only way to establish the robustness of a local list.
- Significance of the setting of a conservation area was raised. Form of architecture is key not just function.
- Noted the importance of not trying to conserve everything because if we do we defend nothing.

WAG preferred option A.

### **Designated assets**

- English Heritage have advised the need to have a policy that builds on NPPF although some were of the view that the NPPF and ACS provided sufficient guidance.
- Para 128-129 considers the significance of heritage assets and need to assess the particular significance of any heritage asset (Bassetlaw DC have produced a guide).
- It was questioned whether we had a good contact network – John Parker could assist with local contacts.

WAG preferred option A.

Newstead Abbey preferred option B

## **Policy Wording**

- Considered section on listed buildings is a good starting point but (b) requires expansion – e.g. teasing out what is meant by sustainability in justification text.
- Reversibility or temporary nature of work / use also key. (Rachel Dewsbury to forward Conservation management plan for Newstead Abbey).
- It was questioned whether, by not having a management plan in place for a conservation area, an area is more vulnerable (e.g. Woodborough). How to assess whether a building makes a valuable contribution or not to a Conservation Area was raised.
- With respect to locally listed assets it was noted the need to consider more than just architectural features such as historic interest. Value is key (Bassetlaw have adopted an appropriate approach).
- Archaeology may fit better as part of the Non-designated Asset policy and viewed important not to identify areas of archaeology on Policies Map.
- Importance of ensuring archaeological monitoring is undertaken / enforced

## **Design**

### **Density**

- A lower density in villages will not support vulnerable local services
- In some parts of Conservation Areas a higher density would be more in keeping with the character of the area.
- Clarification over what the definition of a dwelling was requested.
- Noted that if density is set on an existing density then the character of areas will not change.
- Importance of being site specific and integrate with the rest of the community.
- Considered the influence of developers profit on density proposals.

Woodborough Action Group / Linby PC / Newstead Abbey considered option B provided best protection for different areas. Agreed option C provided no protection. Consensus that a combination of A and B would be the best proposal (i.e. a general approach with certain areas identified for a higher or lower density)

### **Distinctiveness and local valued characteristics**

- Some concern expressed over option B and the use of non-statutory guidance however it was confirmed that a SPD is consulted upon and would carry significant weight.
- Noted that there will be some overlap with Conservation Area appraisals.
- Considered Building for Life is enshrined in local distinctiveness and design issues
- Inclusion of date stones in future developments was proposed.

WAG / Linby PC / WACAT preferred Option A as it provides more “teeth” and that non-statutory policy would not provide the right level of protection. Concern was expressed that this option may not be workable.

### **Functions well, safe, accessible and inclusive**

- Considered that policy should not be too prescriptive.

- Ability to assess Building for Life was raised as was the possibility of needing additional expertise to assess applications.
- Would apply mainly to larger developments

Linby PC supported Option A as non-statutory guidance not considered to provide sufficient protection.

## **Residential Gardens**

- Noted that NPPF provides opportunity to include a policy.
- Dependent on the character of the area.
- Concern that if unable to build in gardens there may be a conflict with the ACS policy of urban concentration.
- It was viewed better to use the term curtilage rather than garden

A criteria based policy Option B was preferred. A 50% approach was considered not to take a count of local circumstances.

## **Matters not debated**

- Providing detail on design in different areas would negate need for special character areas.
- ENV1 protects environmental amenity but considered that amenity should be applied to different policies
- Design reviews are primarily for large developments

# Transport

## What national policy says

Paragraph 30 of the National Planning Policy Framework states encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion. Local Plans should ensure developments are located where the need to travel will be minimised and the use of sustainable transport modes can be maximised (paragraph 34). Local Plans should protect and exploit opportunities for the use of sustainable transport modes for the movement of goods or people. All developments which generate significant amounts of movement should be required to provide a Travel Plan (paragraph 35).

Planning policies should aim for a balance of land uses within their area so that people can be encouraged to minimise journey lengths (paragraph 37) and for larger scale residential development promote a mix of uses in order to provide opportunities to undertake day-to-day activities (paragraph 38).

If setting local parking standards for residential and non-residential development, local planning authorities should take into account the accessibility of the development; the type, mix and use of development; the availability of and opportunities for public transport; local car ownership levels; and the overall need to reduce the use of high-emission vehicles (paragraph 39).

Sites and routes should be identified and protected which could be critical in widening transport choice (paragraph 41).

