



Newark and Sherwood Local Development Framework

Plan Review

Preferred Approach – Sites & Settlements

Consultation Responses Document

July 2017

Introduction

- 1.1 The Newark and Sherwood Local Development Framework Plan Review: Preferred Approach – Sites & Settlements (hereafter referred to as the Preferred Approach – Sites & Settlements) was published for a period of public consultation on 12th January 2017. Representations were requested to be received by 24th February 2017. The Local Development Framework Task Group approved the document for publication on 15th December 2016 following delegated authority from the Economic Development Committee on 15 June 2016.
- 1.2 This statement sets out how many representations were made on the Preferred Approach – Sites & Settlements document and a summary of the main issues raised in those representations, in accordance with Regulation 22(c)(iii) of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012. It goes on to set out the District Council's Response to these and any actions which flow from the District Council's response that have informed the development of the Plan Review.

2. Summary of Main Issues Raised

- 2.1 In total 335 representations were received of which 252 were from residents objecting to the proposed amendment to NUA/Ho/2 to become a Gypsy & Traveller site.
- 2.2 The summary below of the main issues raised sets out the responses in relation to each question in turn and then deals with the additional comments at the end of the report.

QUESTION 1: Do you agree with the proposed changes to Policy NAP1 Newark urban Area? If you think there should be other, or no changes, please explain why.

- 2.3 William Davis Ltd the developers of Land East of Newark, while they supportive of the spatial strategy, argue that a higher level of housing development in Newark should be allowed.
- 2.4 Nottinghamshire County Council made comments about minerals but did not object to the preferred approach. Simons Developments promote Land to the south-east of the Dixons/Knowhow Distribution Centre complex for employment development, arguing for a higher level of employment development in the Newark area, as well as suggesting amendments to the employment land supply calculations.

District Council Response: The comments are noted. the District Council is firmly of the belief that the development targets proposed for the Plan Review are based on robust evidence contained in independently prepared evidence base documents. The Council has a flexible housing and employment land supply for the new plan period. Comments from the County Council with respect to the safeguarding of minerals and waste resources are noted. Whilst no objections have been made on specific sites the Authority has suggested that the site allocation policy for Land South of Newark should make reference to the existence of sand and gravel resource and highlight the potential for prior extraction of the mineral. However the area beyond the Urban Boundary which the Authority has referred to would not accommodate built development, and the site already benefits from extant consent.

Action: None.

QUESTION 2: Do you agree with the proposed changes to Policy NAP 2A Land South of Newark? If you think there should be other, or no changes, please explain why.

- 2.5 Urban and Civic, developers with an interest in Land South of Newark, suggest some amendments to do with retail and education but are essentially supportive.

District Council Response: The comments are noted. Amendments have been made to reflect changes in education requirements; in terms of retail provision the submissions from Urban & Civic are acknowledged. A sequentially appropriate location within the main built-

up area to the south of Newark remains the most suitable and sustainable location to meet future convenience retail needs, given the relationship between population growth and future capacity. However it is difficult to meaningfully separate the relative merits of Land South of Newark and Land around Fernwood. Accordingly Core Policy 8 will be amended to provide support for additional convenience retail development in a sequentially appropriate location, within the main built up area to the south of Newark of a scale sufficient to meet the needs generated by population growth. The operation of the market will be relied upon to determine the final location. Given that convenience capacity is not forecast to be present until post 2026 (District-wide) and will be driven by population growth the timing of delivery is however an important consideration. Whilst it may be appropriate to adopt a pragmatic approach, i.e. not expecting the full forecast population growth to have occurred before development takes place, it is nonetheless important that the potential impact on the District's network of Centres is robustly considered. Application of the Impact Test is viewed as the appropriate means for doing so.

Action: Amend policy and supporting text accordingly.

QUESTION 3: Do you agree with the proposed changes to Policy NAP 2B Land East of Newark? If you think there should be other, or no changes, please explain why.

- 2.6 The masterplan produced by William Davis Ltd, the developers, indicates that Land East of Newark has the capacity for 1,200 dwellings and this is the figure that they would like to see in the policy. They suggest that the country park should extend throughout the development as part of a linked green infrastructure and not be 'restricted solely to land north of Clay Lane'. They argue that only 2 points of access are required. They also suggest that the indicative illustration is deleted as it does not agree with their masterplan.
- 2.7 The preferred approach refers to the provision of 2 GP facilities if required, and the developers say that this should be removed because their pre-application consultation shows that key stakeholders would seek a financial contribution instead. The developers also ask that a Retail Impact Assessment is required only if the scale of retail provision proposed in an application is greater than the thresholds set out in the NPPF. Further suggestions include less stringent requirements for linking pathways with the countryside, providing sports fields, and retaining landscape features.

District Council Response: The comments are noted, the Council agrees that some amendments should be made to reflect the current circumstances with regard to infrastructure provision, however it does not agree that the original design concept of the Country Park should be removed. Following discussions with William Davis a small number of changes have been agreed to the policy, however both parties have agreed that the scheme can be delivered with the current design parameters in place. The changes agreed

refer to GP provision and sports pitches which are now to be delivered off site, and amends to reflect the reality that connection to countryside beyond the A1 is not practical.

