



# Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment Update

**Hucknall**

**November 2016**

**Disclaimer:** The identification of housing potential from sites and buildings within this study does not imply that Ashfield Council would necessarily grant planning permission for their residential development, nor do they constitute land allocations for housing development. Similarly it does not preclude sites being developed for other suitable uses nor does it rule out the formulation of other land use allocations in the emerging Local Plan. Additionally, it does not preclude the possibility of residential development being granted on sites that have not been included. Any planning applications will continue to be treated on their own merits, and be determined in accordance with current planning policies.

# Contents

Chapters	Page
Executive Summary	3
1. Introduction	7
2. National and Local Context	9
3. The SHLAA Process	11
4. Key Sources	13
5. Gypsy and Traveller Sites	16
6. Annual Update	17
7. Deliverability Assessment	18
8. Site Assessment Results	19
9. Site Report Format	27
Tables	
<b>Table 1:</b> Ashfield's Five year land supply position	6
<b>Table 2:</b> Ashfield's Five year land supply including proposed site allocations	7
<b>Table 3:</b> Dwelling requirement and current land supply	10
<b>Table 4:</b> Current Housing Allocations	14
<b>Table 5:</b> Current Employment Allocations	15
<b>Table 6:</b> Designated Recreation Spaces	16
<b>Table 7:</b> Sites submitted to the SHLAA	20
<b>Table 8:</b> Proposed site allocations	21
<b>Table 9:</b> Site with minor policy constraints and major physical constraints	22
<b>Table 10:</b> Site with major policy constraints and physical constraints	22
<b>Table 11:</b> Unsuitable sites	23
<b>Table 12:</b> Excluded sites	26
Appendices	
<b>Appendix 1:</b> Site Reports	
<b>Appendix 2:</b> Local Authority Contact Details	
<b>Appendix 3:</b> Accessibility Analysis Technical Appendix	
<b>Appendix 4:</b> Site Assessment Panel Membership & Minutes	
<b>Appendix 5:</b> Glossary of Terms and Abbreviations	

## Executive Summary

Councils have a statutory requirement to produce a Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA), as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). This Review provides an update to the SHLAA Review for Hucknall, produced in December 2015. Although the whole of Ashfield District is included in the Nottingham Outer Housing Market Area, the four wards of Hucknall form part of the Nottingham Travel to Work Area and the Nottingham Core SHLAA Methodology has been used to assess sites in Hucknall. A separate SHLAA has been undertaken for Sutton in Ashfield, Kirkby-in-Ashfield, Selston, Jacksdale and Underwood using the Nottingham Outer SHLAA methodology which is closely aligned with the Nottingham Core SHLAA methodology.

This report should be read in conjunction with the Nottingham Core SHLAA Methodology report, which sets out how Ashfield District Council (in relation to the Hucknall wards), Nottingham City Council, Gedling Borough Council, Rushcliffe Borough Council, Broxtowe Borough Council and Erewash District Council have undertaken SHLAAs for each local authority area. The preferred method for undertaking a SHLAA is in partnership across one Housing Market Area. However, due to the local authorities in the Nottingham Core HMA being at a different stage of the planning process, this SHLAA for the Hucknall wards has been undertaken separately.

In simple terms, the SHLAA aims to:

- identify sites with potential for housing;
- assess their housing potential and when they are likely to be developed; and
- ensure that there is sufficient land available to meet the housing needs of the District.

This assessment forms a key part of the evidence base underpinning the Ashfield Local Plan. It provides an appraisal of available land to inform the allocation of sites for residential development to meet the objectively assessed housing need in Ashfield.

A desktop appraisal has been undertaken on all sites submitted to the Council through the SHLAA process which are within or on the edge of the main urban area or a named settlement boundary. This approach uses the information available to the Council at a specific point in time; detailed site investigations have not been undertaken. Sites submitted to the Council's SHLAA process which are adjacent to or within a settlement boundary have been visited and site appraisals have been undertaken. Where sites are categorised as 'Suitable' or 'May be suitable subject to policy change/mitigation', this does not mean that planning permission would be granted or that they would be allocated for housing in the Local Plan. There may be overriding factors which have not been identified. In the same vein, sites which have been assessed as being 'Non deliverable/developable' may be granted planning permission if sufficient information is provided to demonstrate that barriers to development can be overcome. The information in this document is not binding on any future recommendation which may be made to the Council or any formal decision by the Council.

