



**NEWARK & SHERWOOD ALLOCATIONS &
DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT DPD**

MATTER 5 – SITE SPECIFIC ISSUES
Sherwood Area
(Issues: 24 to 26)

**Statement on behalf of Newark & Sherwood
District Council**

November 2012

MATTER 5 – SITE SPECIFIC ISSUES SHERWOOD AREA

Issue 24: Do the policies include adequate and appropriate safeguards with regard to the potential effects of development on flooding, biodiversity and local amenity? Has satisfactory provision been made in respect of transport and other infrastructure requirements?

24.1 The selection of sites for allocation within the Sherwood Area was informed by assessments of their effects on the risk of flooding, biodiversity and local amenity. Some sites were discounted during the process due to unresolvable conflict with these issues and where any did not prevent allocation but required addressing through the development of the site, they were made the subject of specific criteria of the policy to be addressed as part of planning applications.

Flood Risk

24.2 Assessment of flood risk began with the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 1 (EB32) of 2009. All initial SHLAA sites and a range of those identified by officers were considered within this. As there were no strategic sites allocated through the Core Strategy (CS) (LDF10) within the Sherwood Area, the next level of assessment took place when the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 2, Phase 2 (SFRA L2 Ph2) (EB34) considered the remainder of sites to be allocated through the Plan. In selecting sites for inclusion in the Plan, preference was given to locating new development in Flood Zone 1 however, in order to meet the growth requirements of the CS, it was necessary to identify some sites that are at risk of flooding. Utilising the SFRA L2 Ph2 (EB34), 4 sites were sequentially selected in the Sherwood Area. The flood risk issues associated with each of these were identified as site specific criteria that require addressing as part of development proposals through the application of the exception test. Full details of the approach taken to flood risk are set out in the Allocations & Development Management Sequential Approach to flood risk (EB36).

Biodiversity & Local Amenity

24.3 The main issues relating to biodiversity and amenity in the Sherwood Area concern the Birklands & Bilhaugh Special Area of Conservation and the increased recreational pressure that would be placed on it by the additional population arising from new homes in the vicinity. During the production of the Plan, the Council co-operated with Natural England over the wording of the document to ensure that potential effects were avoided wherever possible and mitigated against or compensated for if this was not possible. As a result of this, the wording of the Edwinstowe – Sherwood Forest Visitor

Centre Policy ED/VC/1, Policy DM5 - Design, Policy DM7 – Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure, Policy DM10 – Pollution and Hazardous Materials and the Glossary in Appendix were amended to that now presented. In addition to this, a further post submission change to the wording of Policy DM 7 has been agreed with Natural England [Representor 252] and this is detailed in Matter 6 – Development Control Policies.

Transport & Infrastructure

- 24.4 The District Wide Transport Study (EB30) and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) (EB1) were produced as part of the evidence base for the CS. Growth within the district needs to be supported by additional physical and social infrastructure to cater for an increased population and also to improve existing facilities.
- 24.5 Strategic improvements to the highway network which are required because of the growth of the district up to 2026, and which cannot be attributed to the development of any one site, and contributions to a secondary school where the location of growth requires additional secondary school provision will be funded through the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) which came into effect on 1st December 2011. Local infrastructure requirements which arise as a result of growth in the Sherwood Area including education, health and utilities will be met through Developer Contributions, and where appropriate, through funding assistance as set out in the Funding Statement (EB38).
- 24.6 The District Council is therefore satisfied that satisfactory provision has been made for the identified transport and infrastructure requirements of the Sherwood Area.

Issue 25: Are the detailed requirements for the mixed use and employment sites, including retail uses, clear and justified and will they ensure delivery within the planned timescale?

- 25.1 Following the advice of our visiting Inspector, the language used in the site specific criteria of the allocations policies contained in the Publication DPD (ADM2) has been amended. It now makes clear the responsibility for the various requirements set out and when they should be addressed. The Council has steered a tight line between providing unnecessary or quickly dating requirements and setting appropriate context for the determination of development proposals. Viability has been considered as part of the Viability Assessments of the sites and the Funding Statement.