Action: Make agreed amendments to NAP 2B.

QUESTION 4: Do you agree with the changes to Policy NAP 2C Land around Fernwood? If you think there should be other, or no changes, please explain why.

2.8 Strawsons Property, landowners at Land around Fernwood, argue that the preferred approach should be open to B2 and B8 uses at Fernwood Business Park, and should promote non B employment uses more. The Environment Agency are supportive and Highways England have no objections. Urban and Civic, developers with an interest in Land South of Newark, suggest some amendments to do with retail, education and the Southern Link Road but are essentially supportive.

District Council Response: The comments are noted. The policy has been amended to make clear that this requirement refers to the employment land allocated as part of NAP 2C not the current partially developed Fernwood Business Park. The comments by Urban and Civic are noted and are dealt with in answer to

Action: Amend the policy accordingly.

QUESTION 5: Do you agree with the current status and approach to employment land in the Newark Area? If not, please explain why.

2.10 Land to the south-east of the Dixons/Knowhow Distribution Centre complex is being put forward for employment development, arguing for a higher level of employment development in the Newark area, as well as suggesting amendments to the employment land supply calculations.

District Council Response: See question 1 response

Action: None.

QUESTION 6: Do you agree with the current status and approach to housing sites in the Newark Urban Area? If not, please explain why?

2.11 No comments received

District Council Response: None

Action: None

QUESTION 7: Do you agree with the proposed changes to Policy NUA/Ho/7? If you think there should be other, or no changes, please explain why.

2.12 No comments received

District Council Response: None

Action: None

Question 8: Do you agree with the proposed changes to Policy NUA/Ho/2? If you think there should be other, or no changes, please explain why.

- 2.13 A total of 252 responses were received to consultation on proposed changes to NUA/Ho/2, almost all opposed to the preferred approach. Some planning issues were raised, although many of the concerns expressed went beyond the scope of the planning system. Two slightly different versions of a petition have been handed in, opposing the preferred approach. There is also an online version of this petition on the Change.org website which has 670 signatures.
- 2.14 The land owner of the north-west portion of the NUA/Ho/2 site, as well as a substantial area of employment land to the north where their business is based and where land is currently available to rent-strongly objects to the preferred approach. They argue that the consultation 'has blighted the prospects of reoccupation of surplus land and buildings on this employment site', as well as reducing the value of the part of NUA/Ho/2 that they own.
- 2.15 Part of the site is owned by Severn Trent Water. The landowner would like this land, and the land his company already owns, to be used for the development of bricks and mortar housing. Concerns are also raised about traffic impacts, the potential loss of the homeless hostel and visual amenity.
- 2.16 Severn Trent Water has also objected to the proposed changes to Policy NUA/Ho/2. One reason given is concern that the preferred approach will reduce the Council's housing land supply and miss the opportunity to develop a sustainable site for bricks and mortar housing. They also argue that insufficient evidence has been provided to justify the change in policy, meaning that the preferred approach is unsound.
- 2.17 Severn Trent Water are keen to retain the current policy with a view to securing a residential consent for 86 dwellings on the site.
- 2.18 The Environment Agency welcome the preferred approach. Despite the site being within flood zone 2 and requiring the Exception Test, they consider that NUA/Ho/2 offers a much improved reduction in flood risk compared to the 'heavily constrained' Tolney Lane. In the absence of any other alternative sites, the Environment Agency are of the opinion that Quibells Lane should be the preferred location for the siting of future Gypsy & Traveller accommodation, directing all new pitches away from the Tolney lane site.
- 2.19 The National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups support the provision of more Traveller pitches, but are concerned that this should not be at the expense of local

homeless people. They do not think that Travellers pitches sharing the site with a homeless hostel would be a good arrangement, but they do not say why not. If alternative accommodation for the homeless is to be found elsewhere first, then they question whether the site can be delivered to a suitable timescale.

- 2.20 Heine Planning who specialise in Gypsy & Traveller issues raised some concerns that too many pitches are being provided in Newark compared with the rest of the District. There should be more choice of pitches in terms of location, size and tenure, and most Travellers would rather live on small sites owned and occupied by families. They question the deliverability of the site on the grounds of: flood risk; archaeological potential; and proximity to the East Coast Main Line leading to possible noise and vibration issues. She also mentions concerns that the homeless will be displaced.
- 2.21 One local Councillor objects strongly to the preferred approach, commenting on the loss of bricks and mortar housing land, local objections, access, property prices and the perceived loss of the homeless hostel. She also says the preferred approach will be harmful to her business, and complains about how the consultation was carried out. Another Councillor, is keen that a way is found to house more Gypsies & Travellers on Tolney Lane rather than the NUA/Ho/2 site.
- 2.22 Murdoch Planning submitted identical comments on his own behalf and on behalf of various clients who are members of the Gypsy & Traveller community resident at Tolney Lane. As well as saying the pitch need figures are too low and expressing concern at the 'loss' of the homeless facility, the respondent states that the Travellers he represents do not want to live at the site. The submission also noted that one landowner on Tolney Lane also does not want to be at the NUA/HO/2 site and would rather have planning permission for more pitches at Tolney Lane.
- 2.23 The preferred approach to NUA/Ho/2 was widely understood as entailing the imminent demolition of the Seven Hills Homeless Hostel. Two main themes emerged from comments that referred to this. 70 respondents mentioned financial considerations, including the money spent on the refurbishment of the facility and the cost of constructing an alternative facility elsewhere. The other main theme, mentioned in 95 responses, was concern that the users of the hostel would be left with nowhere to live or offered inferior accommodation.
- 2.24 79 responses expressed concern that the potential development of a Gypsy & Traveller site would lower house prices locally. Some acknowledged that this was not an issue that could be taken account of in the planning system.
- 2.25 Worries about traffic issues were mentioned in 57 responses, often accompanied with descriptions of existing traffic problems.

