

Greater Nottingham Aligned Core Strategies

Locally Distinct Housing Issues

for

Gedling Borough Council

Report of Consultation

January 2012

Locally Distinct Housing Issues for Gedling Borough Council (July 2011)

Report of Consultation

Introduction

The Locally Distinct Housing Issues for Gedling Consultation Document was published in July 2011 for a period of 11 weeks ending on 3rd October 2011. The paper outlined the implications of the housing requirement for Gedling Borough and how the housing requirement should be accommodated. A key aspect of the paper was to consider a possible revised approach to the Gedling Colliery/Chase Farm site given concerns regarding the viability of this site.

The comments received during the consultation period have been considered by Gedling Borough and comments have influenced the next draft of the Aligned Core Strategy – the Publication or pre-submission Draft.

This Report of Consultation summarises the comments made and follows the same order of sections as set out in the Locally Distinct Housing Issues for Gedling Borough Consultation Document. These summaries are followed by an ‘Officer Response’ addressing the key points raised and set out views on whether they should be taken into account.

Whilst every effort has been made to reflect the responses made, reference should be made to the original representation for full details. The following overview of comments made during the consultation does not attempt to provide individual responses to the comments raised. The names of organisations and individuals who made comments on that section of the consultation document are listed.

A related Consultation document – the Greater Nottingham Housing Provision Position Paper – was also consulted upon during the summer of 2011. This consultation document sets out the findings of a review of the housing figures in the draft Aligned Core Strategies. A separate report of consultation has been prepared in respect of this consultation document.

Background

No specific comments

Housing Requirement for Gedling Borough

Specific comments were made about the housing requirement for Gedling Borough being too low or too high. The assumptions behind the housing requirement were also questioned as these were not made explicit or there was insufficient information about how the housing figures were arrived at. One respondent commented that it was not possible to come to a view on the housing requirement because the evidence was not available for evaluation.

Some respondents considered that the housing target was 160 houses per year and that natural small development could cover the requirement on the basis of evidence on past completions (306 per year on table 2.5).

Referring to the Government's localism agenda some Parish Councils made the comment that they welcomed a more local approach to planning. Ravenshead Parish Council commented that they would be eager to participate in neighbourhood plans. The Parish Council would not support high densities of housing or schemes with inadequate parking provision and would only support affordable housing which met a local need.

Respondents

(36,175, 200, 225, 242, 330)

Officer Response

Issues relating to the housing requirement are addressed in the Greater Nottingham HPP report of consultation.

The table below paragraph 2.5 states the requirement is 7,268 which results in an annual requirement of 428 dwellings per year over the remaining plan period (7,268/17) assuming the housing supply of allocations and permissions are built over the plan period.

Accommodating the Housing Requirement for Gedling Borough

There was also concern that the paper had assumed that all planning permissions and unimplemented allocations would be delivered in full whereas it was felt the plan should provide more flexibility to ensure the full housing requirement is met in accordance with PPS 3. Sites were put forward for inclusion in the SHLAA - land north of Rise Park and Forge Farm, Bestwood Village and at Brookfields Garden Centre.

Clarification was sought on the meaning of “white land” in connection with the footnote on page 4 of the document.

Respondents

(242, 286, 313)

Officer response

In undertaking the SHLAA we have assessed all live planning permissions and contacted the developer to gain an understanding of if and when they are looking to develop the site. Where the developer has indicated that they no longer intend to develop the site it has not been included in the figures. While it is accepted that not every planning permission will be developed there is more certainty that they can be developed than with sites without planning permission. Through the Site Specific Allocations DPD and delivering a Five Year Land Supply we will assess the current situation and take appropriate action.

The Aligned Core Strategy identifies ‘strategic sites’ which the Borough Council is allocating for development. Together these will not provide the amount of housing required to meet the housing target. Other non-strategic sites will be identified and allocated through the Site Specific Allocations DPD. While, to date, a number of potential sites have been identified it is expected that further sites will be put forward for consideration and these will be assessed through the SHLAA process. A submission form is available on our website for anyone who wishes to promote land for residential development.

