

Appendix 1 Strategic CIL Review Consultation Responses

Question 1) Do you agree with the projects identified for inclusion on the Council Infrastructure List?	Question 2) Are there other strategic infrastructure projects that you consider could be included on the Infrastructure List to be delivered through the Strategic Portion of the CIL?	Officer Comments
I agree with the SIP1, Active Travel, with particular reference to improving access to Gedling CP, the re-purposing of the former GNR railway line should be considered as a priority for its clear and substantial benefits, particularly as it offers a safe, green, traffic-free multiuser heritage route and can facilitate other public heritage benefits (see below). SIP6 - I agree with the ambition to create a local Gedling heritage centre, but would recommend a careful re-assessment of all options to ensure the most sustainable, heritage focused and best environmentally impactful project is identified (see suggestion below).	The Heritage Centre at Gedling CP is laudable, I fully support the idea of further celebrating and making accessible the local heritage of Gedling. Alternative locations for the heritage centre should be considered that could have additional heritage value and better environmental sustainability credentials. Investment in, and re-use of, a heritage building would avoid the need for a new building (as well as addressing local 'Heritage At Risk' issues). For instance, Gedling Old Station is an obvious opportunity and could be a better solution to a new build in the CP. It can be linked to the CP via another CIL priority, SIP1 'active travel routeway', along the former GNR, helping to spread the pressure of visitor numbers and reinvigorate Gedling village centre.	Comments noted.
No, SIP1 has the great merit as to general community benefits. SIP2 is an unfeasible project, as it has been postponed/dropped for very practical reasons. The site is badly situated and the proposed bus route links and lanes on Mansfield Road cannot be delivered without substantial land purchases and major civil engineering works. The site COULD serve other routes than Mansfield Road though, such as linking Mapperley Plains and the City/CMC sites via Oxclose Lane and the ring road, possibly using smaller buses. Please contact me for further discussions if required! SIP3 does have many merits, with sound community benefits. SIP4 Arnold is suffering due to national economic trends, which cannot be remedied by limited local expenditure as suggested. Political pressure on landlords could be brought to bear to rent on high rental levels: this would be beyond CIL. AMP is not a success as I suspect the units are only occupied by virtue of substantial rent discounts, the location is not popular, but perhaps Arnold town centre might see a resurgence if the present cafe culture could be encouraged? SIP5 This could be a useful founding gap filler for CIL. Timescale might be a problem though as the project looks well into the future SIP6 Enough money has gone into this project, it is functioning but another heritage centre is one too many. Please look FORWARDS, not a nostalgic look to a heavily tainted past from which lessons have still not been learnt (personal hobby horse....!) Cheers, and keep up the good work.	Upgrade to Eagle Square market and stalls etc, now it is properly established. The area can still be very bleak, but there is viable economic activity developing, the useable area might need expanding to encourage more stallholders.	Comments noted. The comments in relation to Eagle Square market and stalls are consider to be a more appropriate use of CIL Neighbourhood Funding rather than the Strategic element of CIL.
A member of the friends of Onchan Park group who wholeheartedly love the prospect of the pavilion getting a refurb. We want the Park to be a gem. With this in mind I have 2 questions. 1. Will the package disabled access. 2 with the Park encouraging sport will they have an open access drink fountain to save the need for water bottles. This looks to be a brilliant project that the friends group strongly supports There are two projects which I would disagree with and they being Arnold Leisure Centre and Gedling Country Park. In as much that other areas in need of money to generate actions which I have listed in my other response.	We will produce a plan to help the Park shortly	Comments noted - appear to be more closely related to the recent CIL Non-Parish Neighbourhood Review consultation rather than the CIL Strategic Review.
Historic England do not have any specific projects to raise for consideration at this time. We always request that Councils consider the historic environment within their proposals and seek opportunities to protect and enhance the historic environment. Project SIP1 we would request if there are any opportunities to better reveal the significance of heritage assets, through the transport improvements. Project SIP2 if there are any opportunities to protect and enhance heritage assets and their significance through this project, we would urge them to be sought. Project SIP3 under the assessment of project section we would welcome a reference to the historic environment as a component of Green/ Blue Infrastructure so that it can be considered in any proposals and opportunities are sought if possible. Project SIP4 incorporates public realm improvements, of which there could be opportunities for the historic environment. Project SIP6 we are supportive of a heritage centre and welcome the inclusion of this project within the Community Infrastructure Levy Plan.	I do believe that money should be used in relation to Bestwood Village which is in need of Youth facilities to occupy the young who have no facilities to use. We need activities to occupy the older generation like Men in Sheds as there are no facilities to use, this is due to the lack of infrastructure within the Village for the residents to use and so the project would entail using the Miners Welfare grounds which could generate use of the Community Centre and surrounding grounds. With these you would bring together elderly and young which would combat loneliness, friendship, occupying their minds and with the men in sheds bring together peoples strengths and knowledge this would also bring together the youth of the community and for the young a place to make friends and generate Knowledge within their age range, plus it would have a big impact on the vandalism shown through boredom and much more could be done like putting a kitchen inside the Welfare so the wider community could come together as one. These are just some of my views that would have a big impact on an ever increasing community. N/A	Comments noted.