- 2.26 Concerns that the Seven Hills site was vulnerable to flooding and was therefore unsuitable for allocation, or was too costly to make safe, were raised in 8 comments. 19 respondents worried that housing more people in the area would put pressure on the local school, often stating that there was already a waiting list due to a shortage of places.
- 2.27 The idea that any new Gypsy and Traveller pitches in Newark should be at Tolney Lane despite flood risk was put forward in 40 responses. This was often associated with suggesting improvements to flood defences and mention of vacant land or available pitches at Tolney Lane. 21 comments stated that the Gypsy and Traveller community did not want to live on the Seven Hills site, often citing a community representative who spoke at a public meeting.
- 2.28 32 responses suggested sites other than NUA/Ho/2 for use by Gypsies & Travellers. 30 people suggested that the development would create problems with waste management. 18 respondents complained about the potential for loss of privacy, overlooking, noise or disturbance.
- 2.29 Complaints that the consultation process was inadequate or secretive, or that the preferred approach was insufficiently publicised, were made in 11 comments. A number of respondents wrote that they were made aware of the potential development of a Gypsy & Traveller site by the letter anonymously distributed in the area, by word of mouth or by other means rather than through Council publicity material.
- 2.30 Fewer than 10 respondents:
- expressed a preference for bricks and mortar housing rather than a Traveller site;
 - said that the proximity to the railway line was dangerous, for instance because children might access it;
 - wrote that there would be ill feeling or a lack of social cohesion between the Gypsy & Traveller community and the settled community; and
 - complained about the potential loss of the 'community centre' at Seven Hills.

District Council Response: The comments so far as they relate to legitimate planning concerns are noted. The Council recognises the significant local concern with regards to this site. It has carefully considered these responses and has undertaken further discussions with Seven Trent Water with regards to the delivery of the site. It has concluded the site is not deliverable because it cannot deliver the suitable number of pitches requirement to meet the Council's required need.

Action: Investigate alternatives to NUA/Ho/2 for the delivery of additional Gypsy & Traveller pitches.

QUESTION 9: Do you agree with the continued allocation of site Co/MU/1? If not please explain why.

2.31 11 responses were received about the housing allocations in Collingham including 2 from agents promoting additional allocations at Manor Road (as Co/MU/1 already has permission) and Oaklands as this represents a better site than the reserved land at Co/RL/1. Two local agents and a number of individuals and residents (none from Collingham) support the continued allocation of Co/MU/1 though some note that it will attract more people from Lincolnshire than the NSDC area.

District Council Response: The comments are noted. The Council has made sufficient provision for development within Collingham to meet the housing requirement so no further allocations are being considered for inclusion as part of the Review.

Action: None

QUESTION 10: Do you agree with the continued allocation of site ST/MU/1? If not please explain why.

2.32 7 responses were received about the Mixed Use allocation in Sutton-on-Trent including the Environment Agency who had no objections and the Trent Valley IDB who note that they hope to undertake a scheme in the area to reduce flood risk to the village. A local agent from the village objects to the continued allocation believing the current settlement hierarchy is now inappropriate having regard to changes in local services and facilities. They conclude that since allocation in the previous Local Plan, flood risk has materially changed such that the LPA is now required to carry out a new sequential test and exception test as required by the NPPF if allocation is proposed. This has not been undertaken. It is also clear that the previous allocation did not carry out the necessary consideration under s66 on impact on the Conservation Area; again such a statutory test is required to be undertaken. Other comments from individuals and residents (none from Sutton-on-Trent) agree with the approach taken with one noting that there is no problem developing brown field sites in rural areas as it provides essential housing.

District Council Response: Comments are noted. Site ST/MU/1 is subject to a current planning application which has been under consideration, and subject to a number of amendments and extensive consultation, over some period of time. In responding to the change in flood risk sequential work has been undertaken through the application process, with the availability of reasonable alternative sites at lesser flood risk having been considered. The Environment Agency has approved the Flood Risk Assessment accompanying the pending application and therefore appear satisfied from an Exceptions

Test perspective. The Environment Agency does not raise any objection to the continued allocation of this site and the District Council is not aware of any reason why this site would not be deliverable. Where evidence has come forward to indicate allocations are no longer deliverable they will be deallocated.