Issue 26: Are the housing sites within Ollerton and Boughton deliverable given the requirements of the Core Strategy policies relating to affordable housing and the development management policies set out in the Plan?

- 26.1 In response to the Inspector's Questions, the Council carried out further work to address the concern over the viability of the proposed allocated sites and the revised Viability Assessment of Residential Development (EB39) has been submitted to the Inspector. The findings of the earlier studies are supported by the revised studies namely that some development in the west of the District during the first five years of the plan is most sensitive to issues of viability, taking into account key infrastructure identified in the IDP (EB1). As stated in our Response to the Inspector's initial questions this does not necessarily rule out development.
- 26.2 The District Council has prepared a Funding Statement (EB38) which sets out how the Council intends to deal with potential problems relating to viability on allocations sites. It identifies potential flexibility in securing developer contributions, including the need for the update of the Developer Contributions SPD (LDF2) to focus on IDP (EB1) requirements, amend the CIL Section 123 list to provide additional secondary education places, and provide assistance to support infrastructure provision on sites with marginal viability.
- 26.3 The District Council believe that the Viability Assessment (EB39) and the Funding Statement (EB38) together demonstrate that the housing sites in Ollerton and Boughton are viable and deliverable both in the short and long term.

Issue 27: Outstanding Matters

- 27.1 Representor 78 has expressed concern about traffic issues associated with site OB/HO/1, whether it constitutes an unsustainable green field site, and so therefore brownfield site(s) should be allocated instead, and about flood risk/drainage issues associated with the site. The Highway Authority raised no objections to this site. The scale of development on this site would yield developer contributions to address any site specific traffic or access issues. All available sites have been explored and some brownfield sites such as OB/HO/ 2 and 3 have been allocated. Flood risk and drainage issues do not preclude development, and are recognised and addressed through a site specific criterion.
- 27.2 Possible adverse impact on wildlife through the development of site OB/HO/1 is raised as an issue by Representor 84. There are no known protected species or habitats on the site that would preclude development. It is accepted that a field will support some

biodiversity but this can be addressed through the assessment of proposals through the planning application process.

- 27.3 Representor 117 is worried about an adverse change of character resulting from development of site OB/HO/1. It is acknowledged that development of the scale proposed will inevitably result in some change of character. This is necessary to facilitate growth but also manageable to ensure that the change is not harmful.
- 27.4 Two Representors, 125 and 166, argued that the removal of land adjacent to Maltkiln Close from the Urban Boundary was unjustified. The boundary has been re-instated as part of the modifications.
- 27.5 There has been a request from Representor 206 for the allocation of a small rural housing site at Retford Road Walesby. Walesby has not been identified to receive allocated growth within the Spatial Strategy, however, Core Policy 2 or Spatial Policy 3 could allow for such development.
- 27.6 A request for allocation of the site off Ollerton Road, Edwinstowe (AS/3 at Options Report stage) was received from Representor 52. This site was discounted due to its visual impact from the northern approaches to the settlement. As the other two sites identified in Edwinstowe meet the growth requirements, are viable and deliverable there is no requirement for this.
- 27.7 Representor 77 requests that the Council include Villa Real Farm in the Village Envelope in Edwinstowe. Whilst taking into account the extension to the Village Envelope resulting from the allocation of Ed/Ho/2, there would still remain a significant open frontage on the northern side of Mansfield Road that is worthy of protection from development. There is no requirement to include this land to meet the growth requirements for Edwinstowe.
- 27.8 A request for allocation of site adjacent Stony Field Lane, Bilsthorpe (AS/6 at Options Report stage) was received from Representor 50. This site was discounted due to the identification of highway access constraints which would require third party land to resolve. In addition, the development of the site could impact on views into Bilsthorpe from the South and West. As other viable and deliverable sites have been identified to meet the growth requirements of Bilsthorpe, there is no requirement for this site.
- 27.9 Representor 251 argues for the designation of additional parts of Wellow as MOAs, on the basis that they contribute to the character of the settlement. The Council considers that this is unnecessary because the areas that the Representor refers to are protected

as common land. It is also notable that these areas are predominantly grassy verges and so unlikely to be the subject of development proposals.