I am responding as a member of Pedals, the Nottingham cycle campaign group, having consulted with other members of the group. We are particularly keen to see the Active Travel Links to Gedling Country Park, the Blue-Green Infrastructure projects and the Arnold Town Centre project move forward. For the Gedling Country Park access should be improved from both Spring Lane and Chase Farm sides. This could include improving facilities on Mapperley Plains and a signed route through the residential estate; also link to the proposed greenway on the old railway. In all cases it is key that new infrastructure for walking and cycling connects conveniently and safely with existing networks. In the past there have been examples of good cycling infrastructure that has been unusable because it was not safely linked. It is important that the railway greenway should connect directly to Waldrom Road to the new housing developments there. At the South-west end, there should be safe links into Netherfield, and if possible to the North bank of the Trent. It would be good to see the route on the North bank of the Trent to be made continuous from Stoke Bardolph to Colwick Park, as it would then connect to the forthcoming Waterside bridge at Trent Basin. Park and Ride at Leapool could reduce traffic congestion on Mansfield Road. This could enable adequate cycle facilities to be put on Mansfield Road.	A suggestion for another project would be a cycle route from Leapool to Burntstump (probably along the A60). This would not only be a useful facility for leisure cyclists but would enable cycle commuting to employment at Burntstump (Police & Park Hospital).	Comments noted.
No we don't agree, there is already a leisure centre at Carlton, there's no point in spending many millions of pounds on a new one when there are much more urgent infrastructure requirements across the borough, the same for a heritage centre at Gedling country park. We would prefer to see the money generated from new housing being spent where there is more urgent need, mitigating the affects of the developments that are funding the proposed projects.	Calverton centre car parking, this would involve Calverton parish council buying land and the council money used from a new car park, as already outlined to Mike Avery last year. In addition the large grassed overflow car park at the William Lee park site is massively overused and has become necessary because of all the extra vehicles in the village, this urgently needs a tarmac surface. New cemetery at Hollinwood Lane, Calverton parish council own this land 16 acres and will be soon starting this project subject to funding. There is a severe shortage of burial and ash interment spaces across the borough, this cemetery could last 100 years. Development of William Lee park into a heritage and leisure centre, Calverton parish council own this site, and could incorporate a 3G multi-use pitch, and large BMX track to answer the need in playing field strategy along with a museum/heritage trail based on the life of William Lee, which would be a valuable visitor destination. Manor Park infant and nursery school play area redevelopment, this school is the only one of the four in Calverton that has been overlooked in successive section 106 agreements, the main play equipment has been taken away and funds are not available from other sources, the school wish to provide a fun and stimulating environment which suits the diverse range of interests and needs of the children in the community allowing the children to play, grow and thrive in much sooner. Calverton needs parking in the village centre, more houses have been built and people don't walk to the shops or the doctors they usually drive there from the far ends of the village. There is still a park and ride situation with people from other villages driving to Calverton to get the bus to Nottingham. Perhaps a park and ride at Mapperley would help the issue for the oxtan, woodborough and epperstone people who park here, and then Calverton people would be able to park. Calverton has a huge field for the new cemetery that would benefit the whole borough if it was funded and opened up. Not at that level of specificity, but to be honest, Calverton has been completely upon by Gedling Borough Council for well over a decade now. I did my best to resist some of it while I was a councillor (proposed leisure centre closure) but it would be nice in one of your strategic plans just to have some kind of acknowledgement that we exist over the hill and deserve the same access to facilities and funding in Calverton as everyone else in the Borough. It's become embarrassing to be a Labour party member in this village because of the way Gedling Borough Council have treated the village, not that politically neutral officers should be concerned about that of course, but GBCs name is mud in the village these days and that didn't use to be the case.	Comments noted.
I don't think a park and ride at leaspool island would work. If you have driven that far you may as well drive into the city. Gedling country park is fine the way it is. Arnold town centre could do with some of the empty shops demolished and affordable housing building in the town centre. Retail has shrunk due to on line shopping. Young people need some nice housing in the town centre where there are buses. I disagree with all of the Gedling Country Park schemes. You've just announced swinging parking charges on that site that should provide more than enough income to support future improvements. It's already an excellent community asset. When you look at the way GBC has treated the very similar former colliery spoil-tip site in Calverton investing further significant sums in Gedling Country Park through this would be a disgrace and an insult to the people of Calverton. Similarly, Carlton Forum is already an excellent modern leisure centre with modern facilities. Where is the investment in Calverton Leisure Centre given the vast amount of development you've allowed in Calverton in recent years, and the receipts you have received? And Arnold is on about its 15th "masterplan" in the last 20 years. Stop chucking public money at it. You've done a great job on the market but unless you can get Asda to invest in a new store on Front Street the best you can do is to make it easier for existing retail units to apply for change of use to housing instead of encouraging more retail in a dwindling demand environment. I agree entirely with the Leaspool Island Park and Ride scheme, which would be a great asset for commuters from Gedling Borough (and beyond) into Nottingham, and a potential money earner for the council. I also agree with investment into the Blue-Green infrastructure as outlined in the list.	N/A	Comments noted.
Manor Park infant&nursery school are being left behind with not having money spent on outdoor equipment after what they had was taken away and condemned. There should be a new space created for all of the school in Calverton to use for life skill workshops- this could be used by CFS for practical work or project. The infant and juniors could use the space for hands on science investigations and project or covering a range of the arts. Yes these are needed for an expanding village	More needed for adhd children	Comments noted.

[illegible]