Action: None.

QUESTION 11: Do you agree with the proposed changes to the Southwell Area Policies? If not please explain why.

2.33 16 responses were received concerning the Southwell Area policies (SoAP 1 'Role & Setting of Southwell' and SoAP 2 'Brackenhurst Campus'). Many of which expressed support for the proposed amendments, notably this included Southwell Civic Society, Nottingham Trent University and the National Trust.

2.34 Nonetheless objections were received from the CPRE who disagree with the revision seeking to secure additional car parking capacity, considering that the existing wording promoting sustainable transport measures ought to be retained. The Southwell Medical Centre highlighted that the surgery has reached capacity, with concerns being expressed over the implications of additional growth in the town and at Farnsfield. The consultee requested that development be coordinated with the Clinical Commissioning Group to avoid access to healthcare becoming problematic. Through their planning agent a local landowner put forward that SoAP1 should be amended to support custom and self-build housing, and the references to new employment development widened to include the expansion of existing businesses.

District Council Response: The comments are noted. Content concerning additional car parking has been evidenced through the Town Centre & Retail Study. The proposed approach would run in conjunction with Spatial Policy 7 'Sustainable Transport', which seeks to secure sustainable transport measures. Infrastructure requirements resulting from growth have been considered through the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, and improvements will be delivered through the Community Infrastructure Levy, planning obligations, developer contributions and where appropriate funding assistance from the Council. Assumptions will be revisited at the planning application stage and proposals will be expected to provide for appropriate infrastructure. It is considered that the expansion of existing businesses is already implicitly covered by the reference to new employment development in SoAP1. It is not considered necessary to widen the policy to overtly support custom and self-build housing which is supported through the Plan.

Actions: None.

QUESTION 12: Do you agree with the current status and future approach to employment land in the Southwell Area? If not please explain why.

- 2.35 9 responses were made over the preferred approach to employment allocations in the Southwell Area, expressing support in the most part. The National Trust viewed the de-allocation of the northern section of So/E/2 positively, considering it would support the protection of the immediate surroundings to the Workhouse.
- 2.36 Whilst agreeing with the proposed retention of Crew Lane for employment purposes Southwell Town Council have put forward an alternative approach to the future development of the south east of the Town. This would involve the connection of So/Ho/7 to So/E/3 with the wider site being brought forward for residential development, and access being taken from Fiskerton Road. Having expressed support for the wider approach to employment land allocation in the Southwell Area the Civic Society nevertheless go on to oppose the Town Council's proposal. Representatives of Minster Veterinary Surgery objected to the proposed reduction of So/E/3, though did offer support for an alternative use as per the Town Council's proposal.

District Council Response: The comments are noted. In respect of the National Trust comments it is not viewed as appropriate to delete So/E/2. There is still the need to meet employment land requirements within the Southwell Area, and it is considered that the 'immediate surroundings' of the Workhouse can be positively responded to through a sensitive and appropriate design and layout of development.

Following the County Council's deletion of the Southwell Bypass there is no longer any need to maintain its previously safeguarded line. In this event Policy So/E/1 commits the Authority to taking the opportunity to review the Crew Lane Industrial Estate Policy Area. As part of this the Town Council's proposal concerning So/E/3 and So/Ho/7 will be assessed and its merits considered moving towards the Publication Amended Allocations & Development Management DPD. It should be noted that the proposal would largely involve the amendment of existing allocations.

Action: Assess the Town council's proposal concerning So/E/3 and So/Ho/7 and consider its implications moving towards the Publication Amended Allocations & Development Management DPD.

QUESTION 13: Do you agree with the current status and proposed approach to housing sites in Southwell? If not please explain why.

- 2.37 12 comments have been made on the preferred approach to housing allocations in Southwell, including a number of general supports from residents across the District. Southwell Civic Society also provided support, particularly with regards to the proposed deletion of the former Minster School site and extension of So/Ho/7.
- 2.38 Two alternative sites have been put forward, land to the west of Allenby Road (60-70 dwellings) and land at Crew Lane / Fiskerton Road (circa 300 dwellings and

employment use). With the Allenby Road representations seeking either the sites direct allocation or its inclusion as 'reserved land' to provide additional flexibility. Those made in respect of Crew Lane / Fiskerton Road pursues its allocation through the review, it should be noted that the land in question adjoins the area proposed by the Town Council.

- 2.39 The new surface water management content proposed for inclusion within Southwell housing allocations was the subject of a number of responses. Southwell Town Council queried why a flood return of 1 in 20 years had been used when the Town is subject to flood events of greater than 1 in 100 years, and suggested that the standard sought ought to be run-off rates which are in line with the site's pre-developed state. The Environment Agency advised that there should be continued discussions with the Lead Local Flood Authority (NCC) in order to establish the most appropriate wording for surface water requirements. Notably no response has been received from NCC in its capacity as the LLFA.
- 2.40 The County Council have provided ecological input on So/Ho/4 'Land East of Kirklington Road', the south east of which accommodates mature vegetation, most likely an old orchard and so a 'Habitat of Principle Importance'. The County Council suggest that the area either be deallocated or ensure that its retention as open space is provided for.

