

## Consultation and Officer Responses to the CIL Non-Parish Neighbourhood Funding Consultation September 2018

No.	Name	Organisation	Comment	Officer Response
1	Steve Beard	Sport England	We would not wish to raise specific projects. But would want to emphasise the evidence in the PPS and the prioritised action plan, which should identify projects in this area. The funding could be used to lever other partnership funding	Comment noted
2	Janet Baker	Nottingham North and East Clinical Commissioning Group	Having looked at the information, from a health perspective there are no objections to the recommendations made.	Comment noted
3	Jennifer Eurge	Netherfield Locality Co-ordinator	<p>Update of project information - Requirement to re-submit the WREN funding bid to account for tree works and increase of project costs. Delay also incurred to avoid bird nesting season and the potential requirement for bat surveys. Bid was resubmitted on 13th June 2018 to WREN for £85,411.87 and will be determined on the 5th September. Bid is identical to previously successful bid with the addition of further supporting evidence. Terms of the WREN bid is that the scheme is delivered in the current financial year. CIL Neighbourhood Funding Bid for lighting is still appropriate as made and deliverable in current financial year.</p> <p>On the 6<sup>th</sup> September 2018 a further update has been received from the Netherfield Locality Co-ordinator confirming that the project has been awarded £84,411.87 from WREN.</p>	<p>Comment noted – the deliverability of the project would be unaffected as the project would be required to be delivered within a set timeframe.</p> <p>The award of this funding confirms the deliverability of the wider project.</p>
4	Carla Wright	Natural England	Natural England has no specific comments to make on the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Neighbourhood Portion consultation	Comment noted

5	Rosamund Worrall	Historic England	<p>Historic England has no comment to make on the proposed Cinderpath project or the proposed rolling over of funds in relation to the current consultation document.</p> <p>Whilst we have no specific project to put forward at this time we recommend that provision be made for any future heritage assets at risk in the Non-Parish Areas in respect of the rolling programme of considerations for future infrastructure projects.</p>	<p>Comment noted</p> <p>Providing heritage at risk projects are eligible for funding they could form part of the local infrastructure list.</p>
6	Philip Oddie	Willow Farm Action Group	<p><b>Gedling Access Road</b></p> <p>We accept that the Gedling Access Road (GAR) has been identified as essential in the delivery of a number of housing developments, including Chase Farm. It is therefore recognised as a strategically important element of the Local Plan and is a key part of the strategy by which the Council intends to meet its house building targets.</p> <p>Phase One of the Chase Farm construction is well under way and will result in 315 homes being built, however, this phase is not due for completion until 2026 (source: Chase Farm Planning Application 2015). The Highways Authority has accepted that the Phase One can be completed without the necessity for the GAR.</p> <p>Given that Phase 2, which requires the delivery of the GAR, is not scheduled to commence until 2026 we cannot accept that this project should receive additional funds from this year's allocation from the neighbourhood portion of the CIL. We also note that this funding is not essential to the delivery of the GAR project.</p>	<p>Comment noted</p>

		<p><b>Gedling Colliery School Contributions</b></p> <p>We note that within the summary of Table 3, the allocation of funds from the neighbourhood portion of the CIL will enable the 'faster delivery of an item of strategic infrastructure'. Appendix A of the report then describes the project as being linked to the provision of secondary school places and states that delivery of the project is not required in the short term and recommends that CIL neighbourhood funding is not allocated at present.</p> <p>What this project assessment highlights, however, is a lack of understanding of the real concerns raised by local residents in responding to the Draft Local Plan regarding the existing pressure on local school places that will only increase with the new housing developments. Access to schools is an absolute priority for parents who simply want to ensure that the necessary capacity for school places is available in time to meet the increased demand from new housing. These concerns extend to both primary and secondary school places.</p> <p>We cannot therefore accept the author's statement that the 'delivery of this project is not required in the short-term but will be required as the Chase farm development progresses in the coming years'. As outlined within our submission to the Planning Inspector during the Examination into the Local Plan, the primary schools within one mile of the Chase Farm development are already over-subscribed (source: Gedling Borough Council Infrastructure Delivery Plan 2016). The secondary school is also in a similar position and cannot accommodate the additional demand from new development (source: Chase Farm planning application 2015).</p> <p>Our review of the Council's Local Plan reveals that if</p>	<p>Comment noted</p> <p>Phase II of the Gedling Colliery development will see the provision of a new primary school that will serve the development and the locality. Triggers in the S106 agreement mean that the developer will provide the site for the Primary School for transfer to Nottinghamshire County Council either within 28 days of the commencement date of the GAR or prior to the occupation of the 200<sup>th</sup> dwelling (whichever trigger is the soonest).</p> <p>The CIL (strategic element) will be used to collect monies towards secondary school provision linked to the Colliery development. The pot for this project is expected to increase significantly over the next few years with the expected delivery a number of large development sites contained within the Local Planning Document.</p> <p>The County Council as the Education Authority will be consulted in respect of all major planning applications (10 or more dwellings) and contributions may be sought and pooled to address capacity issues within the locality.</p> <p>At this time this primary school funding has not been put forward by the education authority for Non-Parish CIL Neighbourhood Funding.</p> <p>It is therefore considered that this project wouldn't benefit from a limited contribution by way of the CIL non-parish neighbourhood funding.</p>
--	--	---	---

