

REPORT OF RESPONSES

Please note: Changes to make corrections, clarify points or to reflect discussions had by Council officers have also been made but are not shown in the schedule. This schedule responds to comments made as part of the formal consultation.

General Comments		
Document Reference / Issue / Allocation	Summary of Consultee Comments	Gedling Borough Council Response
General Comments made by organisations		
General Comment	<u>National Grid, the Coal Authority, the Canal and Rivers Trust –</u> No specific comments in response to this consultation.	Noted
General Comment	<u>Save the Earth Co-op –</u> General support for community housing such as council housing rather than private developers. General support for the provision of ethical development, solar battery storage, ground source heat technology, vertical farming, and community centres.	Noted
General Comment / Page 13	<u>Pinewood Infant School/ Resident –</u> Concern that the proposed location of the primary school would potentially affect future admissions by encroaching on Pinewood Infant School's catchment. Schools should be contacted about emerging development.	The County Education Authority has been consulted who have responsibility to ensure that there are sufficient school places provided for the anticipated numbers of primary school children. They have clarified that a new primary school is required within the Arnold education planning area. The development brief states that contributions towards its build costs are required from all housing sites within Arnold. The detailed issue of catchments and provision

		of actual school places are matters for County Education and local schools.
General Comment	<u>Severn Trent Water –</u> Not anticipated for the three site allocations to cause any significant issues to the sewerage system.	Noted
Paragraph 4.4	Paragraph 4.4 states SuDS measures to be adopted by the Statutory Sewerage undertaker but the power to do this has not yet come into force and these changes will not allow all SuDS to be adopted so early liaison with the Sewerage undertaker is advised to determine if adoption is possible and for design specification.	Noted
General Comment	<u>Natural England –</u> Provided a general advice note and expressed support for the inclusion of Green Infrastructure. Approach should include the enhancement of ecological networks to enhance the natural environment. Partnership working with local organisations/ education establishments should be taken to incorporate health and wellbeing including access to the countryside and walking Support the requirement for an ecological survey	An ecological survey will be required as part of the planning application. Enhancement and management of ecological networks will be addressed through the planning application process and via S106 as appropriate.
Paragraph 4.12		
General Comment Sport provision	<u>Sport England –</u> Recommend the use of the ‘Active Design’ (October 2015) planning guidance which includes 10 principles to promote healthy communities through good urban design. Encourage assessment against these principles.	The principles are very detailed therefore are not appropriate for consideration at this stage. Agree reference should be made to encourage these principles. Insert new paragraph 6.19: <u>Developers are also encouraged to utilise Sport England’s ten principles of ‘Active Design’ to promote healthy and active communities through good urban design. The purpose of these</u>

		<i>principles is to create urban environments that make active choices easier and more attractive for people and communities.</i>
General Comment - Sport provision	<p><u>Sport England</u> – Development should contribute towards meeting additional sport provision demand, rather than exacerbating any deficiencies. Provision should be either on or off site and should be informed by a Sports Facilities Strategy or Playing Pitch Strategy etc.</p> <p>Sport England’s Sport Facilities Calculator indicates the approximate 1200 new residents from the three sites would create 70 additional visits per week to sports halls and swimming pools (capital cost of £500,000). Can existing facilities meet additional demand?</p>	<p>See comments on additional playing pitches.</p> <p>A formula based approach is not considered sufficient in terms of justifying need arising from the proposed development as it does not consider the capacity of existing facilities to meet need in future.</p>
General Comment - Sport provision	<p><u>Sport England</u> – The need for formal playing field provision is not referred to in the document. Sport England’s Playing Pitch New Demand Calculator is a useful tool. Opportunity for improvements to Mellish Rugby Club in line with the Gedling Playing Pitch Strategy.</p> <p>Development should not be supported where it will impact the sustainability and viability of Mellish Rugby Club – i.e. impact the use of sports lighting/ evening use. The potential for adverse impact on the club should be assessed against paragraph 182 of the NPPF.</p>	<p>The wording of the development brief will be amended to clarify that the open space proposals shown on the Development Framework Plan comprise those funded through S106 contributions plus longer term ambitions for the Council. The details of the provision funded by developers will depend on the schemes put forward at planning application stage and the extent of on-site provision.</p> <p>The NPPF will be used to help determine planning applications and, as such, paragraph 182 will be taken into account.</p>
Paragraph 2.4	<p><u>Ibstock Group</u> – This paragraph refers to ‘proposals’ for clay extraction. This should be amended to ‘permitted’ as clay extraction</p>	Agree.

Figure 1 (Page 7)	to the north of H8 is permitted The area showing Dorket Head Quarry does not extend to the full permitted working and extraction areas and should be amended.	Agree. ACTION: Amend Figure 1 to identify the full extend of permitted clay extraction at Dorket Head Quarry.
Paragraph 2.12	This paragraph refers to proposed clay extraction. This should be amended to 'permitted' as clay extraction to the north of H8 is permitted	Agree.
3.11 and 3.12	<u>Landowner/ Developer –</u> Discussed the need for prior extraction with NCC Minerals and NCC have requested that any clay won as a result of the development is not wasted. Request that the brief should provide further clarity on the different parcels and requirements in respect of the quarry/mineral operations. Landowner can provide bunding/planting along the northern edge but this would need to consider the landscape setting.	Noted the views of Nottinghamshire County Council as Minerals Planning Authority. Agree – amend to provide more details on screening quarry operations: Paragraph 3.11 amend last bullet: <u><i>The Statement of Common Ground at paragraph 2.10 refers to the need for screening to be built into the housing designs in order to screen views close to the houses from the existing and committed quarry workings. In relation to site H7 this would be addressed by a new planting screening buffer at its northern end complementing and reinforcing existing woodland in this area. For site H8 the form of mitigation to prevent overlooking of the quarry working would be to reinforce the existing landscaping along its northern boundary (as shown on the map at Appendix 2). Both sites are located within the Dumbles Rolling Farmlands Policy Zone and any landscaping should take</i></u>

		<p><u>account of its landscape character.</u></p> <p>Paragraph 3.11 insert new bullet:</p> <p><u>LPD paragraphs 3.13 and 3.15 also state the need for the consideration of prior extraction of clay resource which would look at whether this was feasible and practical and in the light of consultation with Nottinghamshire County as part of the planning application process.</u></p> <p>Amend plans in Appendix 2 to show northern boundary of H7 with the notation (as used for H8) – edges requiring potential reinforcement of landscaping.</p>
General	<p><u>Nottinghamshire County Council</u> –</p> <p>The adopted Nottinghamshire and Nottingham Replacement Waste Local Plan, Part 1: Waste Core Strategy (adopted 10 December 2013) and the saved, non-replaced policies of the Waste Local Plan (adopted 2002), along with the saved policies of the Nottinghamshire Minerals Local Plan (adopted 2005), form part of the development plan for the area. As such, relevant policies in these plans need to be considered. In addition, Minerals Safeguarding and Consultation Areas have been identified in Nottinghamshire and in accordance with Policy SP8 of the emerging draft Minerals Local Plan (July 2018) these should be taken into account where proposals for non-minerals development fall within them.</p>	<p>Agree – amend plans in Appendix 2 to include reference to minerals safeguarding and consultation areas and to show the extent of these areas on the relevant plans.</p> <p>Insert the following after Paragraph 3.13:</p> <p><u>Nottinghamshire Minerals Local Plan 2005</u> <u>The “saved” policies of the Nottinghamshire Minerals local Plan form part of the development plan for the area although this plan is being replaced by a new Minerals Local Plan.</u> <u>Relevant policies include Policy M2.2 which seeks to prevent minerals from being sterilised through inappropriate development. Minerals Safeguarding Areas (MSAs) and Minerals Consultation Areas (MCAs) have been identified</u></p>

		<p><u>in Nottinghamshire and in accordance with SP8 of the emerging draft Minerals Local Plan (July 2018) these should be taken into account where proposals for non-minerals development fall within them. The identified clay resource underlies the area covered by the development brief. The need to avoid sterilisation of the clay resource and phasing and mitigation in response to the permission to extend the adjoining clay quarry have been addressed through the LPD as stated in paragraph 3.11 above. SP8 and a map of the MSAs and MCAs are contained within the emerging Draft Minerals Local Plan (pages 49 and 53) available on the Nottinghamshire County Council website here: http://www.nottinghamshire.gov.uk/planning-and-environment/minerals-local-plan/draft</u></p> <p><u>Nottinghamshire and Nottingham Replacement Waste Plan Part 1 Waste Core Strategy 2013 and Waste Local Plan 2002 (saved policies 2007)</u></p> <p><u>The Waste Core Strategy Part 1 document sets out the overall approach to future waste management in the plan area setting out in broad terms where new or extended waste management sites should be located. The second part of replacement Waste Local Plan will be the Sites and Policies Document. Some of the policies in the Waste Local Plan 2002 remain in force until they are replaced by the</u></p>
--	--	---

		<u>Part Waste Local Plan.</u>
2.10-2.13. 3.11	<u>Nottinghamshire County Council</u> – County Minerals and Waste note reference to policy LPD 64 in relation to appropriate stand-offs, screening, development phasing and prior extraction of clay regarding sites H7 and H8. The Statement of Common Ground has been signed by all interested parties in connection with clay extraction at Dorket Head and site H8. It may be worth referring to the Statement of Common Ground in paragraph 2.12.	Agree – Insert the following to paragraph 2.12: <u>A Statement of Common Ground has been signed by all interested parties in connection with clay extraction at Dorket Head and site H8.</u> Paragraph 3.11 amended as outlined above to refer to Statement of Common Ground.
General Comment	<u>Willow Farm Action Group</u> – Gave general support to the document to achieve consistency between allocated sites. Comments expressed specific support for several sections of the document.	Noted.
Paragraph 1.11	<u>Willow Farm Action Group</u> – Statement that the document does not review the principle of developing the allocated sites should be balanced against the fact that each site will be robustly and transparently assessed against a determination of whether it is compliant with national and local planning policy. This would reflect that the planning application stage, rather than site selection, is the appropriate stage for detailed review.	The LPD has established the principle of development in this location and the planning application will consider the detail of the proposals. The wording suggested in the representation is too prescriptive as planning applications must be considered on merit and against all relevant policies and the NPPF as a material consideration. The policies must be considered together and in the round with the weight given to individual policies to be determined by the decision maker. Inevitably there will be some impacts on existing residents and policies will seek to reconcile conflicts between the development and the local area and ensure that impacts are kept within acceptable limits.

<p>Paragraph 1.7 and 1.8, section 4, section 5, section 6.</p>	<p><u>Willow Farm Action Group</u> – Masterplan Objectives are too development focused and do not take account of the principle that development should achieve a high standard of amenity for existing and future users set out in the revised NPPF. This may promote development regardless of impact on existing residential amenity. Suggest a commitment to maintain a high level of amenity for existing residents is included within the objectives.</p> <p>Support the statement in paragraph 1.7 which intends to ensure that development does not undermine infrastructure provision, however this should also be reflected at paragraph 1.8 that any infrastructure impact assessment will be on a strategic basis rather than on an individual site basis.</p>	<p>The objectives are focussed on the master plan area to steer the future planning application.</p> <p>The NPPF Paragraph 128 states that:-</p> <p>‘Early discussion between applicants, the local planning authority and local community about the design and style of emerging schemes is important for clarifying expectations and reconciling local and commercial interests. Applicants should work closely with those affected by their proposals to evolve designs that take account of the views of the community’.</p> <p>The preparation of the development brief involving GBC, the local community and developer is consistent with paragraph 128.</p> <p>Amenity is covered by Policy LPD 32 which identifies issues for consideration including overshadowing, overbearing, overlooking, noise, level of activity on site, traffic, residential visual amenity, other forms of pollution; impact on amenity space; and impact on renewable energy generation. The table below paragraph 10.2.3 of the LPD sets out how each of these factors will be assessed.</p> <p>Welcome support for paragraph 1.7. Paragraph 1.8 is clear in that the development brief will address the need for infrastructure in a strategic manner:</p>
--	--	--

		<p>Bullet point 5 states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establishes clear infrastructure requirements to support development of all three sites in a strategic manner.
Section 3, Paragraph 3.14	<p><u>Willow Farm Action Group</u> – Policy context is comprehensive. Support requirement for developer contributions towards health, education and open spaces. Would welcome reference to non-design issues in paragraph 3.14, for example the first aim of the Noise Policy Statement for England which seeks to avoid significant adverse impacts from noise as part of sustainable development.</p>	<p>Policy LPD 32 adequately covers noise. GBC's Public Protection officer will be consulted as part of the formal planning application. Policy LPD 10 specifically addresses Noise Pollution.</p>
Paragraph 4.4, 5.39 – 5.46	<p><u>Willow Farm Action Group</u> – Wording in relation to the requirement for a robust flood risk appraisal to inform surface water attenuation measures does not adequately take account of Main Modification 5 (MM5) of the Local Planning Document – which takes a wider approach including connectivity between catchment areas.</p> <p>The guidance in section 5 appears to be on a site by site basis rather than taking account the connectivity between catchment areas. Wording should reflect MM5.</p>	<p>Policies LPD 3 and LPD 4 would be applied. Policy LPD 3 states that where development in areas of flood risk is considered acceptable the decision must be informed by a site specific flood risk assessment. The supporting text advises that in undertaking site specific flood risk assessments developers must take into account a catchment wide flood management approach. Policy LPD 4 deals specifically with surface water flood issues and states clearly that the development should not increase the risk of flooding elsewhere.</p> <p>Section 5 is intended to be site specific whilst section 4 is issue based and addresses flood risk across the three sites which are located within the Day Brook catchment area.</p>
Paragraphs 4.15 – 4.17, 6.18	<p><u>Willow Farm Action Group</u> – Should include a stronger statement requiring developers</p>	<p>It is considered that the wording – “the importance of retaining features on site and</p>

	in the first instance to include existing hedgerows and trees within their plans.	providing compensatory measures and dependent upon the outcome of an ecology assessment and will need to be considered alongside the arboriculture survey” – is sufficiently strong and sensible in taking account of the necessary survey work in the forthcoming designs to be submitted as part of the planning application. In this context development briefs should not be over prescriptive.
Paragraphs 4.29 – 4.37	<u>Willow Farm Action Group</u> – Concern that cul-de-sac accesses indicated as suitable for emergency vehicles are not practical and questions how access limitation would be enforced so as not to result in traffic rat-runs.	<p>In light of comments received from County Highways it is accepted that access for emergency vehicles only is not enforceable.</p> <p>The proposal for 32 homes on part of the Brookfields site served off Crawford Rise has been approved subject to a S106 agreement. Amend paragraph 4.32, 1st bullet.</p> <p>The consultation provided evidence that the proposed access at Campbell Close would depend on acquiring third party land and is therefore not available. Delete paragraph 4.32, 3rd bullet.</p> <p>A developer has stated that access beyond the terminus of Armadale Close is unsuitable for any type of motor vehicle due to steep gradients. Delete paragraph 4.32, 4th bullet.</p> <p>Nottinghamshire County Council Education’s response to this consultation is supportive of an alternative new site for a primary school</p>