“Safeguarded” land sometimes known as “white land” is covered by saved Policy ENV31 of the Gedling Borough Replacement Local Plan (2005). This policy explains that the safeguarded land shown on the proposals map not included within the Green Belt is safeguarded from inappropriate development until a future Development Plan Document is adopted that proposes it for development. This policy is consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework which provides for safeguarding of land between the urban area and the Green Belt which may be required to serve development needs in the longer term.

Strategic Sites

There was a general point that the identified strategic sites required more testing through the planning process in order to ensure that the locations are the most sustainable. More specifically consultees considered that more detailed transport, environmental and ecological assessments should be undertaken. Clarification was also sought on whether the Greater Nottingham Landscape Character Assessment was used to inform the Sustainable Locations for Growth Study.

Some respondents had general concerns about the deliverability of Gedling Colliery, Mapperley Golf Course and Top Wighay Farm.

A general criticism was made by some respondents that the document was poor in its reasoning, biased or superficial in terms of its treatment of the four options, for example in dismissing options that did not support option 4.

Respondents

(36, 175, 253, 266, 286, 288, 324)

Officer Response

The sites have been assessed against the full range of planning considerations including access and transport requirements, infrastructure requirements such as educational need, flood risk and any ecological constraint. These assessments have been published as part of the evidence base supporting the publication draft Aligned Core Strategy and will be subject to testing at the forthcoming examination in public.

Landscape was one of the criteria used in the Sustainable Locations for Growth Study. Although the Landscape Character Assessment does not make specific recommendations about whether an area should be developed or not, it has been used to inform the strategy in the Aligned Core Strategy.

The Locally Distinct Housing Document for Gedling Borough sets out the broad option for accommodating the housing requirement and deliberately took account of how well the various options accords with amongst other matters Council's priorities for the Borough, including the delivery of the Gedling Colliery/Chase Farm site in order to stimulate debate. The Mapperley Golf Course site is not now being pursued (see below for details and which also responds to comments made in respect of Gedling Colliery/Chase Farm).

North of Papplewick Lane

A number of respondents objected to the identification of land North of Papplewick Lane as a potential housing allocation in the Aligned Core Strategy. Some of these respondents objected to both the potential allocation of housing land North of Papplewick Lane and to the allocation of housing land at Top Wighay Farm as they were concerned about the cumulative impact of housing development from these two sites together with other recent and committed housing development on the infrastructure and services in Hucknall. Papplewick Parish Council stated that it had opposed the allocation of Top Wighay and Papplewick Lane as part of the Local Plan process and their objections and reasoning remained unchanged. One respondent supported the allocation of housing land North of Papplewick Lane.

There was concern expressed by Linby Parish Council amongst others, that the Consultation Document at paragraph 4.1 implied that the North of Papplewick Lane

was a “given” and should be subject to the same tests as all the other sites. The site was considered to be no different to the safeguarded land at Top Wighay or other safeguarded land. Respondents also referred to previous proposals for the site being firmly rejected in the past due to ecological, environmental and social reasons (one respondent referred to the Council’s response to the 2002 consultation relating to the Revised Deposit Draft Gedling Replacement Local Plan).

Papplewick Parish Council considered its previous objections to possible development of land north of Papplewick Lane were still relevant (received following the Option for Consultation stage in February 2010). These objections included adverse impact on the Mature Landscape Area, harm to wildlife, visual intrusion and the effects of increased traffic. These concerns were also raised by a number of other consultees and are summarised below.

The majority of comments made related to concerns about the impact of traffic on the road capacity, particularly concerns about traffic congestion on local roads and on main routes into Hucknall and Nottingham. Respondents feared that the proposal would exacerbate existing traffic problems in the area which some attributed to recent development taking place including South of Papplewick Lane. Particular concerns raised included issues such as increased traffic congestion and “rat running” on Hayden Lane and Papplewick Lane and also increased congestion on Bernard Avenue and Church Lane. There were also concerns about worsening safety at junctions including at Linby Lane and Forest Lane and the A60 and Forest Lane.

