

## **Inspector' Note to the Councils following October/November Hearings**

This note is intended to clarify what additional work I asked the Councils to undertake at last week's hearings. It also reflects some further thoughts I have had based on the discussions at the hearings, and these too may require some additional work if suitable evidence is not already available.

### **Housing Distribution in Gedling**

After discussion of the proposed distribution of new housing and other development in the Borough, I questioned whether the identified locations and sites for growth were consistent with a strategy of urban concentration with regeneration. Only 2,840 new homes are planned in or adjoining the main built up area of Nottingham in Gedling out of 7,250 in total.

Ashfield District Council raised concerns about the impact of the proposed 1,600 new homes adjoining Hucknall plus up to 500 homes at Bestwood village on that town's infrastructure. I have requested that Gedling BC undertakes additional work to identify more precisely what the infrastructure requirements of these proposals will be, what impact they would have on Hucknall and how infrastructure works or mitigation measures could be funded. Gedling BC should discuss their findings with Ashfield DC and aim to secure a statement of common ground.

Part of the solution to the two problems summarised above could be to bring forward development at the former Gedling Colliery site and at Teal Close and other locations in or adjoining Nottingham's main built up area.

If this is possible, the Council should consider whether increases in capacity in these locations could reduce the proposed numbers for new housing and employment land around Hucknall, and at Calverton and Ravenshead. In respect of new development of up to 1,300 new homes at Calverton, I have noted concerns about the transport and travel implications, the ability of this rural settlement to absorb the proposed level of new development socially and physically, and the impact on the countryside including the Green Belt and prospective SPA.

### **Toton**

Depending on the number of homes which the Plan promotes here during the plan period, it will be necessary to consider the likely impact on other planned sites and locations. For example: In view of the distance of Brinsley from the main built up area of Nottingham, and the comparatively small scale of development proposed, should the figure of up to 200 new homes be re-considered? And/or is there a case for reducing the figure of up to 2,000 new homes at Kimberley and Eastwood if the Toton site is promoted?

Concerning Field Farm, Appendix A suggests there is a good range of community services/facilities in Stapleford Town Centre. However, this would be a long walk from most parts of the Field Farm site. Stapleford is also expected to serve new residents at Toton [CD/REG/02, Page 79] and

this raises the question - Could Stapleford cope with the combined impact from 2 new significant developments? This may require additional information about traffic impact. Appendix A refers to "Further dialogue on detailed proposals" for Field Farm over community services. Would this mean that community services could be provided on site, so that the proposed Field Farm development would not be merely a housing estate and some of the car journeys to shop in Stapleford might be eliminated?

On Field Farm, which is an Allocation designed to commence within the first 5 years of the plan period, can Appendix A be updated to clarify the currently very generalised references to "further dialogue on detailed proposals"?

### **General**

Policy 2 – Depending on the outcome of the additional work by the Councils in respect of the Toton site and in Gedling, what changes are required to this policy, in particular to the housing numbers? How would amendments affect the 5 year housing land supply? How would the table in Policy 2 showing delivery over 5 year tranches be affected, and the housing trajectories in Appendix C?

Monitoring and review - There have been calls for an early review of the Plan. Whether or not it is necessary for the ACS to seek this, there has to be some guarantee that the monitoring, which is promised in the monitoring arrangement boxes, will be carried out and will lead to action to secure change if the policies are not working. This is essential for positive planning and effectiveness. Section D, Making it Happen, with Policies 18 and 19, could usefully be extended to reassure the reader that a process of plan, monitor and manage is envisaged; that the Councils will act if, for example, key development proposals do not come forward as intended. Some additional information on the triggers which would lead to a policy review or other action would assist.

The Councils have helpfully proposed some changes to update the monitoring arrangements boxes and make clear which future DPDs will take forward specific proposals. A wider review of the text of the ACS is also needed to tighten up the references to future DPDs eg. paragraph 3.2.5. Also, references to "Local Plans" as in 3.2.8 should be clarified – presumably this means the old Local Plans which are to be superseded?

Jill Kingaby (Inspector)  
November 2013