		<p>elsewhere on site H8 which would mean the area of the site to the west of Killisick Lane. Delete paragraph 4.32, 5th bullet.</p> <p>Maps on page 46, 47 and 48 to be amended accordingly.</p> <p>Consequently insert a new bullet to paragraph 4.32: <u>Connections for pedestrians and cyclists may be appropriate from Armadale Close, Roxborough Close and Strathmore Road.</u></p>
Section 4	<u>Willow Farm Action Group</u> – Concern that road design and layout are not addressed in Section 4. These issues should be balanced against the impact upon the amenity of existing residents.	The development brief should not be over prescriptive. It is a detailed matter for the planning application which will be considered against the guidance in the Nottinghamshire Highways Design Guidance.
Paragraph 4.37, 5.16-5.19	<u>Willow Farm Action Group</u> – Assessments of the movement network must include estimated volume of vehicle movements generated by new development and also the effectiveness of the local road network to disperse this additional traffic.	A Transport Assessment will be required to be prepared in accordance with the Nottinghamshire Highways Design Guide. County Highways will also be consulted at the planning application stage.
Paragraph 5.23	<u>Willow Farm Action Group</u> – Will the test for new development to be within 400 m of a bus stop be applied across the Borough? Some LPD allocations would fail to meet this test.	The County Council's Highway Design Guide at section DG6 (Public Transport) paragraph 3.81 states that generally walking distances to bus stops in urban areas should be a maximum of 400m and desirably no more than 250 m. In rural areas the walking distance should not be more than 800 m. Whether a site is within 400 m distance from bus stops was a criteria used in assessing accessibility in the Sustainability Appraisal which was taken into account in site

		selection. The Sustainability Appraisal states that all sites are within 400 m of existing bus stops with exception to H3, H9 and E1 and the majority of site H15 in Calverton. It is assumed that the GAR would enable public transport services to be routed through the new development serving H9 and E1. In the case of H3 and H15 the Sustainability Appraisal seeks to ensure that there is connectivity to existing bus services. Developer's contributions towards connectivity to existing bus services for sites H3 and H15 will be sought at the planning application stage. In overall terms the Borough Council considers the LPD housing allocations to be in sustainable locations and subsequently the allocations have been endorsed by the Inspector.
4.34	<u>Landowner/ Developer</u> – Brief should accord with the Institution of Highways and Transportation (2000) guidelines for providing journeys on foot defines walking distance as 400 m (desirable), 800 m (acceptable) and 1200 m (preferred maximum). Walking distances from homes to stops should reflect these guidelines.	According to the County Council's Highway Design Guide within Urban areas 400 m should be regarded as the maximum.
Paragraph 6.3 –	<u>Willow Farm Action Group</u> – Reference to ACS Policy 10. On this basis amenity should be included as a key objective/ principle of the document.	Amenity is covered by Policy LPD 32. Agree to amend the fourth bullet of paragraph 1.8 to include <u>amenity</u> .
Paragraph 7.3	<u>Willow Farm Action Group</u> – Concern with assessment that sites H7 and H8 are deliverable because they are policy compliant as this goes beyond the principle of development, and suggests	The reference in paragraph 7.3 to “policy compliant” relates to the viability assessment work and the assumption that developer contributions meet policy i.e. they are policy

	the decision to approve planning permission is a foregone conclusion – without assessing residential amenity, flood risk, highway safety and infrastructure.	compliant. Insert the following into paragraph 7.3: This paragraph should not be misconstrued as an indication that any predetermination of the planning application has occurred.
Conclusion	<u>Willow Farm Action Group</u> – The NPPF is clear that developers should work closely with those affected by their proposals to evolve designs that take account of the views of the community. Applications that can demonstrate early, proactive and effective engagement with the community should be looked on more favourably than those that cannot. This engagement is absent from the document and should be included within the development brief.	Paragraph 128 of the NPPF is advisory and cannot be required. The Borough Council is of the view that the masterplan exercise is itself part of early engagement with both the local community and landowners. Agree reference should be made in the masterplan. Insert new paragraph 6.3: <i><u>Paragraph 128 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2018) advises: “Applicants should work closely with those affected by their proposals to evolve designs that take account of the views of the community. Applications that can demonstrate early, proactive and effective engagement with the community should be looked on more favourably than those that cannot”. The preparation of this masterplan has formed part of this early engagement and ongoing engagement in this respect is supported.</u></i>
General	<u>Landowner/ Developer</u> – General support for the development brief, although it should not be prescriptive as without flexibility development will be compromised.	Noted. The SPD will be a material consideration in the determination of future planning applications.
Paragraph 1.1	<u>Landowner/ Developer</u> – Suggest insert text ‘proposed to deliver <u>at least</u> 525 new	Agree.

	homes'. This would be consistent with text at paragraph 5.1 'key development principles'.	
Paragraph 1.7 – Paragraph 1.9	<u>Landowner/ Developer</u> – Is it necessary for the document to be published as an SPD? Request it is published as a design brief.	Yes - the adoption of the development brief as an SPD will give it more weight in the decision making process.
Paragraph 1.10	<u>Landowner/ Developer</u> – Typo – last 2 lines should read "...and how the <u>sites</u> can be well integrated into <u>their</u> wider context"	Agree.
Paragraph 1.12	<u>Landowner/ Developer</u> – Typo – last bullet point should read ' <u>sites</u> '.	Agree.
Paragraph 3.4	<u>Landowner/ Developer</u> – The SPD should be specific to the recently published NPPF 2018.	Agree.
Page 12	<u>Landowner/ Developer</u> – A plan showing the various ownerships obliged to contribute to the Education / Health / Open Space should be included.	<p>No change needed. The text is clear that contributions towards the new primary school will be sought from all of the housing allocations in the Arnold planning area (as shown in Appendix 3). Secondary school and health contributions are based on a formula to be applied to all LPD housing allocations.</p> <p>The wording of the development brief will be amended to clarify that the open space proposals shown on the Development Framework Plan comprise those funded through S106 contributions plus longer term ambitions for the Council. The details of the provision funded by developers will depend on the schemes put forward at planning application stage and the extent of on-site provision.</p>

Paragraph 3.12	<u>Landowner/ Developer</u> – Note that for H7 and H8 applicants are required to consider prior extraction of brick clay, in terms of whether extraction is viable and feasible.	Noted.
Paragraph 5.4 and 5.6	<u>Landowner/ Developer</u> – Suggest the density is referred to as a minimum of 30 dwellings per hectare	Paragraph 5.4 refers to 30 dwellings per hectare in paragraph 10.3.4 of the LPD in terms of being a reasonable minimum density. Paragraph 5.5 notes that the net densities in the development brief are greater than the 30 dwellings indicated as a reasonable density. The masterplanning work indicates that this means the necessary housing numbers can be comfortably met (paragraph 5.6) and that Policy LPD 33 states that densities higher than 30 dwellings per hectare will be supported provided it reflects local character. No change needed.
Paragraph 5.7	<u>Landowner/ Developer</u> – 555 units across all three sites is deliverable. Support high density development above the allocation figures.	Noted
Paragraph 5.8	<u>Landowner/ Developer</u> – Remove reference to ‘no apartments are proposed’ – do not want this to be expressly excluded.	The reference in the paragraph is to the viability work which assumed no flats would be developed. Apartments are not ruled out and applications would be judged on merit.
Paragraph 5.9	<u>Landowner/ Developer</u> – Comfortable with the proposed affordable housing mix although under the new NPPF different affordable housing tenures could be made available. Education land contributions could be offset by less affordable housing contributions.	Noted. Developer contributions will be subject to detailed negotiation at the planning application stage.

General	<u>Landowner/ Developer</u> – Question whether all masterplan landowners have been consulted.	Yes they have been contacted either directly or through their agents.
Paragraph 5.27	<u>Landowner/ Developer</u> – The open space SPD was published in 2001 and is now 17 years old.	Noted. Reference made to <i>Policy LPD 21 (Provision of New Open Space)</i> .
Map Page 46	<u>Landowner/ Developer</u> – Should the plan include the Gables land?	No – this does not form part of the development brief area as it is not an allocation. Therefore amendment to the Map is not necessary. Insert new paragraph 2.11 to clarify the status of the Gables: <i><u>A parcel of land adjoining the north of site H7 'the Gables' does not form part of the allocated site but is also not within the Green Belt. If this land is promoted in the future it could form an extension to H7, subject to compliance with all other relevant policies. This land is however not included within the brief as it is not allocated for development.</u></i>
Map page 47	<u>Landowner/ Developer</u> – The plan shows *redacted* ownership allocated land as green space, which also has planning consent for offices	Noted.
4.38	<u>Landowner/ Developer</u> – Clarification requested as to which sites require monitoring for gas migration	Agree - for clarification, at paragraph 4.38 insert: <i><u>Monitoring for gas migration should be undertaken for sites H7 and H8.</u></i>
4.24	<u>Landowner/ Developer</u> –	It is considered that paragraph 4.24 is factual.

	<p>Should acknowledge that the lack of character or distinctiveness cannot be completely attributed to standard house types.</p> <p>Development Brief should not require only the use of Bespoke house types or amended existing house types.</p>	<p>However, the development brief does not prescribe only bespoke housing types.</p>
6.1 – 6.10	<p><u>Landowner/ Developer</u> –</p> <p>Building for life 12 is used to structure pre-application discussions and is a useful tool and reference should be made to this.</p> <p>Development of parcels should not require bespoke designs. The brief should avoid referring to specific materials.</p>	<p>Agree - include reference to Building for Life 12. Developers are encouraged to include bespoke housing types. At paragraph 6.4 insert: <u>Developers are encouraged to utilise the principles of Building for Life 12 to guide the overall quality of design of their proposals.</u></p>
6.15	<p><u>Landowner/ Developer</u> –</p> <p>If garages are designed to 6C standards the local planning authority should count these as a parking space. Parking courtyards can be designed as attractive and safe environments</p>	<p>Residential parking provision and standards are covered by Policy LPD 57 and the Parking SPD. Provided the dimensions of the dedicated parking space meets the guidelines in the Nottinghamshire Highways Design Guidance then agree the space should count towards parking provision.</p>
5.22	<p><u>Landowner/ Developer</u> –</p> <p>5.22 “will” should be amended to “may”. The sites are not reliant on existing roads which adjoin the sites for emergency access.</p>	<p>Following the response made to the consultation including from County Highways it is accepted that access for emergency vehicles only is not enforceable. Delete paragraph 5.22.</p>
4.19	<p><u>Landowner/ Developer</u> –</p> <p>Brief should make it clear that there is not a requirement for a Heritage way. The site can provide linkage for such a route but only for the land in control of the applicant. Brief should state that cooperation will be needed between separate landowners to ensure wider connectivity.</p>	<p>Noted - paragraph 4.19 does not state that the heritage way is a requirement specific to this site therefore change not necessary.</p>

5.27	<p><u>Landowner/ Developer</u> – Support open space requirements but concerned about reference to 50 or more dwellings requiring an informal sports area. Taking into account the number of homes, location of open space, surface water management and buffers flexibility is needed.</p>	<p>The table below paragraph 5.27 is an extract of the Borough Council's New Housing Development Supplementary Planning Guidance for Open Space Provision (November 2001), which is a material consideration in the determination of any planning application.</p>
5.28	<p>Flexibility is provided by allowing play areas within prescribed catchments.</p>	<p>Paragraph 5.28 reflects the Borough Council's New Housing Development Supplementary Planning Guidance for Open Space Provision (November 2001), which is a material consideration in the determination of any planning application.</p>
General comments -	<p><u>Nottinghamshire County Council</u> – County Council Public Health has undertaken a Rapid Health Impact Assessment (HIA) on the brief. The following recommendations are made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planners should always consider the protection and improvement of health, and the reduction of health inequalities, as fundamental principles when making planning decisions • The brief should consider the principles of Housing our Ageing Population Panel for Innovation (HAPPI) • The brief should specify the applicability and requirements for specialist accommodation within the sites. • Energy efficiency and the potential for energy efficient and innovative design and renewable energy generation should be considered within the brief. • The brief should include further detailed 	<p>Noted</p> <p>Too detailed and prescriptive for a development brief.</p> <p>Too detailed and prescriptive for a development brief.</p> <p>Renewable energy is covered by Policy LPD 2.</p> <p>The Nottingham North and East CCG have</p>

