

Appendix 1. Consultation and Officer Responses to the CIL Non-Parish Neighbourhood Funding Consultation June 2021

No.	Name	Organisation	Comment	Officer Response
1		Natural England	<p>Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development.</p> <p>We are generally supportive of the projects selected for funding and have no objections. In particular, the Green Lung Corridor project should lead to some good Green Infrastructure improvements in the community.</p>	Comments and Support noted.
2		The Coal Authority	I can confirm that the Planning Team at the Coal Authority has no specific comments to make on the current consultation.	Comments noted.
3		Willow Farm Action Group	<p>LIS0003 Project Reference: Green Lung Corridor</p> <p>Gedling Country Park is an excellent facility and is highly valued by residents. The Park provides much needed green space, and we support the intention behind this project, which is to connect this park with the Digby Park in Mapperley, thereby offering residents the opportunity to extend their access to a larger area of connected green landscape.</p> <p>Gedling Country Park's popularity has already required two extensions to the car park, and we recognise that the current project may well encourage residents along the green lung route to access both parks without the use of vehicles. This would, we are sure, be welcomed by residents living on roads situated adjacent to the Country</p>	<p>Comments and Support for LIS0003 noted.</p> <p>Whilst the suggestion to utilise future CIL receipts for the ongoing maintenance costs of the project is noted, it is difficult to forecast CIL receipts for any given year as this is dependent upon the commencement of liable developments.</p> <p>As such it would be impossible to accurately predict future monies which might be collected and therefore the CIL is not considered to be a suitable source of funding for this type of expenditure.</p>

			<p>Park who have experienced significant problems with visitors parking on surrounding roads.</p> <p>We agree that this project supports Regulation 59F of the 2010 Regulations, in that the proposal will lead to the improvement and maintenance of existing infrastructure and may also mitigate some of the additional demand that will be placed upon green spaces by the Chase Farm development. In that sense the project seeks to 'meet a need created by new development'.</p> <p>The pandemic has clearly highlighted the importance that residents place upon access to green spaces and the opportunities for exercise. This project is timely as it supports this public / local community priority.</p> <p>The issue within this project that is a cause for concern, however, is the intention for the on-going maintenance of the project, once complete, to be undertaken by the Council's Parks and Street Care Services. Given the level of demand already placed upon these limited services, we doubt that the department will be able to effectively absorb any additional demand placed upon it by this project. We are fully aware that these services already face a tough challenge, and, to some degree, the achievement of the Council's streets and parks objectives are already being supported by local volunteers. The question we would raise is why the future maintenance of this project cannot also be supported by CIL funding? Certainly, Regulation 59F seems to support the use of funds to maintain infrastructure and, we take the view that the need for maintenance will, to some degree, be linked to the growth in use of these green spaces by the residents of the Chase Farm development.</p>	<p>With regards to the comments made in relation to the project reference LIS0004, I can confirm that the development of the Arnold Marketplace has generated CIL receipts as a liable development.</p> <p>It is considered that the awarding of the CIL monies, as outlined in the Community Infrastructure Levy Non- Parish Funding Local Infrastructure Schedule Project Assessments and Proposed Funding report, would facilitate and enable a more comprehensive development of the Arnold Marketplace better suited to meet the needs of the locality by providing safe, accessible space and increased levels of public amenity.</p>
--	--	--	---	---

			<p>We therefore support this project but would recommend the inclusion of an element of the maintenance costs being found from within the allocated CIL funding.</p> <p>LIS0004 Project Reference: Arnold Marketplace</p> <p>This application is for a £43,000 contribution towards constructing the new Arnold marketplace, as part of an estimated total project cost of £480k. We acknowledge that the contribution sought is relatively small in terms of the project, however, the amount is significant when considered against the available £120,000 CIL fund.</p> <p>We also acknowledge the sound reasons given within the report for the project and its potential for delivering positive benefits for Arnold, which we support, however, we find that the link between the projects stated objectives and the guidance for meeting the requirements of Regulation 59F within the CIL report appears tenuous.</p> <p>We are unclear as to the evidence that would clearly demonstrate that the improvements to the existing marketplace are necessary to 'meet a need created by new development'. The report simply expresses a view that the new developments within this locality will generate more residents/workers using the town centre and its facilities however, we do not, in the absence of additional information, accept the robustness of this claim.</p> <p>We acknowledge that we have not had access to the relevant business case for the improvements to Arnold Market however, based upon this report, we cannot support the provision of finance from the CIL funding to support this project, on the grounds that the project does</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