I Strongly disagree with the list of proposed projects. There is already a leisure centre in Carlton, there is no point in spending 20 or 30 million pounds on building a new one, especially when you don't spend any money on Calverton leisure centre, and there are far more, now urgent infrastructure projects that need implementing in the borough. Likewise for the proposed heritage centre at Gedling Country Park, how can this be viewed as an important infrastructure project? I would prefer to see the infrastructure money spent where there is more urgent need, mitigating the effects of impacts from the developments that are funding the proposed projects. We have a desperate need for improved infrastructure in Calverton right now, and we've still got around 300 planned houses to be built and occupied.	Would like to see the following infrastructure projects in Calverton, funded by GBC using CIL money in co-ordination with Calverton parish council. Far more parking spaces in the centre of the village, if the parish council buy the land. In addition the grass overflow car park at William Lee park is used every day now, not just by park users, it's an unofficial park and ride, it urgently needs a tarmac surface. Hollinwood Lane cemetery needs starting, there is a desperate need for public burial and ash plots across the borough and this 16 acre cemetery would last 100 years. Development of the William Lee park further into a visitor and heritage centre, answering requirements of the playing and heritage strategies, including a 3G multi-play space, large BMX park, and a heritage centre based on William Lee, founder of the first part of the industrial revolution. Development of Manor Park Infant and Nursery School's playground, since the old main play equipment was condemned and removed. The school is the only one of the four schools in the village that has missed out on successive section 106 agreements from the new developments. The school needs a fun and stimulating environment which suits the diverse needs of the children in the community allowing the children to play, grow and thrive much sooner.	Comments noted.
Calverton is routinely omitted from infrastructure planning and development, yet our population is expanding at a phenomenal rate due to the housing projects allocated to the village by GBC.	Calverton requires the following: Increased parking in the village centre for accessing essential amenities such as GP surgery - there is a suitable plot of land available which could be purchased to provide this.	Comments noted.
I am dismayed to note the planned new leisure centre development in Carlton - the existing facilities there are for purpose.	Expansion of the cemetery	
Although a heritage centre would be a "nice touch" at Gedling Country Park we are living in austere times. There are essential projects which require funding and it seems that this is not the time for money to be spent on "luxury" when the basics have not been addressed.	Appropriate surfacing of the car park at William Lee park.	
Disagree, the proposed projects are not helping calverton. Carlton has a leisure center already. Gedling country park has had millions spent on it already. It about time this money went to where it should be going, back into the calverton village to update / add to our infrastructure.	Refurbishment of the playground at Manor Park.	Comments noted.
No, there is a bias towards increased provision to Carlton. Arnold, gelding again, Calverton has had significant housing without any tangible benefits being seen by the local community of the village. The roads are poor due to heavy traffic, or congested due to poor planning on flats lane when the new houses were put in. The village needs trees, a halt to more houses and it to happen in surrounding villages, resurfacing, better infrastructure for the new residents, more green projects, community facilities (paid staff).	N/A	Comments noted.
There is already a leisure centre in Carlton why spend 20 to 30 million on a new one when you don't invest in Calvertons leisure centre, much more urgent need for spending in the borough. Likewise for the proposed heritage centre in Gedling country park how can this be described as an important need for infrastructure? I would prefer to see the money spent on more urgent infrastructure projects. Calverton is in more urgent need to help mitigate the facts of what is being built here. There is around another 360 homes being built which will be occupied and using the village infrastructure when it is already struggling to cope.	Calverton's borough council councils suggested projects to enhance the village using the money from land building in the village.	Comments noted.
No. Calverton is growing in size and population rapidly. Its infrastructure is not. There are insufficient resources for the people who already live in Calverton.	Far more parking spaces are needed in the village, let the parish council buy the land. The grass area of William Lee park is used every day now not just by park users but as an unofficial park and ride. It desperately needs tarmac.	Comments noted.
There are insufficient resources for disabled children both in the schools and in the community. There is insufficient parking.	Manor Park infant and primary school needs development on the playground. Since the old play equipment was condemned and removed there has been nothing replaced. It is the only school in Calverton which hasn't had funding. The children need a fun and stimulating equipment to help them develop and be stimulated sooner. Development of willing Lee park further into a heritage and visitor centre answering requirements of heritage and strategies including a 3D multi use pitch and a bmx track and scooter park. A heritage centre based on the founder William Lee a key player in the industrial revolution. Hollinwopd lane cemetery needs to urgently be started as there is a desperate need for burial plots.	Comments noted.
Crime and antisocial behaviour is a concern also	This is not something an ordinary member of the public can comment on in such detail.	
No I don't agree with the new leisure centre in Carlton. Due to the fact that there is one already. Plus the heritage centre at Gedling Park is a vast expense and the money can be more beneficially spent elsewhere.	SEN provision in all 4 schools is desperately needed as well as facilities in the community for disabled children	Comments noted.
No. Calverton is having a large number of houses built around the village with no investment in infrastructure, education or amenities. The money provided by the builders is not being reinvested in the local area and is being used for other areas of the borough at the expense of the village.	Calverton is or was a small mining village, I was born there and worked at Calverton colliery for 17 year's. It's now becoming a small town. I would love to see this beautiful place have money spent on facilities to take into account the new housing. The leisure centre revamped. The school turned into a hub to create jobs. Apprenticeships like basford Hall college. In the trades bricklayers. Plumbers, electrical engineers car and other forms of electrical work. I had a electrical apprenticeship at the colliery and I believe that you could show the UK. The way forward to rebuilding.	Comments noted.
I strongly disagree. They are not desperate projects. Calverton desperately needs more resources for the amount of new houses being built.	I am not sure of details of other projects but there should be projects focussing on parking and safer roads for the village, expansion of services within the village, greater police presence to match the increase in residents, traffic etc, investment in schooling and resources for children. The parish council appear to be the ones funding this despite the monies received by Gedling borough from residents and builders.	Comments noted.
I do not agree with the proposed spending any CIL monies on Carlton Leisure Centre, there is already adequate provision there to meet the needs of local people.	Updating of Calverton Leisure centre, updating of Manor Park School playground area. More parking for the village.	Comments noted.
	More CIL monies should be spent in Calverton, given the increase in their population, due to all the housing being built there. These monies could be better spent on projects such as more public parking in the centre. Calverton is already used as a vast park and ride by surrounding villages, creating a number of hot spots in the village, including roads surrounding St Wilfrids Square and other areas of the village. In fact the Village Hall car park extension could be tarmac'd by CIL money as this is used as a mini park and ride too. Given the dramatic increase in Calvertons population money could also be used to improve leisure/wellbeing facilities in the village by improving or replacing the current leisure centre.	Comments noted.

[illegible]