A number of respondents commented that the tram and trains operating between Hucknall and Nottingham were full and additional capacity was not possible.

Many respondents also raised objections on the basis that services and facilities in the area such as schools, doctors, dentists and social services were already overstretched and would not be able to cope with the additional residents. In many cases, respondents considered that the proposal must be considered in the context of the cumulative impact arising from this proposal and other recent developments (including land south of Papplewick Lane) on local services and facilities.

Some respondents made the point that the location did not relate well to Gedling urban area and that the impacts would be felt in neighbouring Ashfield. They also urged that Gedling Borough Council should fully explore brownfield options and sites in the Gedling area.

A large number of comments made concerned the impact on wildlife in the area including protected species and in particular the potential adverse impact on Moor Pond Woods which is a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC). Many respondents referred to the importance of the River Leen and associated wildlife including protected species such as water voles and white clawed crayfish which they felt would be threatened by pollution from surface water running into it. The site

was considered by some respondents to be part of the foraging area of protected species present in Moor Pond Woods.

Adding to flood risk was also raised by a number of respondents, both as a result of building in the floodplain and because of water run-off from any new housing. Part of the site is located within flood zone 2 and flood risk needs to be considered. Surface water run-off should be controlled.

There were concerns about the potential adverse impact on the Mature Landscape Area with some respondents considering that the proposal would be contrary to policy ENV37 (Mature Landscape Areas) set out in the Gedling Borough Replacement Local Plan 2005.

There were a number of respondents who considered that development of the site would be harmful to the Green Belt and would lead to coalescence between Hucknall, Linby and Papplewick. Some respondents thought that the site was in the Green Belt, others commented that the land in question should not lose its safeguarded land status and it was also proposed that the site be returned to Green Belt. Respondents also mentioned concerns relating to the loss of countryside and agricultural land.

The potential adverse impact on the conservation areas at Linby and Papplewick and also on the setting of Papplewick Hall was also mentioned.

Respondents

(47, 84, 181, 195, 198, 204, 205, 209, 222, 246, 247, 249, 250, 251, 258, 259, 262, 266, 270, 271, 276, 279, 280, 282, 284, 287, 289, 294, 295, 297, 298, 300, 302, 303, 308, 309, 314, 318, 326, 327, 329)

Petition

The Borough Council also received a petition from residents who wished to register an objection to Gedling Borough Council's proposal to bring forward 'safeguarded land' North of Papplewick lane for the development of 600 houses. This petition contained around 268 different signatures. The petitioners raised the same issues which have been summarised above.

Officer Response

The land North of Papplewick Lane is safeguarded land as shown on the proposals map and not included within the Green Belt and is safeguarded from inappropriate development until a future Local Development Document is adopted that proposes it for development. The requirement for new dwellings in Gedling Borough mean that this site is needed to meet development needs set out in the Aligned Core Strategy to 2028. The site was included as a potential Sustainable Urban Extension in the

Aligned Core Strategies Option for Consultation and therefore it has been subject to consultation previously.

The site will be subject to the same testing as the other strategic allocations commensurate with their inclusion in the Aligned Core Strategy. The sites have all been assessed against the full range of planning considerations including access and transport requirements, infrastructure requirements such as educational need, flood risk and any ecological constraint. These assessments will be published as part of the evidence base supporting the publication draft Aligned Core Strategy and will be subject to testing at the forthcoming examination in public. The assessment for the North of Papplewick Lane site indicates that there is no overriding environmental or infrastructure constraints that should preclude it being allocated as a strategic site in the Aligned Core Strategy.

The site adjoins the main urban area of Hucknall which has a good range of services and facilities. It is located close to the town centre and within walking distance of the NET terminus and employment is within easy reach of new residents. Development will help support the role of Hucknall as a main urban area as residents are likely to depend upon local services such as the town centre shops. Where existing services, such as doctors or schools, are at or near capacity then the developer would be expected to contribute to the additional capacity required as a result of the development. Close working will be required between the two Councils concerned.