			not appear to meet the criteria set for the allocation of CIL funds.	
4		Councillor Ellwood	<p>LIS0003 Project Reference: Green Lung Corridor</p> <p>Clearly the increased occupancy of the Chase Farm Development will create a need for improved infrastructure in the nearby green open spaces as there will be increased footfall on nearby open spaces such as the Digby Park Arboretum. There will be extra wear and tear on the existing footpaths which are already in a poor condition. As such I am not opposed to this Project per se but I have concerns that the details of the Project are not very specific and do not provide much clarity on what the money is to be spent on.</p> <p>In the opening paragraph it refers to improving 'access' to green open spaces in Porchester, Phoenix, Plains and Gedling Ward (presumably Digby Park Arboretum?) With regard to improving access onto the Digby Park Arboretum, there are four existing access points: from Arnold Lane, from a footpath between numbers 5 and 6 Kneeton Close, from a footpath by the side of St. Andrew's House on Digby Avenue and from an entrance at Hillside Avenue. It is difficult to see how additional access points can be established on to the Digby Park Arboretum as there are existing houses that run to the front of the Park along Hillside Avenue, Hazel Grove, Digby Avenue, College Road, Chelwood Drive, Digby Hall Drive, Gunthorpe Road, Kneeton Close and Linsdale Gardens. Does improving access refer to improving</p>	<p>Comments and Support noted.</p> <p>In response to some of the comments made in relation to LIS0003 I can confirm that the project brief details the renovation of existing footpaths rather than the creation of new access points.</p> <p>The proposed project incorporates new landscaping and the installation of new street furniture, including information boards to educate local residents on the historical importance of the area including the mining at Gedling Country Park and other points of interest.</p> <p>The proposed works, if awarded funding, are set to commence in winter 2021/2022 and extend until winter 2023. Initial phases will also include inspections of the existing footpaths and drainage at Digby Park.</p> <p>Whilst the comments regarding LIS0002 are welcomed and noted, it is still considered that the awarding of CIL monies to LIS0003 would represent a more comprehensive development and generate a greater return both financially and in terms of the wider benefit to local residents.</p>

			<p>access to those with mobility issues? again this is very unclear in the narrative to the proposal.</p> <p>The Project refers to improving 'connectivity' from the Chase Farm Development onto the Gedling Country Park, Mapperley Golf Course and the Digby Park Arboretum. I am unclear what 'connectivity' means. If it means making it easier to cross nearby busy roads from the Chase Farm Development onto the Gedling Country Park, Mapperley Golf Course and the Digby Park Arboretum it presumably means establishing pedestrian crossing/s on Arnold Lane and or the Gedling Access Road. My understanding is that the estimated cost of a pedestrian crossing is in the region of £125,000 so the proposed funding of £50,000 would at best provide part funding for one crossing.</p> <p>In the assessment of the suitability of the project, reference is made to the Project funding the re-development of footpaths. This is certainly to be welcomed- clearly the footpaths in the Digby Park Arboretum are in very poor condition. My concern is that improving the footpaths over a wider area along the Digby Park Arboretum may require more substantial funding than £50,000. I have concerns that there is a risk that the funding could result in cosmetic improvements to footpaths which will not stand the test of time. Certainly in the past attempts have been made to put gravel down on the footpath to the rear of Linsdale Gardens/Kneeton Close and such gravel has simply been washed away. It would therefore to my mind make sense to target CIL funding at more specific footpath locations within the Digby Park Arboretum (see next section.)</p> <p>Finally reference in the Project proposal is made to enhancing heritage assets along the open spaces. It is not</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>clear what heritage assets there are in the Digby Park Arboretum or Mapperley Golf Course. Clearly there are specific heritage assets in the Gedling Country Park associated with its mining heritage but I am unclear how additional usage by residents at the Chase Farm Development would endanger these assets and why CIL funding would be considered appropriate.</p> <p>LIS0004 Project Reference: Arnold Marketplace</p> <p>I have no objections to CIL funding being used for this project – particularly as I gather CIL receipts of £66,539 were obtained from this development which in itself is for the public benefit rather than for private gain. My only observation is that the Project refers to the CIL funding to be partly used for counter-terrorism measures- I wondered if there was a possibility of any match funding being available from the Home Office for such works?</p> <p>Other projects considered to be suitable for CIL awards</p> <p>In my view looking again at Project LIS0002- Footpath/Drainage Improvements at Linsdale Gardens should be considered. This project is for more targeted improvements than is described in LIS0003 which I believe would be preferable. Project LIS0002 refers specifically to the footpath that runs between Arnold Lane and Linsdale Gardens/Kneeton Close - this stretch of footpath is much closer to the Chase Farm Development than any other stretch of footpath within the Digby Park</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			Arboretum and will therefore receive the most additional wear and tear from the new residents at Chase Farm Development and should as such be a priority for improvement.	
--	--	--	---	--

5	Historic England		<p>We note the Green Lung and Arnold town centre proposals meet the criteria and are the preferred options to take forward for further consideration by the Council.</p> <p>For consultation questions 1 and 2, I can advise that Historic England has no concerns to raise in relation to the placemaking proposals which would present the prospect of addressing the long-term sustainability of these particular parts of the Borough, and encompass opportunities for wellbeing and better appreciation of the project areas.</p> <p>In terms of consultation question 3, I can also confirm that we have no separate projects to put forward for your consideration.</p>	<p>Comments and Support noted.</p>
---	------------------	--	--	---

Period of Consultation: 7th June 2021 – 5th July 2021

Total Respondents: 5