Calverton is in much needed funds to improve the area. Other areas are much better equip than calverton.	I disagree with GBCs plans. Yet again the focus is on those areas where they are already thriving. Gedding Country Park, whilst a fantastic space, does not require any further developments. I cannot see any value adding anything further to area of GCP. I strongly disagree with improvements to Carlton Forum Leisure Centre. Carlton Forum is a large centre that is already well maintained. Instead the money should be spent on Calverton Leisure Centre. The changing areas within the Leisure Centre are disgusting. After taking my child there at the weekend, there was one working toilet, the other was covered in a bin liner and wrapping tape. It gives a disgusting view of the village and when the number of houses being built is continually increasing, it displays the Parish in a poor light especially when the Parish Council do so much for the village and champion it's voice. Arnold has had a large investment in recent years, with a change of market place, new buildings where the old market place is, but they aren't performing anywhere near where they used to as the high street is dying due to businesses leaving the area. If football is reducing due to the closing of stores, then why spend money when the return in investment is so low? Instead money should be spent within Calverton to strengthen its infrastructure.	New parking areas near the shops would bring in much needed trade for the small shops. The leisure centre would benefit from being renovated. They run youth projects there on a Thursday this could be improved and made available 5 days a week if there were better age appropriate zones in the area.	Comments noted.
	I completely disagree with the list of proposed projects, Carlton already has a great leisure centre, and Gedding park doesn't need a heritage centre.	There are several projects within Calverton that have been started but never finished. This makes the village look gritty even though it's an expensive place to live. Such projects should include: the development and use of Hollinwood Lane Cemetery. Right now it's a glorified car park for horse trials and temporarily being used as a car park for the Miners Welfare (Top Club) whilst the 3G pitch work continues. The Cemetery needs to be opened and used to allow those who wish for their final resting place to be Calverton, to actually be able to do that. Additional projects include the expansion to William Lee Park. This area had become a hub for Calverton and it requires attention. For example, updates to the Tennis Courts and indoor football court such as resurfacing as the tree roots run through and it can cause users to fall and seriously injure themselves. In addition to this, tarmacking the additional parking area. The park is busy at the weekend due to football events, events in the Village Hall and general park attendance, the additional parking needs to be professionally finished. The park would also benefit from additional skateboarding/BMX ramps as the number currently present is not enough to meet the demands of the number of users.	Comments noted.
	Strongly disagree with the proposals. Carlton already has a good leisure centre...why spend millions on another. How can a heritage centre at Gedding park be viewed as important infrastructure ?? I would prefer to see the money spent where there is more urgent need, mitigating the effects from the developments that are funding the proposed projects. We have another 300 houses planned for Calverton and already in desperate need of improved infrastructure.	We have a desperate need for improved infrastructure in Calverton right now, no parking, a leisure centre that only has a small pool, more housing is happening, we need to spend more money on Calverton, even Manor Park school has no climbing frames now the pirate ship was taken down	Comments noted.
	I strongly disagree with the list of proposed projects. There is already a leisure centre in Calton, there is no point in spending £20-30 million on a new one, especially when GBC don't spend any money on Calverton leisure centre and there are far more now urgent infrastructure projects that need implementing in the borough. Likewise for the proposed heritage centre at gedding country park. How can this be viewed as an important infrastructure project? I would prefer to see the infrastructure money spent where there is a more urgent need, mitigating the affects of impacts from the developments that are funding the projects. There is a desperate need for improved infrastructure in calverton right now and there are still around 300 planned houses to be built and occupied.	Where I would prefer the money to be spent Parking in the centre of calverton. Hollinwood lane cemetery to be completed as there is a desperate need for burial spaces. Play equipment at Manor Park School.	Comments noted.
	We need more for the young and the old. People of Calverton shouldn't have to travel to a memory cafe for people with dementia or singing for your brain. We are starting to get some memory cafe but we need more. And need more for people who have had a stroke or something else.	I would like to see more parking spaces in the centre of the village, if the parish council buy the land. The grass overflow car park at William Lee park is used every day not just by park users but as an unofficial park and ride and this area urgently needs a tarmac surface. Hollinwood Lane cemetery needs starting. There is a desperate need for public burial and ash plots across the borough and this 16 acre cemetery would last 100 years. Development of the William Lee park further into a visitor and heritage centre, including a 3G multi play space, a large BMX park. Development of Manor Park Infant and Nursery school's playground, since the old main play equipment was condemned and removed. The school is the only one of four schools in the village that has missed out on successive section 106 agreements from the new developments. The school needs a fun and stimulating environment which suits the diverse needs of the children in the community allowing the children to play, grow and thrive much sooner.	Comments noted.
	I strongly disagree with the proposed projects as they don't benefit the majority of people in GBC area. People from Calverton are unable to access these projects by direct public transport so will be unable to benefit. I believe that the proposed Heritage Centre does not strictly comply with the terms of CIL funding. Given that Calverton has accommodated a disproportionate number of new housing, and therefore contributed a substantial amount of CIL funding, Calverton should by right, receive improvements in local village infrastructure rather than in other areas that Calverton residents are unlikely to access.	We could do with more car park instead of more houses. Calverton could do with a bigger swimming pool. The one that we do have is not adequate I would go to calverton leisure centre more if we had a 25 m pool. At the moment when I do go swimming I have to go to Arnold leisure centre	Comments noted.
No insufficient for the villages.		Calverton Parish Council have proposed several strategic CIL projects that have been worked up and benefit Calverton residents. The proposals meet a strategic need for the borough AND benefit the needs of Calverton residents within an expanding community. Please refer to CPC comments with which I totally agree. Most importantly, Calverton leisure requires modernisation and improvement of the access road. Consideration could also be given to developing the old pit loading yard into a country park, and converting the old railway into a walking/cycling track, initially to Longdale Lane and eventually to Hucknall. These proposals would benefit the people of Calverton using the CIL money directly generated from the expansion of housing in Calverton.	Comments noted.
		Lambley play Park needs new play equipment.	Comments noted. The project suggested in response to Q2 is better suited, given its scale, for the Neighbourhood Portion of CIL. Given that the proposed project is situated within a Parish area of the Borough the expenditure of the Neighbourhood Portion of CIL Receipts would be determined by, and the responsibility of, the local Parish Council.

I Strongly disagree with the list of proposed projects. There is already a leisure centre in Carlton, there is no point in spending 20 or 30 million pounds on building a new one, especially when you don't spend any money on Calverton leisure centre, and there are far more, now urgent infrastructure projects that need implementing in the borough. Likewise for the proposed heritage centre at Gedling Country Park, how can this be viewed as an important infrastructure project? I would prefer to see the infrastructure money spent where there is more urgent need, mitigating the affects of impacts from the developments that are funding the proposed projects. We have a desperate need for improved infrastructure in Calverton right now, and we've still got around 300 planned houses to be built and occupied.	I would like to see the following infrastructure projects in Calverton, funded by GBC using CIL money in co-ordination with Calverton parish council. Far more parking spaces in the centre of the village, if the parish council buy the land. In addition the grass overflow car park at William Lee park is used every day now, not just by park users, it's an unofficial park and ride, it urgently needs a tarmac surface. Hollinwood Lane cemetery needs starting, there is a desperate need for public burial and ash plots across the borough and this 16 acre cemetery would last 100 years. Development of the William Lee park further into a visitor and heritage centre, answering requirements of the playing and heritage strategies, including a 3G multi-play space, large BMX park, and a heritage centre based on William Lee, founder of the first part of the industrial revolution. Development of Manor Park Infant and Nursery School's playground, since the old main play equipment was condemned and removed. The school is the only one of the four schools in the village that has missed out on successive section 105 agreements from the new developments. The school needs a fun and stimulating environment which suits the diverse needs of the children in the community allowing the children to play, grow and thrive much sooner.	Comments noted.
No as Calverton requires more investment I'm very much in favour of a Park& Ride on the A60. This would assist in resolving parking issues in the outlying villages. I'm strongly opposed to the Carlton Leisure Centre. The facilities are already far in excess of those available in Calverton. Also opposed to further funding for Arnold Town Centre and Gedling Country Park - where much money has been invested already at the expense of Calverton for example.	See projects submitted by calverton parish Council I would like to see the following infrastructure projects in Calverton funded by GBC using CIL money in co-ordination with Calverton Parish Council: Parking project Create more parking spaces to alleviate the current difficulties Calverton Calverton Parish Council Purchase of the derelict house on Main Street - to enable car parking spaces along with a tarmac surface for the land adjacent to William Lee Park to enable further spaces. Hollinwood Lane cemetery requires starting to make available some plots which we are in desperate need for across the borough. Further funding to develop William Lee Park and add a heritage centre - historical interest- William Lee. Manor Park school is in desperate need of money to renovate the outdoor area which has previously been condemned. Calverton could once again be a bustling village as it used to be with some thoughtful additions to improve living conditions - which should be funded anyway by the 105 monies from all of the recent new build sites. Again maybe not related but roads would be top of my list infrastructure or not seems to me it's all about wasting money just to keep the borough budget high rather than it dropping on the following year	Comments noted. Comments noted.
No I don't agree with the ideas of what you are planning on the areas described yet again calverton put on the back burner again Arnold has had loads of things change with results that haven't made a difference I just see it as a huge waste of money to not have any increases in anything relating to increase publicity and infrastructure to Arnold as so many businesses are closing so Arnold is a dying trading area there not much attention due to this when really all of calverton and Arnold and other areas of borough areas all require roads resurfacing which is and should be top of anybody's list things that need doing maybe not related to any of this but it would be top of the list	Comments noted.	Comments noted.
No they should be kept separate the councils will be no better off joining together so why change anything now	No	Comments would appear to relate more to Local Government Reorganisation (LGR) and not the Strategic CIL Review.
No I do not agree with the projects identified in the plan. Arnold Town centre has an improved area on the old market site which is already an attraction to shoppers. This could be further improved by lowering the rates for shops, so that more retailers would take up the empty ones and attract more footfall again. No infrastructure money is needed to help this situation. Gedling Country park has already had a lot of money spent on it. It is a lovely space which we visit often - although new parking charges are not a welcome ideal I can't see how a heritage centre there would attract more visitors. I would consider this a luxury and one we can't afford. Plenty of people already go to see what is there - the memorial gardens etc - no need to build anything else. Why a heritage building at Gedling Sad waste of councils money when so many other buildings are in dire straights	Calverton has increased its population by 100s in the last 10 years and it seems the county council are set to increase this hugely in the next 10. It will no longer be a village and will become a town in itself. It would make more sense to have fore thought and use money now - especially some of the money taken from Bellway, Langridge and Persimmon when they were given permission to build here. I live in one of the new builds - we can never find a place to park in the village, St Wilfrids square needs improving and people need access to the few amenities we have here - eg somewhere to park near the Co-op before there is an accident. The local schools need money spending on them - the infants school in particular needs funding support for the outdoor resources needed for the increasing number of children. Some adapted play equipment for the parks to support children with SEND would be a very useful addition to William Lee Park. A larger health centre in Calverton to support the increasing population caused by new builds Improvement to Calverton leisure centre and more leisure infrastructure in the village	Comments noted.