## What the Core Strategy says

Policy 14 (Managing Travel Demand) states the need to travel, especially by private car, will be reduced by securing new developments of appropriate scale in the most accessible locations. The priority for new development is in firstly selecting sites already accessible by walking, cycling and public transport, but where accessibility deficiencies do exist these will need to be fully addressed. A hierarchical approach to ensure the delivery of sustainable transport networks to serve new development will be adopted.

Policy 15 (Transport Infrastructure Priorities) states where new development gives rise to the need for additional transport infrastructure, it should be prioritised in accordance with delivering the spatial strategy in Policy 2, the principles of travel demand management in Policy 14 and the priorities of the Local Transport Plans. New development must include a sufficient package of measures to ensure that journeys by non-private car modes are encouraged, and that residual car trips will not unacceptably

compromise the wider transport system in terms of its effective operation. Part 3 of Policy 15 refers to existing planned transport schemes with committed funding but remain important to the delivery of the Core Strategy (which includes the Gedling Access Road).

### **What the Responses to the Issues and Options say**

Cycling: Nearly all respondents agreed that developer contributions should continue to be required for cycling and that cycle routes should continue to be protected. Natural England states that cycle routes should be incorporated into green infrastructure where practical.

Residential parking: Nearly half of the respondents supported the continuing use of Supplementary Planning Document. Half of respondents felt this should be incorporated into the Local Planning Document. A general point made by Woodborough residents that there was insufficient parking in the village to support more housing.

Non-residential parking: Most respondents favoured setting an approach to non-residential parking through the Local Planning Document. A significant number opted for continuing with the 6Cs Highways Design Guide. Comment was raised to consider including provision encouraging the use of electric or hybrid vehicles through the Supplementary Planning Document.

General transport policy: The majority of respondents (including the Highways Agency) agreed that there is no need for additional policy on general transport. However 41% of respondents considered there should be additional local policy. It was mentioned to establish a local policy which could reflect the nature and character of the area including the need to prevent HGV traffic through villages. Other comments included rural services were generally poor and a Park and Ride site should be located in the north of Nottingham to address existing problems of traffic congestion.

Transport routes: There was an overwhelming view that future transport routes should continue to be identified and protected. A number of respondents referred to safeguarding the mineral line to the former Calverton Colliery and there was also mention of safeguarding the Gedling Colliery line for a cycle route.

Other transport issues: The Nottinghamshire Fire and Rescue Service stressed that all planning decisions must ensure that the needs of the emergency services to reach all areas of the community promptly is carried through.



Full details can be found in the Report of Consultation

(<http://www.gedling.gov.uk/media/documents/planningbuildingcontrol/localplanningdocument/Appendix%20B%20-%20LPD%20Report%20of%20Consultation%20-%20Topics.pdf>).

## Options

Key Question	Option	Comment	Notes
<p>How to increase the number of developments supported by Travel Plans.</p> <p>Reason – paragraphs 35 and 36 of the National Planning Policy Framework = "All developments which generate significant amounts of movement should be required to provide a Travel Plan". One of the indicators for Policy 14 of the Aligned Core Strategy sets a target to "increase the number of developments supported by travel plans".</p>	<p><u>Option A – include a policy</u> Include a policy to require development over a specified threshold to produce a Travel Plan.</p> <p><u>Option B – all developments to produce Travel Plans</u> All developments to produce Travel Plans.</p> <p><u>Option C – include a criteria based policy</u> Set out a series of criteria (retain existing Policy T1).</p> <p><u>Option D – no policy</u> Rely on existing guidance provided by Nottinghamshire County Council and threshold for requiring Travel Plans set by Department of Transport.</p>	<p><u>Option A</u> Pros – only a requirement of large development. Cons – not just about size of development but also location. May need different thresholds for different land uses.</p> <p><u>Option B</u> Pros – increase number of Travel Plans. Cons – onerous for minor development.</p> <p><u>Option C</u> Pros – flexible approach. Cons – may cause uncertainty</p> <p><u>Option D</u> Pros – continue with existing approach. Cons – may not increase number of Travel Plans.</p>	<p>Existing guidance provided by the county is 'Guidance for the preparation of travel plans in support of planning 'applications.</p>