	<p>assessment of planned requirements for developer contributions to NHS and social care facility, and any specific development requirements planned for the site such as primary health care.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planners should use the East Midlands Air Quality and Emissions Mitigation Guidance for Developers (July 2018). Mitigation measures may include provision of electric vehicle recharging and active travel infrastructure. If shared community use and co-location of services is a Development Consideration. Please consider One Public Estate. 	<p>requested financial contributions on a formula basis for them to disperse.</p> <p>This is included within Policy LPD 11.</p> <p>Service co-location is covered by ACS Policy 12.</p>
Paragraph 5.27-5.38 Map 2	<p><u>Nottinghamshire County Council</u> – Areas of open space/ green infrastructure have the potential to be designed for community food growing or allotment purposes in addition to play facilities/ recreation. Such provision would align with the Nottinghamshire Health and Wellbeing Strategy 2018-2022.</p> <p>Map 2 identifies adjoining allotments but the brief does not consider increased demand on these allotments.</p>	<p>The wording of the development brief will be amended to clarify that the open space proposals shown on the Development Framework Plan comprise those funded through S106 contributions plus longer term ambitions for the Council. The details of the provision funded by developers will depend on the schemes put forward at planning application stage and the extent of on-site provision.</p> <p>The Development Framework Plan will also be amended to include an area for allotments within the Green Belt Recreation Area.</p>
	<p><u>Nottinghamshire County Council</u> – The brief makes no reference to access to local food retailers and supermarkets in the local area. Access and Proximity to food outlets and supermarkets has been shown in a recent 2018 TCPA report to impact on house prices.</p>	<p>The location of the site is considered to be accessible to Arnold Town Centre and also local shops and facilities. The sustainability of the site was considered through the site selection process as part of the preparation of the Local Planning Document.</p>
General –	<u>Nottinghamshire County Council</u> –	This issue will be dealt with through the

archaeology	There is undoubtedly potential for archaeology given that the area contains the only convincing Iron Age Hillforts in the County which did not exist in isolation. It is recommended the need for an appropriate archaeological assessment, starting with a geophysical survey, is flagged up.	application of Policy LPD 30.
General – Rights of Way	<u>Nottinghamshire County Council</u> – The development sites impact numerous Public Rights of Way. It is required that the availability of such paths is not affected or obstructed unless subject to appropriate diversion of closure orders. Request to be consulted on re-surfacing or gating issues.	This matter is covered by Policy LPD 58. The County Council's Public Rights of Way Team would be consulted at the planning application stage.
General	<u>Nottinghamshire County Council</u> – Reference should be made in relation to landscaping to the use of native species of tree and shrub appropriate to the local area and the use of wildflower and flowering lawn mixes within open spaces and along site boundaries. SuDS should be multifunctional, providing habitat benefits.	Agree with this principle which is reflected at paragraph 5.46 of the brief, and will be addressed at the planning application stage.
	<u>Nottinghamshire County Council</u> – The ecological value of the sites and therefore the impact and mitigation is unknown. Particularly an issue on site H8.	An ecological survey will be required to be submitted as part of the planning application.
Developer Contributions and Viability		
General Comment - Highways contributions	<u>Highways England</u> – Developer contributions will be sought for infrastructure such as public transport and highways and development will be expected to promote sustainable transport.	Noted
General Comment / Page 13 - Impact on GP/	<u>Local Residents</u> – Several comments raised concerns relating to the impact of the proposed development on local health facilities	In relation to GP services, the Nottingham North and East Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) has been consulted and has stated that the

Dental Surgery.	such as GP's and dental surgeries. There is an existing problem obtaining appointments for these services in the area. Provision of GP practices should be in place prior to new homes being occupied.	proposals would trigger the need to provide health related section 106 funding to ensure that there is appropriate health infrastructure in place to support the growth in population. The timing and phasing of any new health infrastructure is the responsibility of the CCG
General Comment	<u>Nottingham North and East Clinical Commissioning Group</u> – Health related developer contributions would be required to fund appropriate health infrastructure. Funds to be confirmed at a later stage.	Noted
Page 13/ Paragraph 5.11	<u>Local Residents</u> – General concern about the impact of the proposed developments in the area on education services. Concern that provision has not been made for secondary schools as well as primary schools. Redhill Academy and Arnold Hill Academy will both struggle to meet demands.	Contributions from allocations as detailed in the development brief will be required for secondary education provision in line with the County Councils adopted Updated Planning Obligations Strategy. Insert text at paragraph 3.17: <i><u>Developer contributions will also be required to for secondary education provision in line with the County Councils adopted updated Planning Obligations Strategy.</u></i> Insert new paragraph 5.16: <i><u>Developer contributions will also be required to for secondary education provision in line with the County Councils adopted Updated Planning Obligations Strategy.</u></i>
General Comment	Accept that many schools in Arnold are oversubscribed however, there are two early years providers in the locality who have a significant number of spaces for children aged 2, 3 and 4 years which means that the schools they feed into look to be under-subscribed in the	The County Education Authority has been consulted and has reaffirmed its view that a new primary school will be required within the Arnold education planning area.

	next few years as well for e.g. Coppice Farm is only 60% full. The data used to inform the decision seems not to fit the actual situation.	
Paragraphs 5.10 – 5.15	<u>Willow Farm Action Group</u> – Education provision is of major concern and the NPPF makes clear the importance of a sufficient choice of school places for existing and new communities. ACS Policy 18 is clear that new development must be supported by infrastructure provision at the appropriate stage. This part of the report should refer to relevant national or local planning policy and set out when the infrastructure will be in place and how it will be funded. Additional school capacity must be created ahead of occupation of new dwellings.	The detailed S106 agreements will set out more detail on the financial contributions being sought and on the timing of delivery of additional school capacity. The development brief can only give a broad assessment of infrastructure needs and timing. More detail on the exact nature of the development and on the timing of its delivery will be available at the planning application stage.
General Comment	<u>Local Resident</u> – The statement ‘contributions are expected towards education, health and open space’ is vague and should be mandatory and timely.	The contributions likely to be sought are supported by policies and will be subject to legally binding S106 agreements or planning conditions.
Paragraph 7.5	Agree planning obligations for education should be sought from sites not just within NE Arnold but the wider urban area of Arnold.	Noted.
7.1 – 7.9	The viability assessment was undertaken in 2016 and would have taken into account the NCC Planning Obligations Strategy dated April 2014. No discussions have taken place with the developers regarding the implications of the September 2018 Obligations Strategy.	<p>The assumptions used in the GBC Local Plan Viability Assessment (March 2016) are set out within that study.</p> <p>The development brief sets out that a more detailed viability review of the sites has been undertaken with greater clarity over residential areas, open space, and education. However, it is accepted that potential contributions will need to be negotiated as part of the planning</p>

		application process through further discussions with land owners/developers.
Education General/ paragraph 5.10	<p><u>Landowner/ Developers –</u></p> <p>The three developments for 525 dwellings in North East Arnold equate to a 0.5 single form entry school. Costs for the proposed 1 form entry school should not be apportioned from the three developments. Following concerns raised:-</p> <p>Why has the Rolleston Drive allocation not been included as part of education requirements?</p> <p>There should be transparency regarding education contribution requirements and the cost of the school – disproportionate contributions would not be CIL compliant and private sector builds are often significantly more cost effective.</p> <p>Note viability comments about the east of H2 – this will be assessed further at the appropriate time.</p>	<p>The development brief refers to a minimum of 525 dwellings. Agree that all housing allocations in the Arnold primary education planning area should contribute towards the provision of a new primary school on an equal basis which is stated clearly in the masterplan.</p> <p>Work is ongoing between Gedling Borough Council and Nottinghamshire County Council outside of the preparation of the development brief to agree an approach to providing the new primary school within the Arnold primary school catchment area. This work will be used to inform Section 106 discussions. As indicated by paragraphs 5.10 – 5.15 of the brief, it is intended that the process for delivering the primary school is transparent, robust and fair. Section 106 contributions can only be required if they are necessary to make the development acceptable, directly related to the development and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.</p> <p>Rolleston Drive, is Gedling Borough Council's preferred site for anew primary school subject to it being demonstrated that it can be delivered within the required timescales. Additional text will be included to state that the Rolleston Drive site is Gedling Borough Council's preferred site.</p>
Paragraph 5.12	<u>Landowner/ Developer –</u>	Work is ongoing between Gedling Borough

	<p>A contribution formula should be agreed now to ensure contribution requirements are known. In particular the cost of the school, how it will be delivered and how Nottinghamshire County Council will make up the deficit funds so as not to delay housing delivery.</p>	<p>Council and Nottinghamshire County Council outside of the preparation of the development brief to agree an approach to providing the new primary school within the Arnold primary school catchment area. This work will be used to inform Section 106 discussions. As indicated by paragraphs 5.10 – 5.15 of the draft brief, it is intended that the process for delivering the primary school is transparent, robust and fair. Section 106 contributions can only be required if they are necessary to make the development acceptable, directly related to the development and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.</p>
<p>Education Paragraph 1.7</p>	<p><u>Landowner/ Developer</u> – Use of the phrase that the provision of a new primary school will be ‘supported’ by other development sites in Arnold is too ambiguous and should state that financial contributions will be based on Nottinghamshire County Council guidance. Landowners will need to be compensated for the loss of development land for housing.</p>	<p>Agree. Amend paragraph 1.7 to read: <u>Contributions for which will also be expected to be from development at other sites in the Arnold education area...</u></p>
<p>Paragraph 7.7</p>	<p>For H7 and H8 to be delivered the primary school will need to be delivered alongside the housing development. As long as the education land is safeguarded either H7 or H8 could come forward first. There needs to be a clawback mechanism secured should the school land not be developed for any reason.</p>	<p>Work is ongoing between Gedling Borough Council and Nottinghamshire County Council outside of the preparation of the development brief to agree an approach to providing the new primary school. This work will be used to inform Section 106 discussions. As indicated by paragraphs 5.10 – 5.15 of the brief, it is intended that the process for delivering the primary school is transparent, robust and fair. Section 106</p>

		<p>contributions can only be required if they are necessary to make the development acceptable, directly related to the development and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.</p> <p>Any clawback clauses would need to be agreed as part of a S106 Agreement.</p>
Paragraph 7.5	<u>Landowner/ Developer</u> – Notes the key principle of the document is that no one landowner will bear the burden of planning obligations.	Agreed.
	<p><u>Nottinghamshire County Council</u> – County Education welcomes the proposed school provision required to accommodate additional school places generated by Local Plan housing allocations. Pupil projections provided showing a deficit of 313.98 pupils within the Arnold Primary Planning Area up to 2028 taking account of completions, housing commitments and housing allocations.</p> <p>Support Site H8 as the site for the school, however the proposed location within the site is sub-optimal due to site levels and a watercourse that would separate the school building and the playing field. The proposed location for the school suggests the severance of the broad band of trees along the eastern boundary of H8 and suggests the location of SuDS in this area.</p> <p>Recommend an alternative 2ha site is identified within H8 to accommodate a 1 Form Entry School with capacity for 1.5FE expansion.</p>	<p>The County Education response is supportive of an alternative new site for a primary school elsewhere on site H8 which would mean the area of the site to the west of Killisick Lane.</p> <p>Work is ongoing between Gedling Borough Council and Nottinghamshire County Council outside of the preparation of the development brief to agree an approach to providing the new primary school within the Arnold primary school catchment area. This work will be used to inform Section 106 discussions. As indicated by paragraphs 5.10 – 5.15 of the draft brief, it is intended that the process for delivering the primary school is transparent, robust and fair. Section 106 contributions can only be required if they are necessary to make the development acceptable, directly related to the development and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.</p>

		Rolleston Drive, is Gedling Borough Council's preferred site for a new primary school subject to it being demonstrated that it can be delivered within the required timescales.
	<p><u>Nottinghamshire County Council</u> – Wish to ensure Section 106 pooling restrictions are not a barrier to development funding and to ensure the costs and contributions for building the school are equalised between all developers.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The Government is now committed to removing the pooling restriction, subject to changes to regulations in early 2019.</p> <p>Paragraph 5.12 is clear that housing sites in the Arnold planning area will be expected to contribute on a pro-rata basis.</p>
	<p><u>Nottinghamshire County Council</u> – Contributions for secondary education provision will be required in line with the County Council's adopted Updated Planning Obligations Strategy.</p>	Noted – reference made in document.
Housing Mix, Type, Tenure		
3.15	<p><u>Landowner/Developer</u> – LPD does not include a policy that has been locally justified requiring the application of optional building regulations. Reference to Optional Standards should be removed from the brief.</p>	Disagree. The application of optional building regulations is not required but encouraged.
Paragraph 5.8, Section 6	<p><u>Landowner/Developers</u> – No reference is made to self and custom build in document. Would like to see reference to self-build projects and custom build homes to ensure local needs are being met and that the market for such homes in a</p>	<p>Agree. Insert new paragraph 5.10:</p> <p><u><i>Proposals for self-build and custom-build housing on the development sites will be supported provided they are in accordance with Policy LPD 42 (Self Build and Custom Build</i></u></p>

	sustainable location is not discouraged.	<i>Homes) and do not undermine the comprehensive development of the allocated sites.</i>
Paragraph 7.9	<u>Landowner/Developer</u> – Brief should recognise that housing mix will differ across the sites.	Noted – the development brief does allow for this.
Paragraph 6.17	<u>Willow Farm Action Group</u> – In addition to design elements such as window size for solar gain other matters such as the amenity issue of the privacy of existing homes and gardens should be identified at this stage.	This section is concerned with Sustainable Design and solar energy capture and is not intended to be prescriptive. Amenity is covered by Policy LPD 32. No change required.
6.17	<u>Landowner/ Developer</u> – Unclear why there is a need to refer to maximising solar gain through adapting the size of window openings. Environmental performance is established through the Building regulations.	The wording is to encourage and is not prescriptive. No change required.
General Traffic		
General Comment / Page 24 – Traffic / Paragraph 5.22	<u>Local Residents</u> – Several comments raised concerns related to traffic impact including:- The level of traffic will significantly impact on the area resulting in more congestion and traffic pollution <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is already difficult to navigate Killisick Road, Killisick Lane, Gleneagles Drive and Howbeck Road due to on-street parking • Additional parking on junctions will exacerbate traffic problems • Concern about the creation of rat runs. • Many roads are cul-de-sacs with severe access issues • There are traffic problems during the school run. 	The LPD considered the principal of access and generally the Inspector was satisfied. The planning application will need to be supported by a Transport Assessment prepared in accordance with the guidance set out in Nottinghamshire County Council's Highway Design Guide. This will consider the impacts of additional traffic on the road network, key junctions and scope for mitigation.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Buses in the area have difficulty passing and emergency vehicles have difficulties • Concern that traffic from the proposed development will result in a bottleneck at the traffic lights at Coppice Road therefore backing up along Howbeck Road. This will prevent egress for existing residents along Middlebeck Drive, Harwood Close and Stuart Close. • The corner of Howbeck Lane and Killisick Lane is an accident waiting to happen due to speeding. <p>The following solutions were supported by residents:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic surveys should be carried out prior to development • Require a robust approach to traffic volume management to ensure vehicle and pedestrian safety, emergency vehicle access and air quality are not compromised. • More access roads from Surgeys Lane and Mapperley Plains should be considered. • Support more access points instead of all the emergency vehicle access points indicated • To improve access roads need to be wider. 	
General Comment – Parking Standards	<p><u>Local Residents</u> –</p> <p>Parking – recently developed sites shows that allocation of parking spaces has been inadequate. At present pavements are often partially blocked. Access by emergency services is virtually impossible.</p>	<p>The LPD considered the principal of access and generally the Inspector was satisfied. The planning application will need to be supported by a Transport Assessment prepared in accordance with the guidance set out in Nottinghamshire County Council's Highway Design Guide. This will consider the impacts of additional traffic on the road network, key junctions and scope for mitigation.</p>