the proposed developments go ahead, by 2024, H3 Willow Farm will have been completed with 110 new homes. Gedling Colliery / Chase Farm are expected to have completed 540 new homes (60 per year build out rate) and Wood Lane 40 new homes. Utilising the LPA Chase Farm figures for identifying the number of school places, these developments alone will have generated a requirement for 145 primary and 110 secondary places. We have only highlighted these developments because they are within Gedling.

Given that the Phase 2 development of Chase Farm, which includes a new school, is not scheduled to start until 2026, where are these children going to be educated? To date, we have not received an answer to this question.

We believe therefore that utilising funds from the neighbourhood portion of the CIL should be strongly supported on the basis that, as stated in Table 3, funding will enable a faster delivery of additional school places to meet the demand from Chase Farm and the other new housing developments. However, we would require information about the way in which the funds would be spent on such a project, as anything short of building new school premises would be inadequate due to the inability of existing primary schools to expand due to site limitations. Funding schools to take additional pupils in Key Stage 2 and above, above the recommended PAN, might go some way to meeting the demand created by building new houses, but this could only partly solve the problem (again due to site constraints) and would have no effect on meeting the additional demand for Key Stage 1 places, where the legal maximum class size is 30 pupils. It should also be noted that recent changes to the national funding structure for primary schools has led to many local primary schools having significantly reduced budgets for 2018 – 2019 and beyond. Any

The need and progress of this specific project will be continued to be monitoring.

		<p>decision to increase class sizes funded by the neighbourhood portion of the CIL should be taken in light of the current climate of reduced per-pupil funding, and potential reduction in school staffing numbers – the negative effect of increased class sizes on educational outcomes for local pupils should not be overlooked.</p>	
		<p><b>Cinderpath</b></p> <p>We note that this bid for funding comes from concerns expressed by local residents and the emerging Netherfield Neighbourhood (Locality) Plan and we do not believe that we can make an informed comment on this project.</p>	Comment noted
		<p><b>CCTV Camera at King George V Park</b></p> <p>We note that the author states in the final paragraph of the assessment that the project does not fulfil the necessary criteria for funding via CIL Non-Parish Neighbourhood'. We are unsure therefore as to why this project is included within the list.</p> <p>We accept the assessment of non-eligibility.</p>	Comment noted
		<p><b>Outdoor Gym at Muirfield Recreation Ground</b></p> <p>Again the author indicates that the project is not eligible for CIL non-parish neighbourhood funding and we are unsure as to why this project is included within the list.</p> <p>We accept the assessment of non-eligibility.</p>	Comment noted

			<p><b>Multi Use Games Area at Oakdale Recreation Ground</b></p> <p>Given the author's recommendation that the project does not receive any CIL neighbourhood funding at present we have not made any comment.</p>	<p>Comment noted</p>
			<p><b>Twinning Landscape Feature in Arnot Hill Park</b></p> <p>We strongly agree with the author's assessment that this project does not meet the criteria for funding from the CIL neighbourhood funding as it is clearly not connected to an infrastructure need arising from new development.</p>	<p>Comment noted</p>

**Period of Consultation: 23<sup>rd</sup> April 2018 – 25<sup>th</sup> May 2018**

**Total Respondents: 6**