There is no designated wildlife sites located within the allocation although it is acknowledged that the site lies close to the Moor Pond Woods SINC which will remain a protected designation. The site will be subject to a detailed master planning exercise that will seek to ensure that an adequate buffer is maintained between the proposed development and the SINC and also for a protective buffer to be provided along the River Leen Corridor. Opportunities will be sought in order to ensure public access to the River Leen Corridor is improved.

Development will be required to contribute towards the costs of infrastructure, services and facilities required to support the development for example, the developer will be expected to fund additional school places. These contributions will be made to the service provider regardless of district council boundaries.

Part of the site is located within Flood Zone 2 and any forthcoming planning application will need to be subject to a detailed Flood Risk Assessment. However, strategic advice in flood risk terms has been obtained from the Environment Agency which supports the identification of the site for development in the Publication Draft Aligned Core Strategy.

The site was excluded from the Green Belt and allocated as safeguarded land in the Gedling Borough Replacement Local Plan 2005. The Sustainable Urban Extensions Study June 2008 concluded that this safeguarded land (North of Papplewick Lane) would be a sustainable development option and concluded that:

“The area of land already safeguarded from the Green Belt appears to us a logical, residential extension to the Hucknall Urban Area. The consultant team agrees with the Inspector’s reasoning in avoiding northward expansion of the safeguarded land into the Green Belt”.

As such, the land immediately north of the proposed site would be kept in the Green Belt and will remain open so as to prevent coalescence between Hucknall, Linby and Papplewick. This would also prevent any urban encroachment into the historic setting of the two Conservation Areas (Linby and Papplewick) or the setting of Papplewick Hall.

The potential impact of any development on the Mature Landscape Area will be taken into account. Detailed proposals will be expected to utilise the landscape character approach where development is designed so that it respects the character and integrates into its surroundings.

Option 1 – Allocate a larger number of small sites spread throughout the Borough

There were arguments for and against this option. Those in favour considered that a spread of sites across the Borough would be the best or fairest option although some of these included the caveat that brownfield sites should be used first. One respondent considered it important that small and medium sized sites up to 500 dwellings are allocated including at Bestwood, Calverton and Burton Joyce.

Ravenshead Parish Council considered that the village had reached the limit of viable expansion save for some limited infill within the existing settlement. Calverton Parish Council considered its previous comments (relating to the Option for Consultation document 2010) remained valid. The Parish Council does not accept there is a need for excessive encroachment into the Green Belt and that the potential scale of development at Calverton outlined in the strategy is out of proportion. Any major development would increase out-commuting and worsen traffic congestion.

The Parish Councils and other respondents raised concerns about there being insufficient services and facilities available in the villages and that if this option were to be chosen this would have to be addressed. The impact of sites on the historic environment was also mentioned although it was acknowledged that this would depend on the exact location of the specific site and that as a general point small sites may have less impact than larger ones.

Site specific comments were made in support of allocating the Bestwood Business Park currently protected under policy E3 of the Gedling Borough Replacement Local Plan 2005 in the context that there was an oversupply of employment land and little

justification for protecting this site as it is in a poor location and not attractive for long term employment uses.

A further site specific comment referred to it being unreasonable to grant permission at Dark Lane Calverton in advance of conclusions on the overall housing requirement and that Dark Lane should be added to the potential list of sites around Calverton and ranked according to sustainability.

Respondents

(ID 1, 47, 148, 175, 193, 200, 224, 231, 232, 242, 250, 252, 262, 265, 267, 268, 285, 286, 305, 310, 312, 317, 330)

Officer response

The Aligned Core Strategies adopts a strategy of 'urban concentration with regeneration'. For Gedling Borough this means that the following hierarchy will be adopted when identifying sites:

- Within or on the edge of the built up area
- Key villages
- Other villages

The Aligned Core Strategies identify strategic sites (above 500 dwellings). Smaller sites will be identified through a forthcoming site specific Development Plan Document. Key villages including Bestwood, Calverton and Ravenshead have been selected to accommodate growth. These key villages have been assessed for their suitability against a range of factors including services and environmental constraints. Development in other villages will be limited to meeting local needs. Developers will be required to contribute towards the costs of necessary infrastructure and services needed in support of the development.