		<p>In terms of street design developers will need to follow the guidelines set out in Nottinghamshire County Council's Highways Design Guidance and the Manual for Streets.</p> <p>Policy LPD 57 and the Borough Council's SPD on Residential Parking sets out standards for parking provision in residential developments.</p>
Paragraph 5.22	<p><u>Nottinghamshire County Council</u> – Reference to streets such as Strathmore Road, Roxburgh Close and Campbell Gardens providing emergency vehicle access is not clear and could be interpreted as access for all vehicles. Sustainable links could be provided in the form of cycleway/footway links which could possibly facilitate emergency vehicles</p>	<p>Following the response made to the consultation including from County Highways it is accepted that access for emergency vehicles only is not enforceable. Paragraph 4.32 amended accordingly and paragraph 5.22 deleted.</p>
Paragraph 5.17 and 6.10	<p><u>Nottinghamshire County Council</u> – Amend paragraphs. The 6C's Design Guide is to be replaced on the 1st October by the Nottinghamshire Highway Design Guide and Manual for Streets is a secondary document.</p>	<p>Agree - all references to the 6C's Guide to be replaced by reference to the Nottinghamshire Highway Design Guide.</p>
5.17	<p><u>Landowner/ Developer</u> – The 6Cs design Guide does not fully reflect the Manual for Streets and the text should be amended to reflect this.</p>	<p>The key document is the Nottinghamshire Highway Design Guide and the Manual for Streets is secondary as confirmed by the Highways Authority. No change required.</p>
Paragraph 6.10	<p><u>Nottinghamshire County Council</u> – Shared surfacing is not permissible until there is further guidance from the DfT.</p>	<p>Agree - Delete reference to shared surfacing in paragraph 6.10.</p>
Paragraph 6.11	<p><u>Nottinghamshire County Council</u> – Materials should be in keeping with the Nottinghamshire Highway Design Guide as non-standard materials such as those stated would not be acceptable on adoptable layouts.</p>	<p>Agree – in paragraph 6.11 delete reference to the materials highlighted and insert text: <i><u>in accordance with the Nottinghamshire Highways Design Guide.</u></i></p>

Appendix 2 - Road connection between H7 and H8	<u>Local Resident</u> – There should be a road link between H7 and H8 to provide two access routes to H8 therefore reducing traffic along Howbeck Road.	Disagree. County Highways are not supportive of this approach. The approach is to encourage maximum integration with the urban area.
Paragraph 6.9	<u>Willow Farm Action Group</u> – Street network assessment should not simply rely on road widths but should include environmental constraints such as the effects of on-street parking and bridges.	The planning application will need to be supported by a Transport Assessment prepared in accordance with the guidance set out in Nottinghamshire County Council's Highway Design Guide. This will consider the impacts of additional traffic on the road network, key junctions and scope for mitigation.
Local Resident Other		
Paragraph 4.6	<u>Local Resident</u> – Suggest a Landscape and Visual Assessment is undertaken out as development will eradicate the ridgeline. Include contingency arrangements to mitigate landscape impact	The site selection process undertaken as part of the preparation of the Local Planning Document took into account the landscape and visual impact of potential development sites. Policy LPD 19 is also in place to consider specific development proposals at the detailed planning application process and seeks to protect landscape character and to integrate new development proposals with the local landscape character.
General Comment – Town Centre	<u>Local Resident</u> – Concern that retail facilities in the area would not fulfil the needs of increasing population.	The location is considered accessible to the full range of shopping and other services in nearby Arnold Town Centre. There are also local convenience shops within a five minute walk of most of the allocations. The sustainability of the location was considered through the site selection process as part of the preparation of the LPD.
Paragraph 1.3	<u>Local Resident</u> – Statement is misleading as it does not state sites that	Gedling Borough Council owns part of site H8, with the private sector and two Charitable groups

	Gedling Borough Council have an interest in, in particular most of site H8 and a significant portion of site H7. The term 'charitable groups' is misleading as a small plot owned by one charity.	owning the remainder. GBC does not own any part of site H7.
General Comment	<u>Local Resident</u> – Several comments raising concern about the impact of the development of the proposal sites upon house prices.	House prices are not a planning matter.
General Comment	<u>Local Resident</u> – Fully support allocations H2, H7, H8.	Noted.
General Comment	<u>Local Resident</u> – In heavy rain rivers form along Killisick Road and Howbeck Road and further developments will only make this worse e.g. new development off Ladybank Rise.	<p>Surface water flood risk is identified as an issue in section 4 and the development brief identifies potential mitigation measures as part of a desk based exercise. The brief indicates that SUDs should be located within the sites including along the western boundary of site H7.</p> <p>A more detailed Flood Risk Assessment will need to be submitted as part of the planning application process and would need to address surface water flood risk with recommendations for mitigation for sustainable drainage solutions to the accepted standards.</p>
General Comment	<u>Local Resident</u> – The general theme of connectivity and opening up quiet closes will increase traffic and anti-social behavior in darkness hours. Worried that the Council is inviting criminality.	Issues relating to amenity and community safety are covered by Policies LPD 32 and 35.
General Comment	<u>Local Residents</u> – General concern about the removal of trees and hedgerows which will result in <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased risk of flooding 	The development brief acknowledges the importance of retaining features on site and providing compensatory measures. The document notes that this approach must be

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Detriment to local wildlife • Loss of legacy in the area 	dependent upon the outcome of an ecology assessment and will need to be considered alongside the arboriculture survey to provide the necessary information.
Green Belt/ Brownfield Land	<u>Local Residents</u> – Concerns relating to the loss of open countryside and Green Belt. Brownfield sites could have been allocated for housing (for example Daybrook Laundry and Rolleston Drive).	The various Arnold sites have been allocated through the now adopted Local Planning Document. The Inspector has endorsed the Local Planning Document site allocations and concluded that the Council has met the very special circumstances for releasing land in the Green Belt to meet housing need. Housing sites can only be allocated where they are made available and promoted by a willing landowner. Part of the former Daybrook Laundry site is allocated as X1 and other brownfield sites include Rolleston Drive H1 and the former Metallifactory site X2.

Comments relating to Housing Allocation H2 (Brookfields Garden Centre) and H7 (Howbeck Road/Mapperley Plains)		
Document Reference / Issue / Allocation	Summary of Consultee Comments	Gedling Borough Council Response
H2/ H7 - Transport, Access and Connectivity		
H2/H7- Petition	<p><u>Local Residents –</u> A petition with 146 signatures petitioned against the planning application for Brookfields Garden Centre going to 3rd October 2018 Planning Committee before the Arnold Development Brief is finalised; and expressed concern the access to H2 is to be via Crawford Rise which is steep and narrow and not suitable other than for pedestrian/cycle/emergency access. Access to H7 is also proposed via Armadale Close which opens onto Crawford Rise is also unsuitable. The petition is that these two access points must be restricted to emergency vehicles only.</p>	<p>The petition has been considered at the Planning Committee held on the 3rd October 2018. At this meeting Planning Committee resolved to grant permission for 32 homes on part of the Brookfields Garden site subject to signing a S106 Agreement.</p> <p>A developer has stated that access beyond the terminus of Armadale Close is unsuitable for any type of motor vehicle due to steep gradients. Amend paragraph 4.32 and plans in Appendix 2 to remove reference in the document relating to vehicle access to H7 being gained via Armadale Close and include a new bullet point as follows:</p> <p><u>Connections for pedestrians and cyclists may be appropriate from Armadale Close, Roxborough Close and Strathmore Road.</u></p>
<p>H2/H7 – Access via Crawford Rise and Armadale Close</p> <p>(comments were made generally and also with reference</p>	<p><u>Local Residents –</u> Several local residents raised the following concerns regarding the acceptability of Crawford Rise/ Armadale Close as an access for sites H2 and H7:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access via Crawford Rise will result in a vehicular rat-run through to Mapperley Plains. • Crawford Rise is insufficiently wide and is often 	<p>As stated above, the planning application has been considered and Planning Committee has resolved to grant permission for 32 homes on part of the Brookfields Garden site subject to signing a S106 Agreement.</p> <p>The resolution to grant also agreed a condition</p>

<p>to paragraphs 4.32</p>	<p>reduced to a single lane due to on-street parking.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Crawford Rise, Cornell Drive and Armadale Close have existing on-street parking issues (in particular at weekends and evenings) which restrict pedestrian/vehicular movement and safety, restrict refuse collection, restrict emergency vehicle access, impact residential parking availability/access, all of which will be exacerbated by the proposed access. • Concern that large vehicles/ refuse lorries have to reverse down Cornell Drive due to existing problems in the area. • The proposed access is unsuitable for emergency vehicle access which would compromise the safety of residents of H2. • The road layout of Cornell Drive, which has a sharp turn, makes navigation difficult in particular for larger vehicles. • Concern that construction vehicles would be disruptive, damaging and would negatively impact highway safety as access for these vehicles is not suitable. • Crawford Rise/ Armadale Close has a steep gradient which has accessibility issues during icy weather. • Resulting additional traffic would be detrimental to impact residential amenity due to noise, pollution and change of character which would not conform with LPD32 • There will be insufficient parking for existing residents and visitors in the area as a result of the proposed access. 	<p>requiring a Construction Environmental Method Statement to be submitted and approved by the Council before any development can take place. This will address parking of construction and contractors cars, loading and unloading of plant and materials; security hoarding, wheel washing facilities and control of emissions of dust and dirt during construction.</p> <p>In relation to H7, the principle of the housing allocations has been established through the adoption of the Local Planning Document which was endorsed by a government appointed Planning Inspector. The specific issues and resolutions to many of the issues raised would be dealt with through a formal planning application where residents will be able to provide comment. The details of proposals will have to accord with policies in the Local Planning Document which include parking standards, highway safety, neighbouring amenity, design etc. Proposals will be required to be accompanied by a Transport Assessment and be in accordance with the County Council's Nottinghamshire Highways Design Guide.</p> <p>A developer has stated that access beyond the terminus of Armadale Close is unsuitable for any type of motor vehicle due to steep gradients. Amend paragraph 4.32 and plans in Appendix 2 to remove reference in the document relating to vehicle access to H7 being gained via Armadale</p>
---------------------------	---	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The introduction of parking limitations along Crawford Rise would exacerbate parking issues along Cornell Drive. • There are existing issues at the road crossing at the junction of Cornell Drive/ Howbeck Road given the location of two bus stops and two shops. • Additional traffic in the area will exacerbate parking and other issues along Howbeck Road. • The proposed development would immediately impact 150+ existing residents • The proposed access would be inconvenient for the new residents of H2 and H7. • Concern that there will be additional foot travel in the area as people walk to bus stops. • Concern that the proposed access from Crawford Rise would be dangerous • The LPD states that access to H2 and H7 will be from Mapperley Plains. • The proposed access is contrary to NPPF Paragraph 109 as it will result in unacceptable impact on highway safety and have severe cumulative impact on the road network due to increased traffic and parking. • The proposed access is contrary to NPPF Paragraphs 108 and 110 (a) and (c) due to hazards associated with construction vehicles; that it does not prioritise pedestrian and cyclist; and does not encourage limiting vehicle use. • Access to H2/H7 via Armadale Close is contrary to NPPF Paragraph 109 as it will result in unacceptable impact on highway safety 	<p>Close and include a new bullet point as follows:</p> <p><u>Connections for pedestrians and cyclists may be appropriate from Armadale Close, Roxborough Close and Strathmore Road.</u></p>
--	---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is contradictory for Crawford Rise/ Armadale Close to be considered suitable for access when Strathmore Road, Roxburgh Close and Campbell Gardens are not considered suitable for vehicular access even though they have incomparable gradient, access and parking issues compared against Crawford Rise. <p>The following solutions were supported by residents:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More suitable access could be gained from Mapperley Plains resulting in less disruption for existing residents. • Support the proposed connections to H2/H7 if these are footpaths. • Suggest traffic and highways study is undertaken assessing increased traffic, parked vehicles and access to properties. Parking assessment should be undertaken outside of working hours to fully take account of parking issues and blind spots. • Access for construction vehicles should be from Mapperley Plains • Comments made by Highways Authority for application 2017/0155 should be made public • The existing footpath should be closed due to concerns about new residents walking past including late at night. • Access from Crawford Rise should be for emergency vehicles, pedestrian and cyclists only. 	
	<p><u>Landowner/ Developer –</u> Access to H7 via Armadale Close is inappropriate owing to the steepness and narrowness of Crawford Rise.</p>	<p>A developer has stated that access beyond the terminus of Armadale Close is unsuitable for any type of motor vehicle due to steep gradients. Amend paragraph 4.32 and plans in Appendix 2</p>