The SHLAA report presents an analysis of the potential capacity for residential development of sites from both within and outside of the planning process over a 0 to 5, 6 to 10 and 11 to 15 year time period. Sources of sites include:

- Sites submitted by landowners/agents (not currently in the planning system);
- Unimplemented/outstanding planning permissions for housing; and
- Ashfield Local Plan Review (2002) land allocations.

The largest source of potential sites is from land submitted by landowners and agents through a publicised 'call for sites' in October 2007 and subsequent call for sites in 2011 and 2014. Sites which do not adjoin the urban boundary have been excluded from the assessment; as specified in the Nottingham Outer SHLAA Methodology (July, 2008).

The findings from the SHLAA will inform a trajectory of potential housing supply which will form part of the Housing Monitoring Report (2016) and Annual Monitoring Report (AMR). The AMR compares the delivery of housing and the five-year supply of deliverable sites with the annualized strategic requirement.

In October 2014 the Nottingham Outer Councils (Ashfield, Mansfield, and Newark and Sherwood District Councils) jointly appointed G L Hearn to undertake a Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA). The Nottingham Outer SHMA covers the whole of the three District areas (including Hucknall). It provides evidence of the objectively assessed housing need (OAHN) from 2013 to 2033, including a breakdown by type, tenure and size across the housing market area. The Nottingham Outer SHMA (2015) will be used to inform the housing requirement for Ashfield District i.e. the number of dwellings required when taking into consideration the OAHN and, if necessary, the requirement to accommodate development from neighbouring districts in the housing market area, and any significant constraints which would affect the delivery of development within the Plan period i.e. 15 years.

There is a lack of land available within the main urban areas of Ashfield which could accommodate the amount of housing required by the District. This will result in a need for the Council to look to identify suitable land on the edge of the urban areas of the District around Sutton in Ashfield, Kirkby in Ashfield and the villages of Selston, Jacksdale and Underwood. A Green Belt Review has also been undertaken as part of this process. This will inform the site selection process if it is determined that there are exceptional circumstances for Green Belt release.

Table 1 sets out the District's five year housing land supply position with proposed site allocations. This demonstrates that the District would have 6.8 years housing land supply if the Plan was adopted in 2017.

Table 2 sets out the District's current position with regard to the five year housing land supply which is 5.0 years.

**Table 1: Ashfield District Five Year Housing Land Supply position with proposed site allocations**

<b>SEDGEFIELD METHOD OF CALCULATION</b>		
(previous undersupply all included in first 5 years)		(Dwellings)
<b>REQUIREMENT</b>	<b>Five Year Housing Requirement:</b>	
	OAN (April 2013 - 2032)	9120
	Requirement per annum	480
	Baseline requirement for 5 years	2400
	Net Completions (April 2013 - March 2016)	1437
	Under or oversupply since 2013 to 2016	3
	Housing requirement for the next 5 year period adjusted for under/over-supply	2403
	Add 5% buffer of	120
	<b>Total 5 year requirement including buffer</b>	<b>2523</b>
	<b>Annual requirement for the next 5 years</b>	<b>505</b>
<b>SUPPLY</b>	Existing small site planning permissions deliverable within 5 years	272
	Discount applied based on historic lapse rate	-75
	Housing allocations deliverable within 5 years*	3239
	<b>Total amount of housing available and deliverable for the next 5 year period</b>	<b>3436</b>
<b>5 YEAR SUPPLY POSITION</b>	<b>Calculation of 5 year housing land supply</b>	
	Deliverable sites for the 5 year period	3436
	Divided by annual requirement (2016 to 2021)	505
	Equates in years to	<b>6.81</b>
	Oversupply (+) or undersupply (-) of dwellings	<b>913</b>

\* includes 11 dwellings which are small site permissions, but have been included as part of larger allocations.