With respect to Bestwood Business Park, the employment site was assessed as part of the Nottingham City Region Employment Land Study 2007 which recommended that the site should be retained for employment. The retention of this site will help support the local economic base and will help provide employment opportunities in the key village of Bestwood which is identified for growth.

The Dark Lane site is an existing housing allocation in the Gedling Borough Council Replacement Local Plan (2005) and is also the subject of a planning application yet to be determined by Gedling Borough Council.

Option 2 – Allocate an area of the safeguarded land at Top Wighay Farm

There were objections to option 2 which put forward the allocation of an area of safeguarded land at Top Wighay Farm. Ashfield District Council raised concerns

about the cumulative impact of the two proposed allocations at Top Wighay Farm and the North of Papplewick Lane on Hucknall which would result in a 36% increase to the housing stock conflicting with its treatment as a sub regional centre in RSS. It was also questioned whether Hucknall has the infrastructure capacity to accommodate all growth requirements and respondents queried what research had been undertaken into the potential impact of these allocations in Hucknall. Where and how Section 106/CIL contributions would be applied if the impact was on Hucknall?

Other respondents reiterated previous objections to the Top Wighay Farm allocation expressed during the preparation of the Gedling Borough Replacement Local Plan 2005.

There was also some support for the allocation of the safeguarded land at Top Wighay Farm although one of these respondents felt that it was unsatisfactory to plan and design and invest in a project of 500 houses in the knowledge that additional 1000 – 2000 dwellings may or may not be required at some point in the future. This respondent considered that the whole site including the Safeguarded land should be planned as a Sustainable Urban Extension with a complete accommodation brief at the outset.

In relation to Top Wighay Farm other questions raised related to whether there is any prospect of improving public transport and that a detailed transport assessment will be required. Concern was expressed that roads were already congested and the tram and train services at capacity. The comment was made that the planned Hucknall Town centre Improvement Scheme does not take into account this amount of additional growth.

It was also queried what work had been done to assess the impact of the possible allocations on the potential Special Protection Area.

Another respondent considered Top Wighay Farm to be a non urban location. Other objections related to potential impact on wildlife, flood risk, landscape (including features such as trees and hedges) and generally the quality of life of Hucknall residents.

Respondents

(47, 161, 175, 201, 205, 224, 250, 262, 270, 288, 312, 324, and 327)

Officer response

The East Midlands Regional Plan (EMRP) is due for abolition but identifies Hucknall as a sub regional centre and location for significant housing growth. The EMRP housing allocations are minimum provisions and took into account the existing housing supply in the area including the housing allocation at Top Wighay Farm identified in the Gedling Borough Replacement Local Plan 2005 (saved policies).

The sub regional strategy set out in the EMRP notes the preparation of a study to consider the most sustainable location for urban extensions around Nottingham and Hucknall and comments that the six local planning authorities should identify the scale and location of sustainable urban extensions to meet identified development needs until at least 2026 (subsequently published as the Sustainable Urban Extensions Study published in June 2008).

Land adjoining the urban area North of Papplewick Lane was safeguarded for longer term development needs in the Gedling Borough Replacement Local Plan 2005 and this policy (Policy H2) was subsequently “saved” by way of a Direction issued by the Secretary of State in 2008.

Gedling Borough Council can see no conflict with the EMRP which was published by the Secretary of State in March 2009 and which clearly identifies Hucknall for substantial long term growth having taken into account housing supply and the potential for growth around Hucknall.

The adopted Ashfield Local Plan identifies Hucknall as a main urban area as it has a good range of services and facilities and excellent links to Nottingham. Whilst it is accepted there will be increased demand for facilities and services it is expected that developers will contribute towards the additional capacity required by the development. However, new development will bring benefits in terms of a greater residential population that can help sustain services.

As proposals are developed, further discussions with Ashfield District Council will take place regarding mitigation of impacts on Hucknall arising from development in this location.

The proposal to allocate North of Papplewick Lane and the proposal to increase the existing allocation at Top Wighay Farm to 1000 dwellings have been subject to broad assessments that indicate there are no major obstacles to these sites being allocated for housing.