District Council Response: The Council has made sufficient provision for development within Southwell to meet the housing requirement and so consequently no fresh allocations are being considered for inclusion as part of the Review.

A flood return of 1 in 20 (5%) or greater in any year provides the starting point for consideration and discussions to identify the functional floodplain. This is taken as being the appropriate planning test, and basis on which to consider surface water flood risk through the Plan Review. Notably the approach has been signed off by the Environment Agency and the Lead Local Flood Authority has not raised any objection.

The biodiversity comments from the County Council in respect of So/Ho/4 would be dealt with through the planning application process in applying Core Policy 12 and Policy DM7.

Action: None.

QUESTION 14: Do you agree with the current status and proposed approach of housing sites in Farnsfield. If not, please explain why.

- 2.41 Farnsfield Parish Council object to the preferred approach. They say that there is no evidence presented to support the readjustment of the housing figure from 142 dwellings to 211 dwellings. They are concerned about possible further increases in future, and argue that there should be a presumption against more housing

development. The lack of an employment allocation is also a concern, on the grounds that this may lead to 'increased commuting with a negative environmental impact and a negative impact on the local economy.'

- 2.42 The Parish Council are hostile to new housing development because of what they regard as major negative impacts. They mention increased local traffic, a shortage of public transport, highways in poor condition, inadequate footpaths, pressure on the local primary school and the Minster School, and drainage and sewage management problems. They also feel that money from CIL or Section 106 agreements is insufficient.
- 2.43 The Environment Agency and the Trent Valley Internal Drainage Board do not object to the preferred approach. A representative of Farnsfield Medical Centre says that as Southwell Medical Centre is at capacity, Farnsfield may have to take the new residents as patients. The District Council is urged to work with Newark and Sherwood Clinical Commissioning Group to ensure that sufficient healthcare provision is in place to support new residential development.

District Council Response: Comments are noted. The change to the Farnsfield figures reflects the amount of development which has been completed or is already committed within the village during the revised Plan period. Whilst the figure is higher than that proposed within the Core Strategy, it does not require any further allocations to provide for the new requirement and covers the period up to 2033. Whilst the Parish Council's concern is understandable, the existence of the permissions is now more appropriately accounted for within the Strategy. Despite appropriate marketing having been undertaken, no developers were forthcoming for the previously identified employment land.

Action: None

QUESTION 15: Do you agree with the current status and proposed approach to housing sites in Lowdham? If not please explain why.

- 2.44 There was mixed response to housing allocation in Lowdham, whilst it was accepted that greenbelt and flood risk constrained development comment was made that in terms of existing infrastructure Lowdham was a more sustainable location for development than Thoresby Colliery for new housing. The CPRE agreed that the preferred approach would achieve the right balance between protecting the green belt and allowing for the delivery of a small number of affordable homes to suit local need. Local objection to additional housing was on the grounds of additional pressure on local services and traffic congestion.
- 2.45 Representation was made on behalf of the owner of Lo/Ho/1 suggesting that the site is most likely to come forward as mixed use retaining the existing employment use, with the suggestion that the remainder would be best suited for self-build dwellings

and that development of the site is currently unviable due to the Council's desire to see 2 bedroom dwellings being delivered. Suggestions for amending the Green Belt Boundary were also proposed.

District Council Response: Comments are noted. No further amendments are to be made to the Green Belt boundary as part of this review and the Council is the District Council is committed to the regeneration of the Thoresby Colliery site and views the site as a sustainable location to accommodate growth. Evidence from the Housing Market and Needs Assessment (2016) indicates a need for both 2 and 3 bed dwellings in the Nottingham Fringe Area and notes that it is the third most popular choice of location for Self/Custom build dwellings. Policy Lo/Ho/ 1 and Lo/HN/1 will be amended to reflect this.

Action: Amend Policies Lo/Ho/1 and Lo/HN/1.

QUESTION 16: Do you agree with the proposed changes to Policy ShAP2 Role of Ollerton & Boughton? If not please explain why.

2.46 11 responses were received to the amendments to ShAP 2 including from NCC – Strategic Highways who note the that the second and third schemes named in the third bullet point are not forecast in the latest draft NSDC IDP to exceed their theoretical traffic carrying capacity during the life of the Local Plan i.e. by 2033 and hence will not require resolution. They also note that County Council as local highway authority has not approved the NSDC IDP and this is still being considered.

2.47 The CPRE do not agree with the proposed deletion of the sustainable transport part of the policy and submit that that the text from the 2011 CS is retained: "Securing improved public transport linkages between Ollerton Town Centre and the surrounding Sherwood Area." (CS p.97). Two residents (one not from the area) believe the improvements should not be limited to the Town Centre and note that no further significant housing development should proceed until Ollerton roundabout and health care issues are resolved. Other respondents including individuals, a developer and an agent broadly support the changes.

District Council Response: The comments are noted. Agree with the CPRE comment that the sustainable transport text from the policy should be retained.

Action: Amend Policy ShAP 2.

QUESTION 17: Do you agree with the proposed new Policy ShAP3 Role of Edwinstowe? If not please explain why.