		<p>to remove reference in the document relating to vehicle access to H7 being gained via Armadale Close and include a new bullet point as follows:</p> <p><u>Connections for pedestrians and cyclists may be appropriate from Armadale Close, Roxborough Close and Strathmore Road.</u></p>
<p>H2/ H7 – Access via Mapperley Plains</p> <p>Paragraphs 2.8, 4.30, 5.1, 5.2, 5.20, 5.25</p> <p>Paragraph 5.20</p>	<p><u>Local Residents</u> –</p> <p>Several comments supported access to sites H2 and H7 from Mapperley Plains. The LPD states that access to H2 and H7 will be from Mapperley Plains.</p> <p>Some comments objected to the proposed access via Mapperley Plains because:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This will exacerbate existing traffic issues • The proposed T junction on Mapperley Plains will prevent right turning • The proposed roundabout junction will cause tailbacks along Mapperley Plains and will be inadequate • The following solutions were suggested:- • Revision of speed restrictions on approach to the proposed roundabout from Travellers Post • A traffic survey is undertaken • The proposed accesses should be well lit 	<p>The LPD considered the principle of access via Mapperley Plains and generally the Inspector was satisfied. The planning application will need to be supported by a Transport Assessment prepared in accordance with the guidance set out in Nottinghamshire County Council's Highway Design Guide. This will consider the impacts of additional traffic on the road network, key junctions and scope for mitigation.</p>
<p>Paragraphs 5.20 and 5.22</p>	<p><u>Local Resident</u> –</p> <p>Notes that access to H2 will be from Mapperley Plains and H2 traffic will not have full through access to Howbeck Road via Crawford Rise/Cornell Gardens. Concern that increased local traffic volumes from the Gedling by-pass may worsen existing traffic circulation</p>	<p>The proposal for 32 homes on part of the Brookfields site served off Crawford Rise has been approved subject to a S106 agreement.</p> <p>In relation to the allocation for 90 homes being accessed from Crawford Rise the resolution to</p>

	<p>problems with this being exacerbated by H2.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Paragraph 5.20 – should read “Access to Site H2 will <u>ONLY</u> be provided via a new T-junction from Mapperley Plains”, as Crawford Rise is too steep, narrow and windy with existing parking problems. Access to development including construction traffic would not be suitable. Paragraph 5.22 – “Other points of access from neighbouring streets such as Strathmore Road, or Roxburgh Close and Campbell Gardens will provide connections for emergency vehicles <u>ONLY</u>, and will need to be agreed with the Highways Authority <u>and the Police</u>.” 	<p>grant permission is for 32 dwellings with all matters reserved; except access, for subsequent approval. It is considered that matters relating to the layout would be considered at depth at the reserved matters stage and interconnectivity between the sites, should the wider site come forward in the future, can be considered and managed on their own merits should the applications be submitted.</p> <p>In light of comments received from County Highways it is accepted that access for emergency vehicles only is not enforceable, therefore paragraph 5.22 has been deleted. A new bullet has been inserted to paragraph 4.32: <u>Connections for pedestrians and cyclists may be appropriate from Armadale Close, Roxborough Close and Strathmore Road.</u></p>
<p>H7 – Proposed connection via Roxburgh Close</p> <p>(comments were made generally and also with reference to paragraphs 4.32)</p>	<p><u>Local Residents</u> –</p> <p>Several comments raised the following concerns regarding the acceptability of Roxburgh Close as a connection with site H7:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern that public access via Roxburgh Close will result in more pedestrian/cycling activity and therefore potential increases in anti-social behaviour. Concern that the use of Roxburgh Road for emergency vehicles only would not be enforced and would therefore result in a rat run between Mapperley Plains and Howbeck Road. Roxburgh Road is unsuitable for a large increase in traffic volume. 	<p>See above. In light of comments received from County Highways it is accepted that access for emergency vehicles only is not enforceable. However, it is important for the sustainability of the development that there will be integration with the adjoining urban community and so footpath and cycleway access may be appropriate off certain cul-de-sacs. Policies LPD 32 and 35 are in place to address amenity and security issues.</p> <p>The footpath from Ladybank Rise across site H7 to Mapperley Plains would be retained although may need to be diverted as a result of the design</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern the proposed connectivity will impact the quietness of the Roxburgh Close. • Ladybank Rise is also an unsuitable access point <p>The following solutions were supported by residents:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggest an access path is located via Ladybank Rise or Crawford Rise • Suggest Roxburgh Road is not used as a secondary access route. 	of the scheme.
4.32	<p><u>Landowner/ Developer</u> –</p> <p>Emergency access from Roxburgh Close is not expected to be achievable due to the gradient of the road. Request that text is inserted that appropriate road design with appropriate loops can achieve satisfactory road access. The text should also recognise that connections may not be achievable due to land ownership or technical constraints.</p>	See above. In light of comments received from County Highways it is accepted that access for emergency vehicles only is not enforceable.
H7 – Proposed Connection Via Campbell Gardens – 4.32	<p><u>Local Residents</u> –</p> <p>Several comments raised the following concerns regarding the acceptability of Campbell Gardens as a connection with site H7:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern about increased traffic. • Access is unsuitable for access including for emergency vehicles given the twisting, inclining road layout. • Pedestrian and cycle access would be dangerous as a result of increased vehicular use and parking. • Increased parking generally and at the turning head will impact emergency access and safety for all residents including children. • The proposed access goes against the concept of a cul-de-sac 	<p>The consultation has also provided evidence that access through Campbell Gardens would depend on acquiring third party land and is therefore not available.</p> <p>Amend paragraph 4.32 and plans in Appendix 2 to remove reference in the document relating to vehicle access to H7 being gained via Armadale Close.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adverse impact upon the character and residential amenity of the close • Pedestrian/ cycle access would result in youth congregating increasing the likelihood of anti-social behavior. • Campbell Gardens is inaccessible during winter weather resulting in parking on Howbeck Road • Introducing a pathway would result in a rat run for bikes and motorcycles especially as a getaway route for theft of these vehicles. • Residents are opposed to the proposed access <p>The following solutions were supported by residents:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove the paragraph <i>"From the turning head Campbell Gardens into the northern end of Site H7 – as an existing residential cul-de-sac this may be best suited for emergency vehicular access whilst providing a connection for pedestrians and cyclists"</i> • Emergency access can be gained from H8 and H7 • Emergency vehicle access should be solely from Roxburgh Close, or Mellish Rugby Club to reach north of H7, as these would provide easier and quicker access from Coppice Road area. • Suggest any pedestrian/cycling connectivity is solely from Roxburgh Close • Emergency vehicle access should be solely from Mapperley Plains. 	
Paragraph 6.9	<p><u>Local Resident</u> –</p> <p>Concern that site H2 will become a vehicular through route to Mapperley Plains should the development of the eastern 2/3 of H2 have a vehicular link with the 2017/0155 site which has access from Crawford Rise.</p>	<p>In relation to the allocation for 90 homes being accessed from Crawford Rise, the resolution to grant permission is for 32 dwellings with all matters reserved; except access, for subsequent approval. It is considered that matters relating to</p>

		the layout would be considered in depth at the reserved matters stage and interconnectivity between the sites, should the wider site come forward in the future, can be considered and managed on their own merits should the applications be submitted.
Paragraph 4.32	<u>Local Resident</u> – Concern that the development brief is misleading as it shows the connection to the east of H2 from Mapperley Plains. Planning application 2017/0155 considers access from Crawford Rise.	Planning application 2017/0155 covers part of the site. The remainder of the Brookfields site is to be served from Mapperley Plains.
Map Page 48	<u>Local Resident</u> – Object to proposed roads INF02 and INF03 not being linked, which if linked would be a major safety improvement feature through the provision of sufficient exits from the housing development, should an emergency incident happen in the future.	These two proposed roads linking H2 and H7 are proposed to be linked.
Map Page 48	<u>Local Resident</u> – Support an orbital road around the higher contours to link INF02 and INF03. Linkages should be made northwards to join with the B684 road as development progresses. Support a radial road linking the Howbeck Road/Clevedon Drive junction to join INF02/ INF03, running along the higher contours.	An orbital route is not supported as it would encourage more orbital movements by private vehicles as opposed to achieving a closer integration between the allocations and the existing urban community. A road passing through the recreational area which is to remain in Green Belt would also have an urbanising effect and impact on the tranquillities of the recreational area. Pedestrian/cycle access between H7 and H8 and the recreational area planned in between are desirable.
	<u>Local Resident</u> – Will the public right of way across H7 linking Crawford	Yes, but may be subject to diversion through the new development as a result of the scheme

	Rise to Mapperley Plains be retained?	design.
H2/H7	<u>Local Resident</u> – Suggest the public footpath from Crawford Rise to the top of the field is closed to prevent pedestrians walking past.	See above.
Maps GED002/017 & GED002/016, Paragraph 5.3	<u>Landowner/ Developer</u> – Access to H7 shown as through an operational Garden Centre. This plan and associated schedules should be amended as this access is not necessary and would reduce the developable area to the eastern part of H2.	Disagree. The masterplan is seeking comprehensive development although it is indicative. This access provides an option for linking the two sites and so in the interests of maintaining flexibility it should be retained. Other access layouts can be considered on merit at the planning application stage.
Map GED002/017, Paragraph 5.3	<u>Landowner/ Developer</u> – Does not show the access road infrastructure from Crawford Rise as part of the Phase 1 development of site H2. This should also be indicated and taken account in the land budget schedules.	Agree - amend maps on page 46 and 48 to show approved access to site H2 from Crawford rise and amend land schedules at paragraph 5.3 accordingly.
Maps	It should be recognised that access off Mapperley Plains to serve the east of H2 could come from anywhere along that site frontage. The brief shows only one option and should not be prescriptive. Better access to site H2 would be located further south than indicated.	Noted - any access would need to conform to the Nottinghamshire Highways Design Guidelines.
5.20	<u>Landowner/ Developer</u> – Site H7 has an existing access point which serves a small number of residential properties and also is the access to serve a planning permission for an office new office building	Noted.
H2/ H7 – Biodiversity, Trees, Hedgerows		
H2/ H7 – Biodiversity	<u>Local Residents</u> – Several comments raised concerns about the loss of habitat for wildlife that currently occupy the development land, trees and hedges. Suggest mitigation including retaining existing hedges to provide space for wildlife.	The development brief refers to protecting significant hedges. Planning Committee at its meeting on 3 rd October has resolved to grant outline planning permission subject to a Section 106 Agreement. Matters relating to landscaping

	<p>Site H2 noted as containing small mammals, birds (including skylark, fowl, barn owls and partridges), hedgehog, weasels, shrews, foxes, squirrels.</p> <p>Site H7 noted as containing protected wildlife including bats, birds of prey and badgers. Hedges that provide habitat for wildlife should be retained</p>	<p>are reserved for future consideration which will deal with the retention of hedgerows. Conditions have been attached to ensure that significant green infrastructure can be retained when designing the detailed layout to ensure that mature vegetation on existing boundaries are retained and sufficiently protected during the development.</p> <p>Any planning applications in relation to both H2 and H7 will be required to be accompanied by an up to date ecological assessment in accordance with Policy LPD 18 and relevant legislation. Any harmful ecological impacts should be avoided, mitigated or, if not possible, compensated. The relevant legislation for protected species will apply.</p>
H2 – Trees	<p><u>Local Resident</u> – Trees identified with TPOs on cannot be removed.</p>	<p>Noted. There are no TPOs present on any of the allocated sites.</p>
Paragraph 6.16 and 4.12 – H2 Hedgerow	<p><u>Local Residents</u> – Concern about the loss of hedgerows on site H2 and support for their retention. Retain hedgerows at the southern and eastern boundaries. Strongly object to the hedgerow on the western boundary being removed as it has a function as and noise and wildlife habitat buffer.</p> <p>Retain native hedgerows along the north and west boundary of H2 which provides a vital wildlife and green corridor. There is a duty under the NPPF Paragraphs 7, 109, 170 and 175 to retain hedgerows and biodiversity.</p>	<p>The omission of a reference to retaining this particular hedgerow as opposed to the ones at southern and eastern boundaries in the development brief should not be taken to infer its removal. Planning Committee at its meeting on 3rd October has resolved to grant outline planning permission subject to a Section 106 Agreement. Matters relating to landscaping are reserved for future consideration which will deal with the retention of hedgerows. Conditions have been attached to ensure that significant green infrastructure can be retained when designing the detailed layout to ensure that</p>

		mature vegetation on existing boundaries are retained and sufficiently protected during the development. The development brief refers to retaining the existing hedgerow on the southern boundary of H2.
Paragraph 4.17 – H2 Hedgerow	<u>Local Resident</u> – The 220 metre long, 180 year old hedgerow adjoining the rear garden of 28 Middlebeck Drive is not specifically retained as agreed at the LPD Examination. Hedgerow appears on the 1835 Sanderson map.	The development brief refers to protecting significant hedges. Planning Committee at its meeting on 3 rd October has resolved to grant outline planning permission subject to a Section 106 Agreement. Matters relating to landscaping are reserved for future consideration which will deal with the retention of hedgerows. Conditions have been attached to ensure that significant green infrastructure can be retained when designing the detailed layout to ensure that mature vegetation on existing boundaries are retained and sufficiently protected during the development.
Paragraph 4.32	<u>Local Resident</u> – Will the hedgerows behind the garages on Crawford Rise be retained as part of development? Why are they not retained at present?	The omission of a reference to retaining this particular hedgerow as opposed to the ones at southern and eastern boundaries in the development brief should not be taken to infer its removal. Planning Committee at its meeting on 3 rd October has resolved to grant outline planning permission subject to a Section 106 Agreement. Matters relating to landscaping are reserved for future consideration which will deal with the retention of hedgerows. Conditions have been attached to ensure that significant green infrastructure can be retained when designing the detailed layout to ensure that