Living in Calverton it is easy to see how forgotten we seem to be. We have many areas struggling to cope with all the added housing already built and planned for in the future. Doctors and chemist and schools to small to now cope with the size of our village. As a disabled person I have to shop local, and as no large supermarkets it costs more for food. Local leisure centre always been great, but it's clear it needs improving and seems to be being forgotten about. I believe money which was meant to be spent in Calverton is now being used to update Carlton leisure centre which has had improvement in the past. Where as Calverton needs that support. If we loose our leisure centre myself and my children wouldn't have the access to a pool and vital classes. Our village for to long has been ignored and we are not as affluent as perseved. We for one are a low income family trying our best to work with health issues. People are struggling in this village and we need to be seeing more support offered to improve the infrastructure of our Beautiful village full of people just trying to look after each other. But if the village keeps getting bigger and the money put forward to help with that growth doesn't go to us, then these difficulties will just keep getting larger.	Improved school places GP surgery improvements so to cope with the size of village. It can be over a month to wait for an appointment currently. A second chemist as 1 just can't cope with the amount of people who now live in Calverton, can be waiting days to get hold of vital medicine. Larger shops.	Comments noted.
No Arnold has far to much spent on it. The country park is not strategic.	Money needs spending in Calverton Gbc alongside the Parish council need to formulate plans to improve parking and amenities within the village and spend the money where it is earned.	Comments noted.
No. More should be spent on calverton Infrastructure i.e. leisure facilities. The changing rooms and toilets at terrible. Infrastructure changes must be equitable to increased population due to new building. Congestion due to lack of parking is a major issue in Calverton. Also additional provision for social need not reliance on the local Working Club eg Memory Cafe. An extension of health provision is now vital for the thousands more in the village (town). Provision of historical heritage of the village eg Kingswell/textile heritage and museum all need help and development. I disagree. Calverton is expanding so the council needs to put more money into our village amenities.	Local parking and shopping facilities need improvement.	Comments noted.
No. Resources appear to be going to areas to duplicate resources already in place there ie Carlton I strongly disagree with the list of projects. Carlton already has a good leisure centre so why waste millions of pounds on building a new one. It is lime money was invested on Calverton leisure centre. I also don't believe that a heritage centre at Gedding Borough Country Park should be classed as an urgent infrastructure project. No. Nothing on the list for Calverton. A new leisure centre for Carlton and the 'Heritage Centre' for Gedding Country Park would be a total waste of money when more urgent improvements are required elsewhere. NO, you have given planning permission for so many new houses in Calverton, without ANY infrastructure provision. Please try parking in the Square to get to the doctors - good luck.	The inevitability of this expansion will be the inability of Calverton to cope with basic water flow. Finally this is money provided by housing expansion to attract in families so walk ways, schools and play areas all deserve support.	Comments noted.
I strongly disagree with the list of proposed projects, particularly the proposed 'heritage centre' at Gedding Country Park.	The Leisure Centre & parking is a priority and there's space for improvement. The shopping centre is a disgrace and I don't understand why the council can't purchase it and renovate it and work with supermarkets to enhance the areas. School play areas need updating, also, car parking in Calverton is now inadequate because of the increased housing.	Comments noted.
Villages such as Calverton desperately need for improved infrastructure and that's before all the new houses are finished and occupied. I do not agree. Again there is nothing for the ever growing Calverton. Everything is Carlton and Arnold as ever. I Strongly disagree with the list of proposed projects. There is already a leisure centre in Carlton, there is no point in spending 20 or 30 million pounds on building a new one, especially when you don't spend any money on Calverton leisure centre, and there are far more, now urgent infrastructure projects that need implementing in the borough. Likewise for the proposed heritage centre at Gedding Country Park, how can this be viewed as an important infrastructure project? I would prefer to see the infrastructure money spent where there is more urgent need, mitigating the affects of impacts from the developments that are funding the proposed projects. We have a desperate need for improved infrastructure in Calverton right now, and we've still got around 300 planned houses to be built and occupied.	The infrastructure money should be spent where there is more urgent need to mitigate the affects of impacts from the developments that are funding the proposed projects. Calverton is in desperate need for improved infrastructure right now with all the houses that have been built (and still hundreds more planned to be built and occupied). We definitely need more car parking in Calverton and a new playground for Manor Park School. Improved bus services, road improvements in Calverton in the light of 300 even more homes to be built in the village. A guarantee that no more houses will be built on the green belt that only partially now surrounds the 'village' (small town).	Comments noted.
A structural improvement or total refurbishment of the Calverton, Nottingham - leisure centre/facilities will improve the experiences of hundreds of families and young children who will directly benefit from the refurbishment mentioned above.	Doctors, Car Parking, shops, potholes, pavements, the list goes on and one - Calverton the forgotten village. Please consider using CIL money to build the cemetery on Hollinwood Lane.	Comments noted.
	Something for the kids to do such as been suggested befor like a skatepark or bmx track. Also to do something about the parking problems at both the shops ans schools. I would like to see the following infrastructure projects in Calverton, funded by GBC using CIL money in co-ordination with Calverton parish council. Far more parking spaces in the centre of the village, if the parish council buy the land. In addition the grass overflow car park at William Lee park is used every day now, not just by park users, it's an unofficial park and ride, it urgently needs a tarmac surface. Hollinwood Lane cemetery needs starting, there is a desperate need for public burial and ash plots across the borough and this 16 acre cemetery would last 100 years. Development of the William Lee park further into a visitor and heritage centre, answering requirements of the playing and heritage strategies, including a 3G multi-play space, large BMX park, and a heritage centre based on William Lee, founder of the first part of the industrial revolution. Development of Manor Park Infant and Nursery School's playground, since the old main play equipment was condemned and removed. The school is the only one of the four schools in the village that has missed out on successive section 106 agreements from the new developments. The school needs a fun and stimulating environment which suits the diverse needs of the children in the community allowing the children to play, grow and thrive much sooner.	Comments noted.