2.48 15 comments were received on the proposed introduction of ShAP 3 'Role of Edwinstowe'. This number included several residents objecting to the proposed redevelopment of the former colliery - on the grounds of impact on infrastructure (with general highways concerns, impact on healthcare and Ollerton Roundabout

frequently figuring). Historic England provided support, subject to the satisfactory addressing of concerns connected with the redevelopment of Thoresby Colliery. The RSPB and Notts Wildlife Trust have both placed holding objections. With the two bodies being unsatisfied that the type and scale of development proposed for the colliery has been effectively justified (see later comments on ShAP 4). In their view until this has been resolved the matter of how and where Edwinstowe sits in the Settlement Hierarchy cannot be determined.

- 2.49 The owners of Thoresby Colliery provided support for the proposed content of ShAP 3, and have outlined how they believe the proposed redevelopment of the colliery accords with the emerging policy approach.

District Council Response: The District Council is committed to the regeneration of the Thoresby Colliery site and views the site as a sustainable location to accommodate growth and therefore Edwinstowe is best regarded as a Service Centre. The comments made by the nature conservation bodies should be addressed to ensure that the allocation is sound. In response to Historic England's comments the District Council has prepared a Heritage Impact Assessment.

Infrastructure requirements resulting from growth have been considered through the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, and improvements will be delivered through the Community Infrastructure Levy, planning obligations, developer contributions and where appropriate funding assistance from the Council. Assumptions will be revisited at the planning application stage and proposals will be expected to provide for appropriate infrastructure.

Action: Work with the Nature Conservation bodies to address the concerns expressed. Undertake a Heritage Impact Assessment.

QUESTION 18: Do you agree with the proposed new Policy ShAP4 Land at Thoresby Colliery? If not please explain why.

- 2.50 In terms of the proposed allocation of the colliery site through ShAP4 'Land at Thoresby Colliery' 20 responses were received. Again there were a range of objections from residents, mainly focussed on the infrastructure issues outlined in the ShAP 3 responses above. Unsurprisingly the Thoresby Colliery owners provided support for the allocation, and are confident that the emerging site requirements can be met and the quantum of development accommodated.

- 2.51 Whilst providing support in principle a local agent raised fears that additional employment land could stifle delivery of existing employment land in the area. On this basis it was argued that consideration should be given as to whether it would be appropriate to phase release of the employment land.

- 2.52 Historic England have raised concerns over the soundness of the proposed allocation, questioning the degree to which the proposed policy has considered the potential for harm to the historic environment and over what mitigation measures may be needed. The CPRE have submitted objections, pointing to a significant over-allocation of sites relative to requirements. Viewing it as unclear why the Authority has not taken the opportunity to facilitate a green tourism destination. The body does not believe the de-allocation of sites in Newark and re-direction of growth to an open countryside location is the correct approach.
- 2.53 In respect of nature conservation Natural England have welcomed the inclusion of nature conservation interests as part of the proposed approach, and support the requirement for SANGS. The body has however noted that the Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) screening report has not ruled out likely significant effects, and that an Appropriate Assessment may be required. They suggest that dependent on the further findings of the HRA the policy may need to provide further detail on the mitigation measures to prevent adverse impacts on the Special Area of Conservation, and the possible potential Special Protection Area from cat predation and recreational impacts.
- 2.54 The RSPB and Notts Wildlife Trust consider that the HRA does not offer sufficient certainty that a development of in the region of 800 dwellings can be delivered, without having a significant adverse effect on the Birklands and Bilhaugh Special Area of Conservation. These effects would be connected to the levels of nitrogen deposition likely to fall on habitats in the SAC from additional vehicle movements. Further information is to be provided by the site promoters, and the bodies are of the opinion that this is required to allow the proposed allocation to proceed. In their view if the impacts, alone or in-combination, cannot ultimately be satisfactorily mitigated then it may be necessary to reduce the overall scale of development envisaged. Support is however provided by the Environment Agency for how the environmental themes have been brought into the emerging site allocation policy.
- 2.55 In its role as the Highways Authority the County Council suggest that for the avoidance of doubt a further requirement is added securing other highway improvements as necessary to mitigate the impact of residual traffic.

District Council Response: Note the comments. The comments made by the nature conservation bodies should be addressed to ensure that the allocation is sound. In response to Historic England's comments the District Council has prepared a Heritage Impact Assessment. Consideration will also be given to how employment land can be released in a sustainable manner, however it should be noted that the NPPF normally discourages such approaches.

Action: Work with the Nature Conservation bodies to address the concerns expressed. Undertake a Heritage Impact Assessment.

QUESTION 19: Do you agree with the current status and proposed approach to employment sites in the Sherwood Area? If not please explain why.