**Table 2: Ashfield District Five Year Housing Land Supply position without proposed allocations (Current Position)**

<b>SEDGEFIELD METHOD OF CALCULATION</b>		<b>Dwellings</b>
(previous undersupply all included in first 5 years)		
<b>REQUIREMENT</b>	<b>Five Year Housing Requirement:</b>	
	OAN (April 2013 - 2032)	9120
	Requirement per annum	480
	Baseline requirement for 5 years	2400
	Net Completions (April 2013 - March 2016)	1437
	Under or oversupply since 2013 to 2016	3
	Housing requirement for the next 5 year period adjusted for under/over-supply	2403
	Add 5% buffer of	120
	<b>Total 5 year requirement including buffer</b>	<b>2523</b>
	<b>Annual requirement for the next 5 years</b>	<b>505</b>
<b>SUPPLY</b>	Existing planning permissions deliverable within 5 years	2038
	Discount applied based on historic lapse rate	-112
	SHLAA sites deliverable within 5 years (not requiring policy change)	596
	<b>Total amount of housing available and deliverable for the next 5 year period</b>	<b>2522</b>
<b>5 YEAR SUPPLY POSITION</b>	<b>Calculation of 5 year housing land supply</b>	
	Deliverable sites for the 5 year period	2522
	Divided by annual requirement (2016 to 2020)	505
	Equates in years to	<b>5.00</b>
	Oversupply (+) or undersupply (-) of dwellings	<b>-1</b>

# 1. Introduction

## 1.1 Purpose of the Nottingham Core SHLAA

The Nottingham Core Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) forms an important part of the evidence base to support the delivery of housing to meet the community's needs within the Nottingham Core Housing Market Area (HMA) and the Hucknall part of Ashfield. This assessment forms an essential part of the planning process by ensuring an adequate supply of land for housing, using a robust evidence-based approach. This report also includes details of land submitted to the Council for consideration as gypsy and traveller sites.

## 1.2 Nottingham Core SHLAA – Partnership working

The Nottingham Core SHLAA has been developed through the partnership of the following Local Authorities: Ashfield District Council, Broxtowe Borough Council, Erewash Borough Council, Gedling Borough Council, Nottingham City Council, Rushcliffe Borough Council, and Nottinghamshire County Council. The Nottingham Core housing market area includes the whole of each Local Authority Area (identified above) with the exception of the four wards of Hucknall which are in the Nottingham Outer HMA.

## 1.3 SHLAA Review Process

The Hucknall Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment has been updated on a regular basis since the first document was produced in March 2009. The review process enables the Council to monitor any changes which have occurred and to determine if there is a need to identify new sites or re-assess existing sites in terms of suitability and deliverability. Currently there is still an insufficient amount of land available within the main urban areas of Ashfield to meet the housing requirement. Consequently, it has been necessary to undertake a comprehensive review of land availability.

1.4 As part of the SHLAA Review process, a call for sites was undertaken between October and December 2014. A newspaper advertisement was placed in the Ashfield Chad, Hucknall Dispatch, Alferton Chad and Eastwood and Kimberley Advertiser. This resulted in a further 11 new sites being submitted to the Nottingham Outer SHLAA. Existing SHLAA sites have also been reviewed to determine if any changes have occurred since the last review and to re-evaluate the deliverability of development.

## 1.5 Relationship to the Local Plan

The Hucknall SHLAA provides essential evidence for the preparation of Ashfield Local Plan. It is a technical evidence base for the identification of 'deliverable'<sup>1</sup> and 'developable'<sup>2</sup> sites, as set out in the NPPF, which could be used to help provide new housing over a period of at least 15 years. Sites which are deemed to be potentially suitable, available and deliverable or developable will be reviewed through the Local Plan process to ascertain their suitability for allocation. The assessment results of the SHLAA should not be viewed as implying that a site would be taken forward as a housing allocation in the Local Plan. Other evidence will be taken into consideration when determining the most suitable sites to be taken forward, for example the Sustainability Appraisal, Landscape Assessments and Green Belt Review (2015).

## 1.6 5 Year Supply of Deliverable Sites

One of the most important roles of the SHLAA is to determine if each Local Authority has a 5 year supply of deliverable sites for new housing. This process enables the Council to actively plan, monitor and manage housing supply to ensure that it can deliver a flexible supply of land for housing.