In terms of the impact on the prospective Special Protection Area, a screening exercise has been undertaken by the promoters of the site to consider the potential impact on the nightjar and woodlarks and indicates that there would be no significant effects. The Site of Importance for Nature Conservation will continue to be protected.

The Environment Agency maps indicate that the area is not at risk from flooding.

Option 3 – identify another strategic urban edge site

Some respondents supported the allocation of the New Farm site with one respondent indicating that transport studies commissioned by the developer demonstrated that access could be gained from Mansfield Road. Other respondents

considered that further detailed transport assessments should be commissioned in respect of the New Farm site if it was to be considered further.

The comment was made that the New Farm site could have some implications for the setting of the Grade II Bestwood Lodge Hotel. If this site is put forward the impact on the historic environment will need to be assessed.

Respondents

(1, 47, 175, 219, 250, 262)

Officer comment

New Farm - work has been undertaken by the developer, Highways Authority and the Borough Council into the access and highways capacity issues surrounding the New Farm site. The Highways Authority has commented that *“the development traffic would rely on using a very congested section of the A60 Mansfield Road between Leapool Island and Oxclose Lane. Due to land constraints, it is difficult to see where appropriate traffic mitigation can be introduced. Whilst it would be possible to heavily promote public transport services to encourage more sustainable travel, these services would ultimately be reliant on the same congested highway network unless adequately catered for by the introduction of bus priority measures. How this would be achieved is very unclear.”* It should also be noted that part of the A60 Corridor has been identified as an ‘Air Quality Management Area’.

The potential development of New Farm will be required to have regard to the protection of Listed Buildings and their settings.

Option 4 – Identify additional land in the vicinity of Gedling Colliery/Chase Farm to ensure viability

A large number of respondents objected to option 4 who were strongly opposed to the identification of Mapperley Golf Course as a potential strategic site. Many respondents referred to the loss of amenity and open space and that the proposal would adversely affect the quality of life in the locality.

A large number of objectors argued that the proposal would exacerbate existing traffic problems in the area leading to more congestion, parking problems and highway safety issues. Related to this were fears about increased pollution from vehicles.

A further major concern related to the proposals giving rise to increased demand for utilities, services and facilities which many people thought were already over stretched.

Many people raised objections on the basis of the potential adverse impact on wildlife and habitat including the loss of trees, hedges, plant life, wild birds and animals including protected species.

The loss of recreational facilities was mentioned by a number of people saying that in addition to golf the area was used informally for recreational activities including walking, exercising dogs, picnicking, cycling and play space for local children. More specific comments raised concerns about the loss of the “small park” off Digby Avenue (designated as open space in the Gedling Borough Replacement Local Plan 2005) and also to the loss of the bridle path around the Golf Course.

A number of respondents questioned the financial viability of the option and in particular how much a replacement golf course would cost and whether these costs had been factored into the option. Comments included that a proportion of the sale would have to go to an interested 3rd party and also that there was a long period left on the lease. A number of people objected to the use of any public money to fund a replacement Golf Course elsewhere. There was a call for a full development appraisal to be carried out to assess viability and deliverability.

Whilst, a number of respondents expressed support for the Gedling Colliery/Chase Farm site to be developed a number queried why this proposal was being linked to the Mapperley Golf Course site. Some respondents felt that the need for the Gedling Access Road had become an end in itself rather than a means to an end.

Respondents also queried whether there was demand for the housing in the area as a number of homes in the area were vacant and some housing developments were reported as stalled. Housing completions were also considered by a number of respondents to be lower than expected.

Numerous people argued that the Borough Council could find alternative sites particularly brownfield sites which should be a priority. Others considered that there were a number of vacant properties in the area arguing that these should be used first.

Respondents

(2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 160, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 208, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 243, 244, 245, 248, 250, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 260, 261, 263, 264, 267, 268, 269, 272, 273, 274, 275, 277, 278, 281, 283, 288, 290, 291, 292, 293, 296, 301,

305, 306, 307, 310, 311, 315, 316, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 325, 328, 331, 332, 333, 334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 339.