Key Question	Option	Comment	Notes
<p>What approach should be taken to residential car parking standards.</p> <p>Reason – to provide guidance on National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 39 which states "If setting local parking standards for residential and non-residential development, local planning authorities should take into account: the accessibility of the development; the type, mix and use of development; the availability of and opportunities for public transport; local car ownership levels; and an overall need to reduce the use of high-emission vehicles."</p>	<p><u>Option A – include a Gedling specific policy</u> Include a Gedling specific policy incorporating the key elements of Residential Car Parking Supplementary Planning Document.</p> <p><u>Option B – no policy</u> Rely on 6Cs Highway Design Guide.</p>	<p><u>Option A</u> Pros – policy requirement and gives key elements greater weight. Cons – would be harder to amend if needed.</p> <p><u>Option B</u> Pros – greater status. Cons – local circumstances not taken into account.</p>	<p>May need to update Residential Car Parking Supplementary Planning Document based on Census 2011 as the Supplementary Planning Document currently uses Census 2001.</p>

Key Question	Option	Comment	Notes
<p>What approach should be taken to non-residential car parking standards.</p> <p>Reason – to provide guidance on National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 39 which states "If setting local parking standards for residential and non-residential development, local planning authorities should take into account: the accessibility of the development; the type, mix and use of development; the availability of and opportunities for public transport; local car ownership levels; and an overall need to reduce the use of high-emission vehicles."</p>	<p><u>Option A – include a policy</u> Include a policy to incorporate key elements of 6Cs Highway Design Guide.</p> <p><u>Option B – no policy</u> Rely on 6Cs Highway Design Guide.</p> <p><u>Option C – include a Gedling specific policy</u> Include a Gedling's specific policy based on paragraph 39 of National Planning Policy Framework (taking account of accessibility of development, type, mix and use of development, availability of public transport, local car ownership levels and the need to reduce use of high-emission vehicles).</p>	<p><u>Option A</u> Pros – becomes policy requirement and gives key elements greater weight. Cons – would be harder to amend if needed.</p> <p><u>Option B</u> Pros – continue with existing approach. Cons – local circumstances not taken into account. Would carry less weight when determining planning applications.</p> <p><u>Option C</u> Pros – policy in line with NPPF and local circumstances taken into account. Cons – implications for future location of development, choosing locations in the conurbation based on amount of parking provision.</p>	<p>Section DG14 and Table DG11 of the 6Cs Highway Design Guide are still relevant (<a href="http://www.leics.gov.uk/index/6csdg/highway_req_development_part3.htm#section_dg14">http://www.leics.gov.uk/index/6csdg/highway_req_development_part3.htm#section_dg14</a>).</p>

Key Question	Option	Comment	Notes
<p>What approach should be taken on future Park and Ride provision.</p> <p>Reason – consultation response argues for a Park and Ride site to address existing problems of traffic congestion.</p>	<p><u>Option A – include a policy</u> Include a policy.</p> <p><u>Option B – no policy</u> Rely on paragraph 90 of National Planning Policy Framework which states "Certain other forms of development are also not inappropriate in Green Belt provided they preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land in Green Belt. These are: ... local transport infrastructure which can demonstrate a requirement for a Green Belt location".</p>	<p><u>Option A</u> Pros – clear policy position. Cons – likely to involve significant amount of work.</p> <p><u>Options B</u> Pros – use of national policy. Cons – relies on information and assessments at application stage.</p>	<p>Consultation responses suggest new Park and Ride site in the north of Nottingham.</p> <p>Para 90 states local transport infrastructure which can demonstrate a requirement for a Green Belt location is not inappropriate.</p>

### Matters not being debated

Issue	Comment
<p>A policy to include provision of electric or hybrid vehicles.</p> <p>Reason – consultation response</p>	<p>This will be covered in Air Quality policy. Consultation response suggests including provision of electric or hybrid vehicles through the SPD.</p>

Issue	Comment
<p>Protect sites and routes i.e. cycle routes and recreational routes.</p> <p>Reason – paragraph 41 of the National Planning Policy Framework</p>	<p>Need to retain current Replacement Local Plan Policy T9 (cycle routes).</p> <p>Overwhelming view that future transport routes should continue to be identified and protected.</p> <p>Consultation responses suggest safeguarding mineral line to former Calverton Colliery and safeguarding Gedling Colliery line for a cycle route.</p>
<p>Cycle routes be incorporated into green infrastructure (where practical).</p> <p>Reason – consultation response (i.e. Natural England)</p>	<p>Rely on Core Strategy Policy 16.3.</p>
<p>Consider a policy to prevent HGV traffic through villages.</p> <p>Reason – consultation response</p>	<p>It is for the County Council to restrict HGVs on specific routes.</p>
<p>Consider a policy to address the needs of emergency services to reach all areas of the community promptly.</p> <p>Reason – consultation response</p>	<p>Emergency services are consulted on planning applications.</p>
<p>Developer contributions required for cycling.</p>	<p>This will be considered on an application by application basis.</p>