- 2.56 10 responses were received to the approach to employment in the Sherwood Area including one from the Environment Agency who recommend for site OB/E/3 that development be kept free from any associated flood zones impacting this site or a 10 metre buffer (if this is the greater), for flood risk management and to improve habitat and water quality.
- 2.57 Most respondents broadly support the approach but points were made regarding the need for flexibility to respond to legitimate demand when and where it manifests itself, including uses which fall outside of the traditional “B” uses, and the possible need for some phasing given the addition of Thorsby Colliery. Two individuals disagreed, one noting that there is enough trade and industry in the Sherwood Area and the other noting the need for tourism and to elevate the related cultural benefits (including attracting major businesses) which not been identified as a major potential for the area specifically based around Sherwood Forest, Edwinstowe and the former colliery site.

District Council Response: The comments are noted. Those from the Environment Agency with respect to OB/E/3 are recognised and will be considered moving into the Publication Amendment Allocations & Development Management DPD. Comments concerning the need for flexibility are acknowledged, where such concerns are impacting on delivery of an allocation then this could be addressed through the planning application process.

The District Council is committed to the regeneration of the Thoresby Colliery site and views the site as a sustainable location to accommodate growth.

Action: Review OB/E/3 in light of the Environment Agency comments.

QUESTION 20: Do you agree with the current status and proposed approach to housing sites in Ollerton & Boughton? If not please explain why.

- 2.58 Some support was indicated for the Ollerton and Boughton housing allocations, the Environment Agency advised that they could not offer a full response for allocation OB/MU/1 prior to receiving and analysing the River Maun Hydraulic Model (this has subsequently been reviewed and found to be appropriate).

Avant Homes promoted the allocation of the new site at Harrow Lane, Boughton for 400 homes with the recommendation that if the OAN is higher the site could provide additional dwellings when required. One resident objected to further housing

allocation stating that the land between Tesco and Newark Road that has planning permission should be built out prior to any new development on agricultural land.

District Council Response: The comments are noted. The Council has made sufficient provision for development within Ollerton & Boughton to meet the housing requirement so no further allocations are being considered for inclusion as part of the Review.

Action: None

QUESTION 21: Do you agree with the current status and proposed approach to housing sites in Edwinstowe? If not please explain why.

2.59 The response to the preferred approach to the housing allocations in Edwinstowe was small in number, with the bulk being from residents raising objections to the proposed allocation of the colliery site (again mainly on infrastructure grounds). The landowner has put forward additional land to the east of Maythorn Grove for allocation, which they believe can provide a suitable link between the existing settlement and the colliery site.

District Council Response: Comments are noted. The District Council is committed to the regeneration of the Thoresby Colliery site and views the site as a sustainable location to accommodate growth. The Council has made sufficient provision for development within Edwinstowe to meet the housing requirement so no further allocations are being considered for inclusion as part of the Review.

Action: None

QUESTION 22: Do you agree with the current status and proposed approach to housing sites in Bilsthorpe? If not please explain why.

2.60 10 responses were received about the housing allocations in Bilsthorpe including one from the owners of site Bi/MU/1 confirming that the site is deliverable within the next 5 years and should be increased from 75 to 85 dwellings. The Parish Council request that when making decisions the increased activity at the junctions on the A614 and A617 is considered, seeking traffic lights and /or a roundabout to be installed, noting that overall visibility needs to be improved and additional signage would also be greatly appreciated.

2.61 A local landowner considers that additional flexibility should be added through a positive approach to windfalls of an appropriate scale in and on the edge of Bilsthorpe, both in and outside the envelope. A local agent objects to the de-allocation of Bi/Ho/1 and considers it should remain allocated for flexibility. Other comments from individuals and residents (none from Bilsthorpe) variously agreed with the approach taken, considered that there were enough houses already, or believed it could accommodate more housing as it is well connected logistically.

District Council Response: Comments are noted. The Council has made sufficient provision for development within Bilsthorpe with the expanded area of Policy Bi/Ho/2 which now incorporates the whole of the former Nobles Foods site. Development of these sites will more than meet the housing requirement but as the de-allocated Bi/Ho/1 site remains within the Village Envelope there would be no objection in principle to its development if a proposal were to come forward.

Action: None.

QUESTION 23: Do you agree with the current status and proposed approach to employment sites in the Mansfield Fringe Area? If not please explain why.

2.62 Some support was offered for the preferred approach to employment allocations, although a number of respondents felt that allocation should actually be higher across the Mansfield Fringe Area.

District Council Response: Comments are noted - The District Council has made sufficient employment provision across the District.

Action: None

QUESTION 24: Do you agree with the current status and proposed approach to housing sites in Rainworth? If not please explain why.

2.63 In respect of the mixed use and housing allocations, two objections were raised to the de-allocation of RA/MU/1 with recommendation from a planning consultant that the land should remain allocated but purely for housing development. The Parish Council also objected to the preferred approach for RA/MU/1 and considered that the area would be best served by retail/business development.

2.64 The Parish Council in addition raised concern that housing allocation Ra/Ho/1 would have an adverse effect on traffic and other local infrastructure. In addition the allocated numbers for Phase 2 of Ra/Ho/2 would create over intensification of this development, Phase 1 that is now under construction.

2.65 Nottinghamshire County Council raised concern that Ra/E/1 has the potential to support protected species and should be subject to an ecological assessment before deciding whether it is appropriate for development. The EA recommend a sequential approach to site layout for RA/E/1 and a 10m buffer for flood risk management.