Far too much has been thrown at these areas already whilst Calverton grows in size and has no funding.	Parking facilities in Calverton. Residents are facing an ongoing battle with inconsiderate parking due to no parking for people going to the shop, work and even commuting to town. I will point to my road in particular, Renals Way where I have a daily battle with these people and in particular St Wilfrids School drop off and pick up time. Parking over residents drives, parking on the pavement and parking in such a way residents cannot see to get on or off their drives safely. Many arguments and sometimes threats. All reported to the school, NCC parking enforcement, police, parish council and governors of the school, also MP and no one is either willing too or cannot do anything about it. Shocking.	Comments noted.
I don't agree with the proposed projects listed. Calverton always gets left out and generally we accept it. Seeing as we are doubling our population in the village why not ask the public of calverton what the priority would be in our village. Nhs facilities, schools extension s and our leisure centre which is so archaic	Schools extension. Gp facilities, leisure centre upgraded	Comments noted.
I Strongly disagree with the list of proposed projects. There is already a leisure centre in Carlton, there is no point in spending 20 or 30 million pounds on building a new one, especially when you don't spend any money on Calverton leisure centre, and there are far more, now urgent infrastructure projects that need implementing in the borough. Likewise for the proposed heritage centre at Gedling Country Park, how can this be viewed as an important infrastructure project? I would prefer to see the infrastructure money spent where there is more urgent need, mitigating the affects of impacts from the developments that are funding the proposed projects. We have desperate need for improved infrastructure in Calverton right now, and we've still got around 300 planned houses to be built and occupied.	I would like to see the following infrastructure projects in Calverton, funded by GBC using CIL money in co-ordination with Calverton parish council. Far more parking spaces in the centre of the village, if the parish council buy the land. In addition the grass overflow car park at William Lee park is used every day now, not just by park users, it's an unofficial park and ride, it urgently needs a tarmac surface. Hollinwood Lane cemetery needs starting, there is a desperate need for public burial and ash plots across the borough and this 16 acre cemetery would last 100 years. Development of the William Lee park further into a visitor and heritage centre, answering requirements f the playing and heritage strategies, including a 3G multi-play space, large BMX park, and a heritage centre based on William Lee, founder of the first part of the industrial revolution. Development of Manor Park Infant and Nursery School's playground since the old main play equipment was condemned and removed. The school is the only one of the four schools in the village that has missed out on successive section 106 agreements from the new developments. The school needs a fun and stimulating environment which suits the diverse needs of the children in the community allowing the children to play, grow and thrive much sooner.	Comments noted.
I disagree with the proposals. Spend money in Claverton where hundreds and hundreds of new homes have been built. There has been no improvement to infrastructure to accommodate the increase in population, which is of detriment to the village.	Spend the money in Calverton and improve infrastructure for the village.	Comments noted.
I do not agree to the proposals, money spent in other areas when Calverton is severely lacking the infrastructure to keep up with the growth of the village is not acceptable.	Calverton is in desperate need of additional parking around the existing shopping areas. Further development of the villages play areas. Development of the local schools to keep up with the growth of the village. As well as much needed funding for Manor Park to improve their play area.	Comments noted.
I Strongly disagree with the list of proposed projects. There is already a leisure centre in Carlton, there is no point in spending 20 or 30 million pounds on building a new one, especially when you don't spend any money on Calverton leisure centre, and there are far more, now urgent infrastructure projects that need implementing in the borough. Likewise for the proposed heritage centre at Gedling Country Park, how can this be viewed as an important infrastructure project? I would prefer to see the infrastructure money spent where there is more urgent need, mitigating the affects of impacts from the developments that are funding the proposed projects. We have a desperate need for improved infrastructure in Calverton right now, and we've still got around 300 planned houses to be built and occupied.	I would like to see the following infrastructure projects in Calverton, funded by GBC using CIL money in co-ordination with Calverton Parish council. Far more parking spaces in the centre of the village, if the parish council buy the land. In addition the grass overflow car park at William Lee park is used every day now, not just by park users, it's an unofficial park and ride, it urgently needs a tarmac surface. Hollinwood Lane cemetery needs starting, there is a desperate need for public burial and ash plots across the borough and this 16 acre cemetery would last 100 years. Development of the William Lee park further into a visitor and heritage centre, answering requirements of the playing and heritage strategies, including a 3G multi-play space, large BMX park, and a heritage centre based on William Lee, founder of the first part of the industrial revolution. Development of Manor Park Infant and Nursery School's playground, since the old main play equipment was condemned and removed. The school is the only one of the four schools in the village that has missed out on successive section 106 agreements from the new developments. The school needs a fun and stimulating environment which suits the diverse needs of the children in the community allowing the children to play, grow and thrive much sooner.	Comments noted.
I disagree with Gedling country park heritage centre inclusion on the grounds that the introduction on parking fees should pay for this improvement.	With calverton expanding and more cars, parking improvements required around village centre. A614/foxton rdjunctionrequire improving next to Arnold town football ground i.e. traffic lights or a roundabout. Leisure facilities improvement need to continue to be improved at William lee park, Seely park and collier road field.	Comments noted.
I disagree with Carlton new leisure whilst calverton leisure centre is not improved and the village/town is expanding with 100's of new housing.		Comments noted.
I disagree with park and ride at Lea pool roundabout unless it's part of greater project including tram network to cover Arnold,calverton and Gedling.		Comments noted.
Strongly disagree with proposed list of projects. Would prefer to see the infrastructure money spent where there is a greater need, mitigating impacts from the developments that are funding the proposed projects.	I would like to see the following infrastructure projects in Calverton, funded by GBC using CIL money in coordination with Calverton parish Council. More parking in the village centre, if the parish Council buy the land. Grass overflow parking at William Lee park needs tarmacking. Hollinwood Lane cemetery needs starting. Development of Manor Park school's playground.	Comments noted.
Calverton have contributed alot to the budget due to the amount of new housing built but we have no added infrastructure. We need an updated leisure centre, more parking, bigger schools, the roads need re surfacing.	As above	Comments noted.
There's some good stuff but Calverton is more urgent need for parking etc than a heritage centre at Gedling country park	Parking in Calverton. A William Lee heritage centre. Upgrades to Manor Park school playground. A BMX park.	Comments noted.
Not enough is done for Calverton when we get all the houses! We need parking spaces so we can get to the shops and doctors and how about us being a heritage destination? Ps Manor Park school needs a new playground	Additional parking in the square and at William Lee park, a new BMX park and 3G pitch. a William Lee heritage and visitor centre	Comments noted.
Some of the projects are good but not as important as parking and facilities in Calverton, yes we would like the mineral line opened (but preferably with a tram?) but we need parking now!	Parking at st.wilfrids square and William Lee park. A large BMX and pump track. A 3G multi use pitch. A New playground for Manor Park school. A William Lee heritage centre.	Comments noted.
Calverton is in desperate need of major infrastructure improves before some of the listed projects! You need to start spending the money to mitigate the new developments in our village	All in Calverton, with the parish council as the lead agency, Lots of new parking spaces. Small retail units. Improvements to Manor Park school playground. A William Lee museum. A large bmx park. A 3G multipplay pitch.	Comments noted.
Investment urgently required in calverton to improve and make services fit for purpose after three large new housing estates built.	Investment urgently required in calverton to improve and make services fit for purpose after three large new housing estates built.	Comments noted.