A petition signed by approximately 2,385 people was received where petitioners were totally opposed to any form of development of Mapperley Golf Course land. The petitioners raised the same issues that have been summarised above.

Officer Response

Appraisal work undertaken to assess the viability and deliverability of a combined Mapperley Golf Course/Gedling Colliery Scheme shows that whilst the scheme is potentially viable there are significant financial risks involved and compromises that the Borough Council would have had to accept such a much larger number of homes and lower proportion of affordable homes. The appraisal also showed that there was a significant up front funding gap associated with paying for the cost of the Gedling Access Road which has no identified source of funding. Without alternative public funding and a more realistic risk profile, the Borough Council's view is that the development is unlikely to be deliverable and it has been decided that the Mapperley Golf Course site should no longer be proposed for development.

For clarification the "small park" off Digby Avenue was not proposed for possible development and will remain protected open space.

The Borough Council will continue to support development of the Gedling Colliery/Chase Farm site which remains suitable and available for development but is not presently deliverable. This site will require the Gedling Access Road to be built which will help alleviate traffic congestion in the area a concern raised by many local residents.

Noting local concerns about the impact of new development on services and facilities in general, the Borough Council's position is that as a broad principle new development should contribute to the additional capacity required in order to support that particular development. This policy principle is set out in the Publication Draft Aligned Core Strategy.

The level of vacant homes in the Borough is about 2% of which around three quarters (750 properties) have been vacant for more than 6 months. There will always be some vacancies in the stock to allow for "churn" in the market (e.g. homes for sale or houses awaiting new tenants). However, Gedling Borough is seeking to work with the landlords of longer term vacant properties in order to see whether it can bring them back into use. The current difficulties in the housing market are more to do with affordability issues and the availability of housing finance as opposed to lack of demand.

The Borough's future housing supply does include brownfield sites but the scale of the housing requirements will mean that some Greenfield sites are required in sustainable locations.

The Special Contacts Leaflet October 2011

During October, a special edition of Gedling Borough's magazine "Contacts" was sent to every Gedling Borough Household in the form of a leaflet outlining the four main options for accommodating housing in the Borough. This was intended to raise awareness of the housing issues in the Borough and to ensure that every Gedling household has the opportunity to have a say. This exercise was in addition to the consultation on the Locally Distinct Housing Issues for Gedling set out above.

In summary the exercise indicated that in essence, those living in the rural areas would prefer the houses to be built in the urban areas and those living in the urban areas would prefer the houses to be built in the rural areas. The results of this exercise are included in appendix A.

Appendix A – Options

Results of Special Contacts consultation

1.1 Question 1 of the Special Contacts leaflet asked ‘where should we build the houses?’ The percentage and number of respondents expressing a preference for each of the 4 options was as follows:-

	% of total respondents	Number of respondents
Option 1 (Top Wighay Farm)	44%	1,455
Option 2 (New Farm)	3.4%	114
Option 3 (Villages)	13.5%	448
Option 4 (Mapperley Golf Course/Gedling Colliery)	38%	1,291
Total		3,308

1.2 As residents were asked to enter their postcode as part of their response, we are able to establish that, in essence, those living in the rural areas would prefer the houses to be built in the urban areas and those living in the urban areas would prefer the houses to be built in the rural areas.

1.3 The key reasons given by respondents for their preference was as follows:-

Option 1 (Top Wighay Farm):-

- Least disruption to green belt land/environment (25%)

Followed by:-

- Availability of adequate infrastructure/transport links (18%)
- Potential to provide larger number/wider choice of housing in area (16%)

Option 2 (New Farm)

- Availability of public services/amenities in the area (24%)

Closely followed by:-

- Availability of adequate infrastructure/transport links (22%)
- Least disruption to green belt land/environment (15%)

Option 3 (villages)

- Option will not stretch existing resources/impact on existing communities (45% - this was the key reason given, by some margin)

Option 4 (Mapperley Golf Course/Gedling Colliery)

- Least disruption to green belt land/environment (28%)

Followed by:-

Area is currently underused (20%)