		mature vegetation on existing boundaries are retained and sufficiently protected during the development. The development brief refers to retaining the existing hedgerow on the southern boundary of H2.
General	<u>Local Resident</u> – Will the hedgerow near the proposed access route to extend Armadale Close be retained to provide a natural barrier between existing and proposed development.	See above.
Paragraph 4.17	<u>Local Resident</u> – General support for a proper assessment of the network of hedgerows.	Noted.
H2/H7 – Residential Amenity / Landscape		
H2 – Residential Amenity (comments were made generally and also with reference to paragraphs 3.13, 4.8,6.16)	<u>Local Residents</u> – Several comments raised concerns relating to the impact of the development of site H2 upon surrounding residential amenity, including:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns about overlooking from new homes into existing properties. The development 3 or 2.5 storey high housing in addition and the removal of hedges would not conform with LPD32 as it would be overbearing, overshadowing, overlooking and be out of character with the existing area. Concern that development on H2 will be built with inadequate separation distance therefore impacting residential privacy of properties on Crawford Rise. The scoping report for the Brookfields garden centre development (a few years ago) referred to protecting the amenity of Crawford Rise residents. The following solutions were supported by residents:-	<p>These are all matters which would be dealt with at the planning application stage. Policy LPD 32 addresses overlooking, overbearing and overshadowing and guidance in the following text indicates how such issues should be assessed.</p> <p>The Development brief refers to protecting significant hedges. Planning Committee at its meeting on 3rd October has resolved to grant outline planning permission subject to a Section 106 Agreement. Matters relating to landscaping are reserved for future consideration which will deal with the retention of hedgerows. Conditions have been attached to ensure that significant green infrastructure can be retained when designing the detailed layout to ensure that mature vegetation on existing boundaries are retained and sufficiently protected during the</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • retain the row of Hawthorne trees (lined path between 8 houses and Brookfields) between houses along Crawford Rise and the Brookfields railings and the Cypress trees on the Brookfields side of the railings to provide a residential amenity buffer during and after development • Retain hedgerows to protect views and visual amenity • Reconsider support for 3 or 2.5 storey dwellings. Support low building heights along the prominent ridge line 	development.
Paragraphs 4.8, and 6.4-6.7	In relation to requiring low building heights on the prominent ridgeline, these paragraphs should be more specific rather than cover generalities.	The development brief is not intended to be overly prescriptive
H7 – Residential Amenity (comments were made generally and also with reference to paragraphs 6.16)	<p><u>Local Residents –</u> Several comments raised concerns relating to the impact of the development of site H7 upon surrounding residential amenity, including:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The development of H7 would destroy the prominent ridgeline towards Plains Road. • 3-storey properties on the steeper parts of H7 would overlook properties on Roxburgh Close which would contravene Policy LPD32 as it would be overlooking, overshadowing and overbearing and reduce natural light on these properties in winter months. • Retain hedgerows at the southern and eastern boundaries of H7. Strongly object to the hedgerow on the western boundary being removed. Hedgerow makes a big difference to the noise level. <p>The following solutions were supported by residents:-</p>	The development brief acknowledges that a ridgeline exists and runs through sites H2 and H7 and will require careful treatment. Developers will need to apply a landscape character approach seeking to integrate the development into the local landscape and to avoid “hard urban edges”. Policy LPD 19 (Landscape Character and Visual Impact) would be applied.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reconsider support for 3 or 2.5 storey dwellings. Support low building heights along the prominent ridge line • Retain hedgerows • Suggest restricting development of H7 below the ridge line. 	
H2/H7 - (comments were made generally and also with reference to paragraphs 6.18)	<p><u>Local Residents</u> – Several comments were received raising general concern about the loss of hedgerows and in general support of retaining hedgerows and trees within sites H2 and H7 including:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trees and hedgerows provide a privacy buffer for existing dwellings and the new dwellings and their construction phase. • Retention of hedges and trees is welcome but should not be prescriptive. 	The development brief refers to protecting significant hedges. In general the principal of retaining hedges and trees where practical is accepted. Matters relating to landscaping are to be dealt with at the detailed planning application stage.
H7 buffer - Paragraph 6.18 and 5.37	<p><u>Local Residents</u> – Comments relating to the proposed open space/ buffer along the western boundary of H7 were received, including:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The landscape buffer/ green corridor is very narrow and should be wider to provide adequate privacy • The landscape buffer/ green corridor should be defined by a barrier wall with the properties on Roxburgh Close • People using the corridor will be able to look straight into the adjoining rear gardens and also be able to access these gardens. Rear gardens of Roxburgh Close are approx. 5 meters below the boundary of H7 • Landscaping proposals should integrate all existing and new hedge and tree planting and boundary 	The development brief is indicative and the final width of the buffer will depend on the layout and design of the scheme and also on the design of the engineering scheme for sustainable drainage systems. This matter will be considered in detail at the planning application stage. Policy LPD 32 addresses overlooking, and guidance in the supporting text indicates how such issues should be assessed.

	treatments with the street.	
6.18 (H7)	<p><u>Landowner/ Developer</u> – Further enhancement along the Mellish Rugby Club boundary is unnecessary. Landscape buffer along southern boundary will be subject to detailed engineering works that will determine the size and extent of SUDs. The word “must” be replaced with the word “should” and caveated by the need to protect adjacent properties from the risk of flooding as the size and shape of SUDs could make it impractical to provide a landscape buffer.</p>	<p>Disagree - the development brief indicates that this is a significant boundary that could be enhanced and strengthened raising overall quality.</p> <p>Note the comments on engineering design and SUDs (also see above).</p> <p>Agree. Amend paragraph 6.18 to read <u>should</u>.</p>
H7 – Mapperley Plains Frontage General comment/ paragraph 4.6, 6.16	<p><u>Landowner/ Developers</u> – Some houses will be required on the Mapperley Plains road frontage for market-facing/ commercial purposes.</p> <p>The reference to a 10 meter buffer along the Mapperley Plains frontage is too prescriptive. Should be amended to read ‘an appropriately landscaped buffer to Mapperley Plains’ so as not to be prescriptive.</p> <p>Bullet point 4 replace with emphasis on creating meaningful variation across a network of primary, secondary or tertiary streets.</p>	<p>The development brief is indicative of the width of the buffer.</p> <p>Accept the need for flexibility. Amend paragraph 6.16 to remove reference to 10 metres. The width of the buffer in this location would be considered in detail at the planning application stage.</p> <p>Bullet point 4 focuses development with a greater scale and massing on the primary streets and it is considered that this principle should be retained.</p>
4.6 (H7)	<p><u>Landowner/ Developer</u> – The topography and quantum of development is such that the character of the ridge will need to change. Question whether referencing to minimising landscape and visual impact is appropriate. Request that brief focusses on the type of skyline that should be created.</p>	<p>Disagree - this is not appropriate for the brief. A Landscape Impact and Visual Analysis assessment will be required as part of the planning application.</p>
Flooding		
H7 – Flooding	<p><u>Local Resident</u> – Drainage issues may arise as a result of cutting through</p>	<p>Policies LPD 3 and LPD 4 deal with flood risk and will require drainage solutions. For</p>

	<p>turning head impacting the road surface and abutting gardens.</p> <p>The existing wall helps to alleviate water flowing off the higher land which could mean increased flooding if the wall is removed.</p>	<p>clarification it is acknowledged that access via Campbell Gardens is not available due to the need for third party land.</p>
<p>Paragraphs 5.30-5.46 – Flooding H2</p>	<p><u>Local Resident</u> –</p> <p>This section takes account of surface water flooding surrounding H2 as existing, but not potential issues following completion of the development. The document should require risk management measures to be in place should flooding occur following development. Suggest a reserve strip of land and possible easements within site H2 are incorporated into the brief for ditches to enable water to drain eastwards into the dumbles.</p> <p>Insufficient data is collected by Severn Trent Water, the Environment Agency and the LLFA to adequately reflect surface water flooding in the rear gardens of Middlebeck Drive and therefore the houses to be developed on the H2 site.</p>	<p>See above response. The surface drainage scheme would need to address the risks of flooding arising out of the proposed development.</p>
<p>Paragraph 5.40</p>	<p><u>Local Resident</u> –</p> <p>There are existing flooding issues most years in the rear gardens of Middlebeck Drive. Severn Trent/Environment Agency would not have predicted this risk of flooding and seem unaware in their published reports.</p> <p>Need to include some sort of drainage on the boundary.</p> <p>There is an ancient hedge that needs preserving which should be put in plans along with the water drainage solution.</p>	<p>Planning Committee at its meeting on 3rd October has resolved to grant outline planning permission subject to a Section 106 Agreement. This consent is conditional on a detailed surface water drainage scheme being submitted and approved by the authority in writing.</p>
<p>Paragraph 5.41 – H7</p>	<p><u>Local Resident</u> –</p> <p>Surface water run-off attenuation modelling would be a theoretical exercise. If the impact of flooding is more severe than modelled, who would be responsible for</p>	<p>The water drainage plan would need to be prepared by suitably qualified professionals.</p>

	damage cause to the gabion walls on the properties on Roxburgh Close? Suggest that assurance is sought that developers are responsible for any subsequent damage caused by flooding.	
Paragraph 5.41 – H7	<u>Local Resident</u> – Concern about the impact of additional hard surfacing, given local gradients and the potential for flooding when it rains. Will provision be made to ensure that surface water run-off will not run into adjacent properties?	Policies LPD 3 and LPD 4 deal with flood risk and will require drainage solutions. The surface drainage scheme would need to address the risks of flooding arising out of the proposed development.
H2/ H7 Other Matters		
Paragraphs 4.23-4.25	<u>Local Resident</u> – This section is misleading as it does not make reference to the housing density of existing development to the west of H2 namely Crawford Rise, Cornell Drive, Carradale Close, Armadale Close. These areas are defined by very steep gradients with high density terraced housing and several cul-de-sacs. There is poor access to adopted roads and garage courts and existing on-street parking issues.	Paragraph 4.23 of the development brief adequately describes the local area in terms of the built environment.
H7 – proximity with rugby club	<u>Mellish Rugby Club</u> – Concern that the proximity of H7 to the rugby club will result in trespassing, property damage and dog fouling on the grounds. Concern that the proposed development may cause disruption to day-to-day running of Mellish Rugby Club	Boundary treatments are a matter for the detailed planning application process.
Section 6	<u>Landowner/ Developers</u> – Should refer to self-build and custom build on site H7.	Agree. Insert new paragraph 5.10: <i><u>Proposals for self-build and custom-build housing on the development sites will be supported provided they are in accordance with Policy LPD 42 (Self Build and Custom Build Homes) and do not undermine the comprehensive development of the allocated</u></i>

		<u>sites.</u>
Map Page 47	The existing access to H7 serves a few houses and also would serve a planning permission for an office once implemented however area surrounding is shown as open space. Plans and layouts provided so that they can be accurately reflected in the appendix plans.	Noted.
H2/H7 – Affordable Housing Paragraph 5.8	<p><u>Local Residents</u> – Concern that affordable housing proposed within site H7 would result in issues. Preference would be for elderly residents’ provision.</p> <p>Concerned about the amount of affordable housing. It seems the real need for housing will be exploited by business to make money. It will bring more people into the area instead of serving it.</p>	The Borough Council has a housing target to meet objectively assessed housing need which has been endorsed by the planning inspector examining the Local Planning Document. Much of this need will be met by the private house building industry. The LPD Policy as set out in the development brief is to provide for 30% of the allocated housing to be defined as affordable.
H2/H7 – Affordable Housing	<p><u>Local Resident</u> – Efforts by applicants to reduce affordable housing requirements on H2 and H7 should be resisted.</p>	Noted.
Paragraph 7.6 and 3.12	<p><u>Landowner/ Developer</u> – This paragraph refers to a 20% base line affordable housing requirement. Paragraph 3.12 refers to a 30% affordable housing requirement on site H2. This should be clarified.</p>	Unable to find the proposed differentiation in the document. The development brief is clear that there is a 30% affordable housing requirement on sites H2 and H7, whereas site H8 straddles two housing sub-market requirements (20% and 30%) therefore a 20% requirement is applied to this site.
Paragraph 2.7	<p><u>Local Residents</u> – Middlebeck Drive is already quite dangerous from speeding and used as a cut through and this could significantly worsen. There should be through roads on the development. Turning right onto Plains Road is very</p>	The preparation of the LPD considered the principal of access and generally the Inspector was satisfied. The planning application will need to be supported by a Transport Assessment prepared in accordance with the guidance set

	<p>slow and there are long queues to/from work to Spring Lane roundabout and coming home from Gedling Road which would worsen after building.</p> <p>There are also problems of unanticipated traffic levels down Middlebeck Drive.</p> <p>In anticipation of an additional 400-500 vehicles/ vans associated with the development, concern that residential areas such as Middlebeck Drive with existing parking issues will form a rat-run. Suggest this will be managed by speed and parking restrictions, rather than road humps which may damage vehicles and increase pollution through additional braking.</p>	<p>out in Nottinghamshire County Council's Highway Design Guide. This will consider the impacts of additional traffic on the road network, key junctions and scope for mitigation.</p>
H2/H7	<p><u>Local Resident</u> – Concern about the disruption, noise and pollution resulting from building work.</p>	<p>This issue will be addressed at the planning application stage. GBC would attach a condition requiring a Construction and Environmental Management Plan which addresses matters such as hours of working, contractor's parking, noise and dust.</p>
H2/H7	<p><u>Local Resident</u> – Preference to have a view of greenery rather than development as it has benefits for physical and mental wellbeing.</p>	<p>The development brief refers to protecting significant hedges. In general the principle of retaining hedges and trees where practical is accepted. Matters relating to landscaping are to be dealt with at the detailed planning application stage.</p>
<p>H2 – Relocation of the existing Garden Centre</p> <p>Paragraph 2.9</p>	<p><u>Local Residents</u> – Comments relating to the likelihood of 2/3 of the land forming H2 being developed given the location/ relocation of the Garden Centre.</p> <p>Clarification relating to whether the relocation of the</p>	<p>In the planning statement supporting the outline application, paragraph 3.39, under Section 7: Comprehensiveness states that: "The applicant owns the active Brookfields Garden Centre site located immediately to the east of the current application site. It is intended to develop the</p>