I would like projects to be invested into Calverton village, that will benefit the residents. I disagree with the projects listed on the CIL - we need increased infrastructure in Calverton. Increased housing and future development plans are putting an increased pressure and risk on our already existing infrastructure that just isn't fit for purpose. It seems that proposals outlined are inequitable for example the proposal to introduce another leisure centre in Carlton. Why? They have one already? Calverton existing leisure centre needs a refresh and updating. Heritage Centre at Gedling country park? Residents of Calverton would prefer that money to be spent on creating safer environments for our children to learn and play - for example the playground at Manor Park Infants school would benefit from some funding to make urgent and necessary improvements.	I would like projects to be invested into Calverton village, that will benefit the residents. Funding for Manor Park Infants playground repairs and funding for the Calverton leisure and youth centre to make necessary improvements to buildings, make safe, encourage more people to want to use to get fit/socialise/reduce isolation/give our teens somewhere to socialise/reduce anti social behaviour etc etc. Perhaps consider funding to childrens centres/family hubs in the village that can provide more services to our community around mental health, run clubsw/vents/community groups etc etc	Comments noted. Comments noted.
No I don't agree with this list, fix the problems in Calverton. We need big improvements to Calverton since all the extra houses were built. Parking is a major issue in our village and getting worse. The infrastructure list is flawed as it does not tightly push funding to the communities affected by new development. This village has seen a huge increase in housing without improvements to the physical infrastructure such as GP's, buses across the borough and county, EV infrastructure etc. without this tight geographic approach the infrastructure list builds resentment in communities and fails to support cohesion. No to the ideas in Carlton & Arnold, they're not benefiting Calverton which needs more car parking, affordable shopping. Items missing including infrastructure for the new homes within Calverton are not addressed, poor quality surgery, dental and shopping precinct from 1970's none of these are being addressed but the money is coming from all the new houses, at least do as you have done in Gedling, local shops charge between 150 and 300% more for the same items as a supermarket. Arnold has been financed enough with it's arc, now give the money back to Calverton SIP3 No mention has been made to the Ouse Dyke which falls within Gedling - their could be opportunities to daylight sections of the watercourse which would be desirable, as well as improving the banks. Sections of the watercourse are concrete channel so of very limited ecological value. Removing concrete, grey infrastructure and re-meandering in sections where possible would be desirable. The Ouse Dyke is hidden away in most locations so it would be good to open it up and improve residents access to water. Many people in Gedling/Carlton may not even be aware it exists. Further opportunities would be to improve tree cover along banks to improve shade and resilience to climate change/drought, particularly on the river Trent. We feel that the Blue-Green Infrastructure (BGI) wording could be more comprehensive to include the following information or something similar. BGI provides benefits such as air quality improvement, amenity provision, carbon sequestration, increased biodiversity, flood risk management, and health and wellbeing. De-paving and greening an area (e.g. through SuDs) can also help to provide local relief to high temperatures. BGI provides an opportunity to reconnect watercourses to their floodplains and should be considered alongside development proposals. SIP4 We should point out that, in line with our detailed comments in relation to the Ambition Arnold Executive Summary consultation which we responded to in September 2024 that the majority of Arnold lies within flood zone 1. However, we highlighted that there are surface water flooding issues impacting Arnold which in turn does impact the Day Brook which is located to the south of the settlement of Arnold. We therefore highlighted the importance of incorporating effective SuDs and BGI interventions to help manage this flood risk. It may be prudent to include reference to these comments or signpost readers back to our comments on the Ambition Arnold Executive Summary consultation response. Other considerations could include the incorporation of rain gardens, a pond, swales etc. If any tree planting is proposed, we recommend planting native species only.	Improvements to the centre of the village to make it look nicer plus lots of extra parking as there are never enough spaces and it's causing real issues with residents and visitors from Woodborough and Lambley Children are our main concern I would expect the borough council to have a clear list developed with the parish council and community groups in Calverton rather than expecting a member of the public in a consultation exercise to provide one. No to the ideas in Carlton & Arnold, they're not benefiting Calverton which needs more car parking, affordable shopping. Aldi or Lidl, removal of leisure only status of land next to local council, there is sufficient space there for a new supermarket and health centre but local council states it's only to be used for leisure.	Comments noted. Comments noted Comments noted. The Neighbourhood Portion of CIL is specifically designed to meet localised needs within the areas where CIL receipts have been collected. In areas with Parish Council the Neighbourhood Portion of CIL Receipts are passed directly to the Local Parish Council. Comments noted. Comments noted.
N/A		Comments noted.