## **Key issues arising from Transport Workshop 15.1.2015**

Jo Gray (GBC)	Dave Pick (Notts County Council, Highways)
Ian McDonald (GBC)	Amy Cockayne (Ashfield District Council)
David Astill (Nottingham City Transport),	Matt Leighton (Network Rail)
Mike Rowan (Woodborough Action Group)	Bettina Lange (Notts Campaign for Better Transport)
Patrick Smith (Woodborough Parish Council)	Simon Molsom (Linby & Papplewick PC)
Matt Easter (Sustrans)	Giulla Panetta (Travel Right)
Steve Ryder (Nottingham City, Planning)	Richard Cooper (PEDALS)
Graeme Foster (GBC)	Lisa Guest (Nottm. City - Highways)
Vince Mandair (Notts County Council, Highways)	

### **Transport**

#### **Travel Plans**

- Woodborough PC mentioned the need to distinguish between urban and rural areas where in the latter case relatively small developments could have a significant impact.
- The DfT Guidance 2007 has a threshold for the requirement for Travel Plans for all use classes. For residential development, the threshold is 80 units but the guidance is flexible and the specific requirements of particular locations can be taken into account, including conservation areas.
- A key issue was the quality of Travel Plans and what they sought to achieve. There is a need for them to be tied into the transport assessment supporting planning applications and to have “teeth” secured by way of condition or S106 planning obligations. Penalties can be imposed or additional measures built into the Travel Plan sought if monitoring suggests that targets are not being met.
- The DfT Guidance includes advice on the content of Travel Plans and the Highways Authorities’ role is to scrutinise Travel Plans for effectiveness.
- Different arguments were put as to whether the DfT guidance on S106/conditions should be included in local plan policy to give added certainty with the opposing view there was no need as the DfT Guidance has sufficient status.
- In any event, there was a general consensus that reference to the DfT Guidance should be included within the Plan.
- There was a degree of consensus for having both thresholds and criteria in the Policy on the need for Travel Plans.

## **Residential Parking Standards**

- By way of background, the 6Cs Group provides consistency across the three Counties/Cities on parking provision but does not provide guidelines on residential parking standards.
- Good examples to look at include Essex County Council, Leicester City and Staffordshire County Council.
- The consensus was to include residential parking standards in policy (based on the existing SPD but with updated information from the Census).

## **Policy Wording**

- Some considered there was an anomaly in the car parking SPD requirements for 2 bed properties up to 5 units and the requirements for 2 beds properties for 6 or more units. GBC agreed to look into this.
- Suggested wording for the draft policies included “.....meet the normal requirements for maximum parking provision.....”
- Whilst not accepted by all representatives it was suggested that the policy includes a caveat as follows: “....or otherwise as agreed by the LPA”. Alternatively, the wording of the SPD allows for flexibility in certain circumstances.

## **Non Residential Parking**

- General agreement to include a policy to cross refer to the 6C’s Guidance, but not reproduce it as an appendix because it is a web based “living” document that is revised regularly.
- Nottingham City refers to the 6C’s Guidance but also include guidelines in an appendix relating to non-residential uses and the types of local circumstances that may be considered.

## **Park and Ride Policy**

- It was explained that NCC had investigated and safeguarded certain proposals. The Park and Ride site on the A60 at Leapool Island has been investigated but it was somewhat remote location from the City Centre and did not offer the advantages over the car as buses would be queuing in the same traffic as it is difficult to get bus priority measures along the Mansfield Road. Funding was also an issue and this area would not be a priority as it is not as viable as other sites.
- The group generally agreed that there was too much uncertainty over a potential Park and Ride site at Leapool Island and the site should not be specifically protected through Policy in the Local Planning Document although a general reference to provide general support to potential P+R sites could be included in the supporting text.
- Noted that Gedling Colliery Park and Ride site is safeguarded for rail and tram based transport. The tram network is being established with lines 2 and 3

under construction and further lines including Gedling Colliery are a longer term possibility.

**Matters not to be debated**

- Note that it is intended that the Local Planning Document will include reference to supporting electric or hybrid vehicles through air quality policy.
- Note that it is intended that the Local Planning Document will protect cycle routes and recreational routes. Consideration to be given to safeguarding routes for multi-purpose use.
- Whilst it was noted that the issue of enforcing HGV routes was a police matter and not a matter for the Local Planning Document, communities were encouraged to gather evidence of HGV “rat running” through villages.