Paragraph 7.1	<p>Garden Centre is referring to relocating to the undeveloped 1/3 of the allocated site or off-site relocation.</p> <p>Clarification relating to why site H2 is considered unviable and whether this refers to the undeveloped 1/3 or the 2/3 area occupied by the garden centre.</p>	<p>entire site within the Plan period. The western part first followed by the eastern part that currently accommodates the Garden Centre buildings. The western part will assist in funding the relocation of the garden centre. Our client is actively searching for an alternative site.” This point has been reiterated through the preparation of the Local Planning Document.</p>
Paragraphs 2.9 and 3.9	<p><u>Local Resident</u> –</p> <p>These sections are contradictory on the basis that 2017/0155 is piecemeal development of site H2. Paragraph 2.9 and 2017/0155 submission documents refer to intentions to relocate the garden centre to facilitate development, but this is vague with no evidence the landowner is actively looking for site relocation. There would be no incentive for the remaining 2/3 of H2 to be developed if the other 1/3 of the site is developed with access of Crawford Rise. Concern that permitting piecemeal development of H2 would undermine the rest of site H2 being developed.</p>	<p>Planning Committee resolved to grant planning permission subject to a Section 106 agreement being signed. The Committee Report sets out that the proposed development of the part of the Brookfields Garden Centre would not prejudice the remainder of the site from being developed.</p>
Map GED002/017	<p><u>Landowner/ Developer</u> –</p> <p>POS04 is shown as 0.17ha. This is more than is required for a LAP. We consider that this should be reduced to circa 250 sq m (0.025 ha).</p>	<p>Proposals will need to accord with the Borough Council’s New Housing Development Supplementary Planning Guidance for Open Space Provision (November 2001), which is a material consideration in the determination of any planning application. Page 11 of the guidance states that the maximum size of a LAP should be 100 m2 however it is noted that there is also a requirement for an area of standoff.</p>

Comments relating to Housing Allocation H8 (Killisick Lane) and the Recreational Area		
Document Reference / Issue / Allocation	Summary of Consultee Comments	Gedling Borough Council Response
<p>H8 – Connectivity via Strathmore Road</p> <p>(comments were made generally and also with reference to paragraphs 3.11; 4.32; 5.22; 6.9; 6.16)</p>	<p><u>Local Residents</u> –</p> <p>Several comments raised the following concerns regarding the acceptability of the proposed emergency and pedestrian connectivity between Strathmore Road and Site H8:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed access will be used as a short cut through to access the school, which will result in obstructive parking along Strathmore Road and will block the proposed emergency access • Strathmore Road is insufficiently wide to accommodate resulting additional parking associated with the school • Increased parking along Strathmore Road will compromise pedestrian safety/ mobility • Increased parking along Strathmore Road will prevent refuse lorry access • Increased parking along Strathmore Road will impact residential amenity and privacy exacerbated by the loss of green space within site H8 • Increased pedestrian and schoolchildren activity will result in littering, noise and deterioration of the Strathmore road. • Concern that the aim of the masterplan for better surveillance will not be achieved as there will be more pedestrians walking along Strathmore Road. • Concern regarding the achievability and enforcement of 'emergency access only'. 	<p>Work is ongoing between Gedling Borough Council and Nottinghamshire County Council outside of the preparation of the development brief to agree an approach to providing the new primary school within the Arnold primary school catchment area. This work will be used to inform Section 106 discussions. As indicated by paragraphs 5.10 – 5.15 of the draft brief, it is intended that the process for delivering the primary school is transparent, robust and fair. Section 106 contributions can only be required if they are necessary to make the development acceptable, directly related to the development and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.</p> <p>Rolleston Drive is Gedling Borough Council's preferred site for a new primary school subject to it being demonstrated that it can be delivered within the required timescales.</p> <p>However, Nottinghamshire County Council Education's response to this consultation is supportive of an alternative new site for a primary school elsewhere on site H8 which would mean the area of the site to the west of</p>

	<p>The following solutions were supported by residents:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove the proposed access from Strathmore Road. • Extend the proposed access to enable car users to access the school from Strathmore Road. • Suggest emergency vehicle access is achieved by way of introducing a solid high gate, rather than giving pedestrian and cycling access. • If the access remains as proposed, include parking restrictions on Strathmore Road. 	<p>Killisick Lane. Access to the housing development and new primary school will need to be from Killisick Lane via a suitable access arrangement, but County Highways has indicated that the principle of an access to serve both uses would be acceptable.</p> <p>In light of comments received from County Highways it is accepted that access for emergency vehicles only is not enforceable.</p> <p>However, it is important for the sustainability of the development that there will be integration with the adjoining urban community and so footpath and cycleway access may be appropriate off certain cul-de-sacs. Policies LPD 32 and 35 are in place to address amenity and security issues. Parking provision and standards are covered by Policy LPD 57 and appendix D of the LPD, based on the Borough Councils Residential Car Parking Standards SPD. The planning application will need to be supported by a Transport Assessment prepared in accordance with the guidance set out in Nottinghamshire County Council's Highway Design Guide. This will consider the impacts of additional traffic on the road network, key junctions and scope for mitigation.</p> <p>Action – amend plans in Appendix 2 to remove location for the primary school. The</p>
--	--	---

		Borough Council's preferred location for the primary school is outside the Masterplan area at the housing allocation H1 Rolleston Drive. Action – remove reference on plans in Appendix 2 to access for emergency vehicles via Strathmore road. Retain pedestrian/cycle route.
Paragraphs 4.32, 5.22 and 3.11.	<u>Local Resident</u> - Page 24 (para 4.32) and page 32 (para 5.22) refer to Strathmore Road providing emergency vehicle access only whereas Page 12 (para 3.11) refers to 'additional access'. Clarity is required.	Following the responses made to the consultation including from County Highways it is accepted that access for emergency vehicles only is not enforceable. Amend Paragraph 3.11, H8, 4 th bullet to read: <i><u>Additional pedestrian and cycling access...</u></i> Action – remove reference on plans in Appendix 2 to access for emergency vehicles via Strathmore road. Retain pedestrian/cycle route.
Paragraph 4.32	<u>Local Resident</u> - Support the location of a footpath from Strathmore Road to Mapperley Plains.	Noted.
H8 – Traffic concerns (comments were made generally and also with reference to paragraphs 4.32, 5.21)	<u>Local Residents</u> – Several residents raised concerns about the impact on traffic of the proposed development of H8 including:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Killisick Road has an existing problem with traffic which is a danger to schoolchildren • Resulting additional strain on Killisick Lane/Road which is congested at school open/close hours; has parking issues, and buses struggle to navigate. • General chaos and blocked roads. • Concern that the introduction of traffic calming 	The planning application will need to be supported by a Transport Assessment prepared in accordance with the guidance set out in Nottinghamshire County Council's Highway Design Guide. This will consider the impacts of additional traffic on the road network, key junctions and scope for mitigation. Parking provision and standards are covered by Policy LPD 57 and appendix D of the LPD, based on the Borough Councils

	<p>bumps would result in hazards and parking difficulties.</p> <p>The following solutions were supported by residents:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support introduction of road bumps and pelican crossing • Suggest parking along Howbeck Road is controlled • Suggest out-of-service bus routes are reviewed along Howbeck Road. 	<p>Residential Car Parking Standards SPD.</p> <p>Suggestions for existing bus routes should be made to the service provider.</p>
H8 – Biodiversity	<p><u>Local Residents</u> –</p> <p>Concern about the loss or disruption of wildlife such as trees, shrubs, meadows, specific species, insects, birds, small mammals and amphibians as a result of development.</p> <p>Question whether a biodiversity impact assessment has taken place and what the outcome was.</p>	<p>The planning application will be required to be accompanied by an up to date ecological assessment under Policy LPD18. Any harmful ecological impacts should be avoided, mitigated or, if not possible, compensated. A detailed ecological survey was not undertaken as part of allocating the site, the appropriate time for this being the planning application stage.</p>
Paragraphs 4.31 and 4.32	<p><u>Local Resident</u> –</p> <p>Concern that current developments along Howbeck and Gleneagles Roads have no off-road parking. Additional traffic from new development will increase the likelihood of road collisions. Support a traffic survey to include parking restrictions around junctions to be required as part of development.</p>	<p>The planning application will need to be supported by a Transport Assessment prepared in accordance with the guidance set out in Nottinghamshire County Council’s Highway Design Guide. This will consider the impacts of additional traffic on the road network, key junctions and scope for mitigation. Parking provision and standards are covered by LPD 57 and appendix D of the LPD, based on the Borough Councils Residential Car Parking Standards SPD.</p>
H8 – Hedgerows	<p><u>Local Residents</u> –</p> <p>Support for the retention and addition of new hedgerows and trees for recreation and wildlife.</p> <p>Concerned about wildlife in the hedgerow between the</p>	<p>The development brief refers to protecting significant hedges. The planning application will be required to be accompanied by an up to date ecological assessment under Policy</p>

	proposed school and the playing field.	<p>LPD18. Any harmful ecological impacts should be avoided, mitigated or, if not possible, compensated.</p> <p>It should be noted that the Borough Council's preferred location for the primary school is outside the Masterplan area at the housing allocation H1 Rolleston Drive.</p>
Paragraphs 4.9, 4.10, 4.16 and 4.17	<p><u>Local Residents</u> –</p> <p>Several comments supporting the general retention of hedgerows and trees within the H8 site were received including:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support the retention of hedgerows and trees bordering the main path through H8 (Killisick Lane). • The trees and hedgerows provide a wildlife corridor. • The trees and hedgerows provide noise and visual screening. • The trees and hedgerows alleviate flooding issues • Several mature oak trees are located at the turning of Killisick Lane towards Surgeys Lane. 	<p>The development brief refers to protecting significant hedges. The planning application will be required to be accompanied by an up to date ecological assessment under Policy LPD18. Any harmful ecological impacts should be avoided, mitigated or, if not possible, compensated.</p> <p>Policy LPD32 will be considered at the planning application stage protects residential amenity including the consideration of proposals on noise and residential visual amenity.</p> <p>Flood risk and surface water flooding risk Policies LPD 3 and LPD 4 will be considered at the planning application stage.</p> <p>Trees within the development sites have been assessed for their suitability for a Tree Protection Order.</p>
H8 – Impact on or Loss of Local Nature	<p><u>Local Residents</u> –</p> <p>Several Local residents raised concerns relating to the</p>	<p>The principle of the housing allocations, including the loss of part of the Local Nature</p>

<p>Reserve</p> <p>(comments were made generally and also with reference to page 9, paragraphs 2.11, 6.16)</p>	<p>impact of development on the Hobbucks Local Nature (LNR), or the loss of part of the LNR to provide access to site H8. Comments included:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The development of H8 would detrimentally impact the LNR notwithstanding the proposed green corridors. • The LNR is protected by Law therefore the loss of part of it is unacceptable. • The proposal is contrary to the LNR's draft management plan 2013-2018. • The LNR has been rejuvenated in recent years • There are trees with TPOs which cannot be removed. • Loss of veteran trees and effects on local fauna and flora. • Disruption of a local recreational resource for dog walkers, child development and education • Unacceptable loss of habitat which compensation works cannot replace <p>The following solutions were supported by residents:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retain the LNR in its entirety. • Reduce the number of houses on the adjoining meadowland to the LNR. • Undertake environmental surveys and put an ecological management plan in place. • The Main H8 access road could be repositioned so that it joins a northwards extended Killisick Road, rather than extending Howbeck Road to the west. • Suggest using existing roads as an access point such as Strathmore Road. • Suggest brownfield sites are developed instead of 	<p>Reserve was established through the adoption of the Local Planning Document (July 2018), which was found sound by the government appointed independent Planning Inspector.</p> <p>The planning application will be required to be accompanied by an up to date ecological assessment under Policy LPD18. Any harmful ecological impacts should be avoided, mitigated or, if not possible, compensated.</p> <p>The proposed access to site H8 has been identified as the most appropriate by Nottinghamshire County Council Highways.</p>
---	--	---

	<p>Green Belt/ LNR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Propose the H8 development is instead located on the agricultural fields surrounding H7. 	
<p>Paragraphs 1.4, 2.11, 3.11, 4.32</p> <p>(also relates to H7)</p>	<p>These paragraphs contain contradictory statements:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Paragraph 1.4 supports development integrating with existing development; Paragraph 2.11 states access to H8 will be via the Local Nature Reserve; Paragraph 3.11 states access may be possible from Strathmore Road Paragraph 4.32 lists potential access routes to H7/ H8. <p>Surrounding cul-de-sacs (Breachin Close, Strathmore Road, Campbell Gardens, Firth Close, Hamilton Close) should be used to access site H7/H8 to spread access and traffic density – these streets were built with the expectation of future development. These access routes should be prioritised over the proposed route through the Local Nature Reserve.</p>	<p>The development brief should not be prescriptive. 1.4 is an overall principle. 2.11 refers to primary access. 3.11 and 4.32 refer to possible additional access such as pedestrian activity and were contradictory as drafted.</p> <p>Amend paragraphs 3.11 and 4.32 to clarify that only pedestrian and cycling access is suitable via Strathmore Road.</p> <p>The use of cul-de-sacs has been explored as part of preparing the development brief. The proposed access to site H8 has been identified as the most appropriate by Nottinghamshire County Council Highways.</p>
H8 – LNR	<p><u>Nottinghamshire County Council</u> –</p> <p>Loss of part of the Local Nature Reserve is regrettable. Suggest the access road is redesigned to minimise land take.</p>	<p>The principle of the housing allocations, including the loss of part of the Local Nature Reserve was established through the adoption of the Part 2 Local Plan (July 2018), which was found sound by the government appointed independent Planning Inspector. A compensatory area will be provided, as set out in the development brief.</p>
Paragraph 2.11	<p><u>Local Residents</u> -</p> <p>Concern that compensatory land would not be a designated Local Nature Reserve therefore it would not compensate the loss. Question whether the compensatory land would be</p>	<p>Paragraphs 8.2.5 and 8.3.4 of the Part 2 Local Plan (July 2018) are clear that new provision of open space will be protected under Policy LPD 20. The Council could in the</p>