Active Travel Links (SIP1) - The County Council supports the inclusion of Active Travel Links (SIP1) on the Infrastructure List. The document refers to the priorities being broadly identified through consideration of demand data and policy fit and specifically identifies access to Gedling Country Park as the main priority. However, access to Gedling Country Park is rated as a low priority in the Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) and, as a result, is not programmed for consideration until beyond 2036. It is therefore suggested that the description of Active Travel Links (SIP1) is broadened to enable improvements to the strategic cycle network across the whole borough, in accordance with the priorities in the LCWIP, rather than limited to links to Gedling Country Park. The County Council would particularly welcome reference to the A612 Corridor within the description of SIP1. The second phase of this project (shown in green below) is part-funded but the third phase (to connect to Colliery Way) is currently unfunded and is a long term priority. Leapool Roundabout Park and Ride Service (SIP2) - The County Council agrees with the inclusion of the Leapool P&R Service on the Infrastructure List. Outcomes from the feasibility work undertaken previously were positive and through the East Midlands Combined County Authority there is potential funding on the horizon for capital schemes but also potential access to revenue funding which would allow for an update and undertaking of additional related feasibility work. It's also a scheme that is currently being modelled within the transport assessment mitigation strategy for the Greater Notts Strategic Plan. Blue-Green Infrastructure Improvement Works (SIP3) - The County Council supports the inclusion of Blue-Green Infrastructure Improvement Works (SIP3) on the Infrastructure List, particularly with reference to the Calverton Mineral Line. This project is featured as a medium priority in the LCWIP, and feasibility and costing work is ongoing. The County Council would recommend that this project is included as a distinct project within the Infrastructure List rather than an example of an improvement under SIP3.	It is unclear whether 'secondary school contributions at Top Wighay Farm' (TWF) is proposed to be retained on the list following this review. The County Council would request that a secondary school expansion to meet the needs of TWF is included on the Infrastructure List. There is forecast to be an insufficiency of secondary school places in the Hucknall Planning Area due to growth in pupil population from TWF. There is no funding through the S106 Agreement for TWF to support secondary school capacity and whilst funding may be provided through S106 from other schemes, a proportionate sum would still be required from CIL relative to the impact of TWF. Indicatively, the permitted 805 dwellings at TWF would yield 129 secondary aged pupils which would equate to a contribution of £3,904,830 based on the cost per place in NCC Developer Contributions Strategy. It is noted that 'secondary school contributions for Gedling Colliery / Chase Farm' will now be achieved through the S106 for this development, in light of the Council's decision to repurpose the primary school contribution to instead benefit Carlton Academy. On this basis, this project would not need to be retained on the Infrastructure List. However, the modification to the S106 is yet to be signed by the housing developer or the borough council and the support of the GBC is sought to secure this modification to enable the funds to be invested. Without this, the County Council cannot recommend that this item is removed from the Infrastructure List.	Comments noted.
--	---	------------------------

Active Travel Links (SIP1) - The County Council supports the inclusion of Active Travel Links (SIP1) on the Infrastructure List. The document refers to the priorities being broody specified through consideration of demand data and policy fit and specifically identifies access to Gedling Country Park as the main priority. However, access to Gedling Country Park is rated as a low priority in the Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) and, as a result, is not programmed for consideration until beyond 2036. It is therefore suggested that the description of Active Travel Links (SIP1) is broadened to enable improvements to the strategic cycle network across the whole borough, in accordance with the priorities in the LCWIP, rather than limited to links to Gedling Country Park. The County Council would particularly welcome reference to the A612 Corridor within the description of SIP1. The second phase of this project (shown in green below) is part-funded but the third phase (to connect to Colliery Way) is currently unfunded and is a long term priority.

Leaspool Roundabout Park and Ride Service (SIP2) - The County Council agrees with the inclusion of the Leaspool Park Service on the Infrastructure List. Outcomes from the feasibility work undertaken previously were positive and through the East Midlands Combined County Authority there is potential funding on the horizon for capital schemes but also potential access to revenue funding which would allow for an update and undertaking of additional related feasibility work. It is also a scheme that is currently being modelled within the transport assessment mitigation strategy for the Greater Nottingham Strategic Plan.

Blue-Green Infrastructure Improvement Works (SIP3) - The County Council supports the inclusion of Blue-Green Infrastructure Improvement Works (SIP3) on the Infrastructure List particularly with reference to the Calverton Mineral Line. This project is featured as a medium priority in the LCWIP, and feasibility and costing work is ongoing. The County Council would recommend that this project is included as a distinct project within the Infrastructure List rather than an example of an improvement under SIP3.

It is unclear whether secondary school contributions at Top Withyway Farm (TWIF) is proposed to be retained on the list following this review. The County Council would request that a secondary school expansion to meet the needs of TWIF is included on the Infrastructure List. There is forecast to be an insurmountable of secondary school places in the Hucknall Planning Area due to growth in pupil population from TWIF. There is no funding through the S106 Agreement for TWIF to support secondary school capacity and whilst funding may be provided through S106 from other schemes, a proportionate sum would still be required from CIL relative to the impact of TWIF. Indicatively, the permitted 805 dwellings at TWIF would yield 129 secondary aged pupils which would equate to a contribution of £3,904,830 based on the cost per place in NCC Developer Contributions Strategy.

It is noted that secondary school contributions for Gedling Country / Chase Farm will now be achieved through the S106 for this development. In light of the Council's decision to re-purpose the primary school contribution to instead benefit Carlton Academy. On this basis, this project would not need to be retained on the Infrastructure List. However, the modification to the S106 is yet to be signed by the housing developer or the borough council and the support of the GBC is sought to secure this modification to enable the funds to be invested. Without this, the County Council cannot recommend that this item is removed from the Infrastructure List.

Comments noted.

Summary Table of Representations

	(SIP1) Active Travel Links	(SIP2) Leaspool Roundabout	(SIP3) Blue/Green Infrastructure	(SIP4) Ambition Arnold	(SIP5) Carlton Leisure and Community Centre	(SIP6) Gedling Country Park Heritage Centre
Support	4	4	4	3	2	3
Neutral	23	23	23	25	23	24
Object	22	25	22	27	52	48