District Council Response: Comments are noted. The District Council has made sufficient provision to meet the housing requirement in Rainworth but as the de-allocated RA/MU/1 site remains within the Village Envelope there would be no objection in principle to its development if a proposal were to come forward. Issues around transport and

infrastructure are addressed as part of the policy. The part of RA/Ho2 which does not yet have planning permission is of sufficient size to accommodate the additional number of dwellings allocated. The comments of the Nottinghamshire County Council and the Environment Agency will be taken into account as part of the policy.

Action: Amend Policy Ra/E/1

QUESTION 25: Do you agree with the current status and proposed approach to housing sites in Clipstone.

2.67 There was general support for the housing allocations, although one agent raised concern that C1/MU/1 is unlikely to come forward while the headstocks remain in place.

District Council Response: Comments are noted.

Action: None

QUESTION 26: Do you agree with the current status and proposed approach to housing sites in Blidworth? If not please explain why.

2.68 There was strong opposition to the New Lane housing allocation (B1/Ho/3) from residents and a local house builder, objection was on the grounds of poor highway provision and impact on local infrastructure provision. Representation was made on behalf of the land owner advising that the land is available immediately and talks are on-going with a house builder to dispose of the land.

2.69 One objection was raised to the deallocation of B1/Ho/4. Several requests were made that a further review of the green belt should be undertaken, to off-set the deallocation of B1/Ho/4 and stating that there are more suitable areas for housing allocation than New Lane.

District Council Response: Comments are noted. In respect to Policy B1/Ho/3 Issues around transport and infrastructure are addressed as part of the policy. The District Council have been informed by the owners of B1/Ho/4 that the land is no longer available for development. The Green Belt review was undertaken as part of the production of Allocations & Development Management DPD process and it was intended to be a one off and not a continual approach which would be revisited at every review of the Development Plan as set out in Paragraph 83 of the NPPF.

Action: None

QUESTION 27: Do you agree with the proposed new Core Policy 10a Local Drainage Designations? If not please explain why.

2.70 The preferred approach received limited comment, significantly however support has been provided by the Environment Agency who recognise the need for the designations, and look forward to subsequent involvement. Notably no response has been received from NCC in their capacity as LLFA. The Trent Valley Internal Drainage Board suggests Sutton-on-Trent for inclusion as an area where a designation could be explored, given previous flood events. Whilst agreeing that a policy is required Southwell Town Council put forward that a more coherent policy can only be created after the NCC mitigation plan has been finalised.

2.71 Beyond this local agents have raised the importance of the approach being proportionate to the scale and form of development proposed. Whilst another argued that the approach risked the development of a two tier approach to the management of surface water. A small number of residents commented, all providing support.

District Council Response: The comments are noted. It is not considered that the approach would result in a 'two-tiered' system. Where there is the evidence to support their introduction then Local Drainage Designations would be supported in locations beyond Southwell and Lowdham.

Action: None.

QUESTION 28: Do you agree with the proposed amendment to Core Policy 9 Sustainable Design? If not please explain why.

2.72 Limited response to the proposal to amend Core Policy 9, support from everyone who responded including the Environment Agency who wanted to include 'sustainable water management' within any policy. One respondent objected on the grounds that the Council should concentrate on Local Plan implementation and neighbourhood planning rather than an SPD on sustainable design.

District Council Response: Comments are noted

Action: None

District-wide Issues and Additional comments

2.73 A small number of district –wide issues where raised by consultees of particular note were:

- Nottinghamshire County Council – seeking to ensure the plan is compliant with the various provisions of the NPPF in relation to Minerals and Waste planning.

- Newark & Sherwood Homes want to ensure that future housing provision respects tenure shortages on the ground, and that future development doesn't impact on HRA investment
- A number of agents disagreed with the approach to the review because of the Council's approach to housing numbers, the fact that their sites were not included and one suggesting that "it will be necessary to test each proposed allocation to be taken forward against all other options that can be identified as 'reasonable alternatives' in order for the site allocation methodology to be sound."
- Education Funding Agency – wanted to draw attention to their role in funding new pupil place provision, working closely with the Local Education Authority and the Local Planning Authority.
- Sport England – suggested that the emerging Playing Pitch strategy and any update to the built sport strategy could help inform the Plan Review.

District Council Response: The comments are noted. Through the Plan Review the continued deliverability of all existing allocations has been considered. The approach to site allocation is considered robust and sound. Comments from the County Council concerning minerals and waste safeguarding have been addressed earlier in this report. The input from the Newark & Sherwood Homes, the Education Funding Agency and Sport England is acknowledged.

Action:

None.

Comments on the Draft Integrated Impact Assessment

2.7.4 Comments on the Draft Integrated Impact Assessment (Draft IIA) were submitted by Nottinghamshire County Council (NCC) and Historic England. NCC were supportive of the document, and suggested amendments to make references to waste and minerals more up-to-date or thorough. Historic England pointed out that their Advice Note on Site Allocations has been in place for over a year but is referred to as being in draft form.

District Council Response: These comments are noted.

Action: The IIA will be amended as NCC and Historic England advise.