	protected.	future consider the case for compensatory land to be designated as part of the Local Nature Reserve. (Also see below comment).
Paragraph 4.14	<p><u>Natural England</u> –</p> <p>As part of the provision of compensatory Green Infrastructure in place of the LNR, it would be useful to apply the concept of biodiversity net gain (as set out in the NPPF 2018) – which would ensure a demonstrable gain in biodiversity assets. The most common metric is the ‘DEFRA Metric’ which calculates biodiversity units required to achieve gain and it transparent and evidence-based - https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/technicalpaper-the-metric-for-the-biodiversity-offsetting-pilot-in-england</p>	<p>Agree. Insert text into paragraph 4.14:</p> <p><i><u>Any compensatory green infrastructure in place of the Local Nature Reserve should apply the concept of biodiversity net gain, such as the approach based on the DEFRA Metric, to ensure that there is a demonstrable gain in biodiversity assets.</u></i></p>
4.12 – 4.17	<p><u>National Wildlife Trust</u> –</p> <p>Loss of part of the LNR is unacceptable. LNR is a statutory designation and S19 of the Act states that LNR de-declaration should only be pursued as a matter of necessity.</p> <p>Advise that a substantial buffer between any new development and the LNR is required.</p> <p>Concerned that the housing allocation includes the fields immediately east of the LNR which support well connected and thick hedges which should be retained. As the fields are small cannot realistically see how hedges and a sufficient protective buffer site with new built development and recommend retention of these habitats as an extension of the LNR.</p> <p>LPA has duty to protect NERC Act section 41 habitats and species of Principal Importance which includes hedges.</p>	<p>The principle of the housing allocations, including the loss of part of the Local Nature Reserve was established through the adoption of the Part 2 Local Plan (July 2018), which was found sound by the government appointed independent Planning Inspector. A compensatory area will be provided, as set out in the development brief.</p> <p>Paragraph 4.16 of the brief refers to the opportunity for retention and integration of hedgerows and green infrastructure within H8.</p> <p>The planning application will be required to be accompanied by an up to date ecological assessment under Policy LPD18. Any harmful ecological impacts should be avoided, mitigated or, if not possible, compensated.</p>

	Full ecological survey will be required.	
Appendix 2 Map, Paragraph 4.16	<u>Nottinghamshire County Council</u> – Only one of four of the east-west oriented hedgerows within the western part of H8 is protected. These hedgerows are likely to be of some age and provide a mature landscape matrix within which housing can be developed, reducing the ecological impact. It is considered that more of these hedgerows should be retained and that paragraph 4.16 should be strengthened beyond the retention of the hedgerows being an ‘opportunity’.	Paragraph 4.16 of the brief refers to the opportunity for retention and integration of hedgerows and green infrastructure within H8. This will be informed at the planning application stage which will be required to be accompanied by an up to date ecological assessment under Policy LPD18. Any harmful ecological impacts should be avoided, mitigated or, if not possible, compensated.
Paragraph 2.11	<u>Local Resident</u> – Concern about the impact of development on the Killisick Road/ Howbeck Road junction area. Suggest that new properties that are visible from Howbeck Road are designed to blend in with the existing style and structure of the area.	This issue is covered by guidance in the development brief and will be addressed by ACS Policy 10 and Policy LPD 32 at the planning application stage.
Paragraph 5.8	Proposed development should be largely affordable housing or social housing for which there is a huge need.	Policy LPD 36 requires 20-30% of the housing to be affordable depending on the location.
H8 – Education Site (comments were made generally and also with reference to paragraph 5.14)	<u>Local Residents</u> – Several Local residents raised concerns relating to the proposed location of the education site, including:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns that protective fencing would be places behind existing properties. • Edge of built up area location is unsuitable for a school as it would adversely affect the character of the area through increased noise, traffic, parking and anti-social behavior. • The area between Campbell Gardens and Strathmore Road is a natural reservoir for excess water and is often flooded and therefore unsuitable as a playing field. • Resulting parking and traffic issues as a result of 	Work is ongoing between Gedling Borough Council and Nottinghamshire County Council outside of the preparation of the development brief to agree an approach to providing the new primary school within the Arnold primary school catchment area. This work will be used to inform Section 106 discussions. As indicated by paragraphs 5.10 – 5.15 of the draft brief, it is intended that the process for delivering the primary school is transparent, robust and fair. Section 106 contributions can only be required if they are necessary to make the development acceptable, directly related

	<p>cars dropping off and picking up children. Further traffic in the area would be dangerous and unacceptable.</p> <p>The following solutions were supported by residents:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggest landscaping/ planting is included between the proposed school playing field and properties on Campbell Gardens. • Suggest school is located to the north of H8 with adjacent extracted quarry land is used as the playing field. Impact would then only be on new residents. • Retain the area proposed as a playing field as an area of woodland for wildlife • The land underneath the proposed bridges should be fenced off to prevent anti-social behavior, drug use and theft 	<p>to the development and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.</p> <p>Rolleston Drive, is Gedling Borough Council's preferred site for a new primary school subject to it being demonstrated that it can be delivered within the required timescales.</p> <p>However, Nottinghamshire County Council Education's response to this consultation is supportive of an alternative new site for a primary school elsewhere on site H8 which would mean the area of the site to the west of Killisick Lane. Access to the housing development and new primary school will need to be from Killisick Road via a suitable access arrangement but County Highways has indicated that the principle of an access to serve both uses would be acceptable.</p>
Paragraph 5.12	<p><u>Landowner/ Developer –</u></p> <p>Notes that LPD does not make provision for a primary school in its policies or policies map. Paragraph 5.12 refers to the other five sites in the Arnold planning area will be expected to make pro rata contributions. It is not clear what level of contribution from each site is required.</p> <p>Landowner agreed to purchase the site on the basis of NCCs 2014 Developer Contributions Strategy and the new Obligations Strategy is not referenced in the LPD. Pending confirmation of the requirement for a new school and level of contributions, Davidsons objects to this paragraph. Needs resolving as a matter of urgency.</p>	<p>Work is ongoing between Gedling Borough Council and Nottinghamshire County Council outside of the preparation of the development brief to agree an approach to providing the new primary school. This work will be used to inform Section 106 discussions. As indicated by paragraphs 5.10 – 5.15 of the brief, it is intended that the process for delivering the primary school is transparent, robust and fair. Section 106 contributions can only be required if they are necessary to make the</p>

		<p>development acceptable, directly related to the development and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development. The level of contribution will be required on a pro-rata basis across the Arnold allocations and will be finalised once the land costs have been confirmed.</p>
Paragraph 5.15	<p><u>Landowner/ Developer</u> – Questions whether the location of the school has been agreed and whether an alternative site has been considered taking account of appropriateness in terms of delivery timescales, location and delivery in terms of ownership</p>	<p>Work is ongoing between Gedling Borough Council and Nottinghamshire County Council outside of the preparation of the development brief to agree an approach to providing the new primary school. This work will be used to inform Section 106 discussions. As indicated by paragraphs 5.10 – 5.15 of the brief, it is intended that the process for delivering the primary school is transparent, robust and fair. Section 106 contributions can only be required if they are necessary to make the development acceptable, directly related to the development and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.</p> <p>Rolleston Drive, is Gedling Borough Council's preferred site for a new primary school subject to it being demonstrated that it can be delivered within the required timescales.</p> <p>Nottinghamshire County Council Education's response to this consultation is supportive of an alternative new site for a primary school elsewhere on site H8 which would mean the</p>

		<p>area of the site to the west of Killisick Lane. Access to the housing development and new primary school will need to be from Killisick Road via a suitable access arrangement but County Highways has indicated that the principle of an access to serve both uses would be acceptable.</p>
	<p><u>Landowner/ Developer</u> –</p> <p>Development Brief should be more explicit regarding the funding of a delivery mechanism for the proposed primary school. All eight housing sites need to do more than support provision of the primary school. Two issues:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funding the total costs should be funded by all eight sites and includes build costs and land costs. The land costs need to compensate the H8 owners for giving up housing land. • Delivery contributions will come forward over time which suggests an element of forward funding. The timing of the school also needs clarity – if it is required before a certain number of occupations then this could become a fundamental issue. Without clarity this could stall development. 	<p>Work is ongoing between Gedling Borough Council and Nottinghamshire County Council outside of the preparation of the development brief to agree an approach to providing the new primary school. This work will be used to inform Section 106 discussions. As indicated by paragraphs 5.10 – 5.15 of the brief, it is intended that the process for delivering the primary school is transparent, robust and fair. Section 106 contributions can only be required if they are necessary to make the development acceptable, directly related to the development and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.</p> <p>Rolleston Drive, is Gedling Borough Council's preferred site for a new primary school subject to it being demonstrated that it can be delivered within the required timescales.</p>
Paragraph 5.32 –	<u>Local Resident</u> –	Proposals will need to accord with the

Recreational area	<p>Comments objecting to the proposed play site within the recreational area as:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed park and path are at an isolated, poorly-lit location and will create an area of anti-social behavior, drug use and crime. Children will therefore be isolated from using it. • In the past there was a path linking Spinningdale, Gleneagles Drive and Howbeck which was sold by the Council for development now forming Clevedon Drive. There is no reason to re-introduce this path. • Concerns over unlimited unsupervised access, safety, antisocial behaviour and noise. • The following solutions were supported - the play facility should be located within the proposed development site as a public green which would have natural surveillance. 	Borough Council's New Housing Development Supplementary Planning Guidance for Open Space Provision (November 2001), which is a material consideration in the determination of any planning application.
Paragraph 5.1	<p><u>Landowner/ Developer</u> – Support the use of the Green Belt area to be used as a recreation area between H7 and H8, which will enable residential capacities to be maximised.</p>	Noted.
H8 – General	<p><u>Local Resident</u> – Questions about who would live in the properties.</p>	The properties will be sold on the open market. Up to 30% will be affordable homes.
H8 – General	<p><u>Local Resident</u> – Questioned when consultation had taken place relating to the principle of allocation H8.</p>	Consultation took place through the preparation of the Local Planning Document. A 6 week consultation period which was widely advertised took place in May 2016.
H8 – General	<p><u>Local Resident</u> – Concern that the brickworks will degrade the area in order to pre-empt development.</p>	<p>The housing allocations are needed to meet an objectively assessed housing need as endorsed by an independent planning inspector.</p> <p>The housing sites are considered to be in</p>

		<p>sustainable locations and are underlain by an important natural clay resource. The Local Planning Document requires that the practicality of the prior extraction of the clay resource is considered prior to construction of homes.</p> <p>The development sites are not in the ownership of the adjoining brickworks.</p>
H8 – General	<p><u>Local Residents</u> – Concern that a 1000 year old street Killisick Lane will be compromised.</p>	<p>The development brief seeks to maintain the bridleway along its present route.</p>

Comments not relating to the consultation document		
Document Reference / Issue / Allocation	Summary of Consultee Comments	Gedling Borough Council Response
	<u>Local Resident</u> – Concerns relating to the impact of housing allocations in Redhill (sites H2, X2 and X3) and their impact on traffic and the Green Belt	Not covered by the development brief.
Comments specific to the planning application 2017/0155.	<u>Local Residents</u> – Objections to planning application 2017/0155 – outline application for up to 32 dwellings on site H2. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residents should be able to comment on the brief prior to any planning decision being made. Concern the highways authority has not provided feedback on the suitability of access for heavy plant, construction and delivery vehicles as part of considering the suitability of access to H2 from Crawford Rise as part of 2017/0155 Comments on the transport statement submitted as part of planning application Proposal is inappropriate given the level of existing on-street parking along Crawford Rise and Cornell Drive, which obstructs delivery vehicles. Suggest introduction of a one-way system or parking enforcement Suggest all development is accessed from Mapperley Plains. Paragraph 111 of the NPPF requires a 	These matters have been addressed through the planning application process. Planning Committee has resolved to grant permission subject to the signing of a Section 106 agreement.

	<p>supporting transport statement/ assessment as part of determining planning applications. The transport statement provided as part of 2017/0155 is reliant on out-of-date data from 2008 and is therefore unreliable to base a decision on and does not consider access for heavy plant, construction or delivery vehicles.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (In relation to paragraph 4.17 of the document) The Phase 1 Habitats and Ecology survey in support of planning application 2017/0155 is inaccurate as it does not take account of a hidden leylandii hedge along the west boundary (which continues along the H7 west boundary). This is contrary to NPPF Paragraphs 7, 109, 170 and 175. • Concern that a detailed arboricultural survey of the development site was not undertaken as part of the 2017/0155 application, in line with paragraph 4.11 of the brief. • (In relation to Paragraph 5.3 and 6.18 of the document) note there is no commitment to retain hedges as part of 2017/0155 which only retains the southern and short section of the western boundary. • (In relation to Paragraph 4.8 ,6.16, 3.13) Note there was no landscape and visual impact assessment in support of 2017/0155 and LPD policy 19 was not utilised to assess the application. 	
--	--	--

Consultation Process	<p><u>Local Residents</u> –</p> <p>Concern with a lack of consultation and transparency.</p> <p>General frustration with the consultation event at The Beacon Community Centre in particular that it had no representation from the emergency services.</p> <p>Earlier consultation should take place.</p>	Noted.
Property Maintenance	Suggest the council maintains the currently neglected garages, hedges and roads with pot holes on Crawford Rise.	On adopted highways, mending potholes, roadside verges and hedge cutting are the responsibility of the County Council. It is generally the responsibility of the landowners to maintain private roads, private hedgerows and privately owned garages.
Sport Improvement Grants	<p><u>Mellish Rugby Club</u> –</p> <p>Request to apply for improvement grants for the Mellish Rugby Club premises to improve security.</p>	Noted.
H8 - LNR	Letter from Cllr Wheeler and Cllr Paling was misleading as it stated there would be no loss of the LNR	The letter was responding to the concerns that the whole Local Nature Reserve was to be developed for housing. The principle of using a small part of the LNR to access the H8 site has already been agreed through the examination of the Local Planning Document adopted in July 2018.