In order to be classed as 'deliverable' a site must be:

- Suitable – the site offers a suitable location for development which would contribute to the creation of sustainable, mixed communities;

---

<sup>1</sup> And <sup>5</sup> As defined by the National Planning Policy Framework

- Available – the site is available now;
- Achievable – there is a reasonable prospect that housing will be developed on the site at a particular point in time (within 5 years).

**1.7** Ashfield District’s 5 year housing land supply mainly consists of sites with planning permission. Following this SHLAA Review, it is apparent that the District does not have sufficient land available within the main urban area to meet the housing requirement. Consequently, as part of the Local Plan site selection process, it will be necessary to review SHLAA sites on the edge of the urban boundary in order to identify suitable sites to be taken forward as housing allocations in the Ashfield Local Plan.

**1.8** In some instances landowners with sites in suitable location (within the urban/settlement boundary) have informed the Council that their site will come forward within 5 years. The Council have therefore assumed that development is deliverable within 5 years. The National Planning Policy Framework sets out that:

“To be considered deliverable, sites should be available now, offer a suitable location for development now, and be achievable with a realistic prospect that housing will be delivered on the site within five years and in particular that development of the site is viable. Sites with planning permission should be considered deliverable until permission expires, unless there is clear evidence that schemes will not be implemented within five years, for example they will not be viable, there is no longer a demand for the type of units or sites have long term phasing plans.”

**1.9 Supply of Developable Sites in years 6 to 10 and 11 to 15**

The SHLAA also identifies a supply of developable sites for years 6 to 10 and, if possible a supply of sites for years 11 to 15. This has also been informed by contact with landowners.

The NPPF defines developable sites as follows:

*“To be considered developable, sites should be in a suitable location for housing development and there should be a reasonable prospect that the site is available and could be viably developed at a point envisaged.”*

**1.10 Sites with Policy Constraints**

Sites submitted to the Council which are outside the main urban boundary or named settlement boundary, and those which have other significant policy constraints have not been included in the housing trajectory as development would be contrary to planning policy. The Local Plan process will determine which of these sites are the most suitable to be taken forward as residential allocations.

## 2. National and Local Context

2.1. The National Planning Policy Framework indicates that, to boost significantly their supply of housing, Local Authorities should use their evidence base to ensure that their Local Plan meets the full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing in the housing market area, as far as is consistent with the policies set out in the NPPF, including identifying key sites which are critical to the delivery of the housing strategy over the plan period. The Nottingham Outer Strategic Housing Market Area Assessment (2015) identifies the full objectively assessed housing need for Ashfield. This equates to a requirement of 9120 houses (480 per annum) for the District for the period 2013 to 2032 i.e. the 15 year Plan period if the Local Plan was adopted in 2017. A net total of 1437 homes were delivered from 1/4/2013 to 31/3/2016, resulting in a requirement for 7683 new homes between 2016 and 2032. In terms of supply, there are a total of 7788 deliverable and developable dwellings (which includes sites with planning permission and sites without planning permission proposed for allocation) to 2032. Taking into consideration a windfall allowance, based on past delivery rates, a further 682 dwellings is anticipated to be delivered over the Plan period.

Table 3: Dwelling Requirement and Provision 2013-2032			Dwellings
REQUIREMENT	1	Dwelling Requirement 2013 to 2032 (GL Hearne OAN)	9,120
	2	Houses Developed 1/4/2013 to 31/3/2016 (including new build, Conversions & Change of Use)	1485
	3	Houses Demolished 1/4/2013 to 31/3/2016	48
	4	Houses needed to meet requirement, 1/4/2016 to 31/4/2032 (1 - 2 + 3)	<b>7,683</b>
SUPPLY	5	Houses deliverable on <b>small sites</b> , (including new build, net conversions and change of use) 1/4/2016 to 31/3/2032	
		a) With planning permission at 1st April 2016	273
		b) Demolitions and other losses with planning permission at 1st April 2016	0
		c) Deduction to account for potential lapsed permissions	-62
	6	Houses deliverable on <b>large sites</b> 1/4/2016 to 31/3/2032	
		a) With planning permission at 1st April 2016	2304
		b) Demolitions and other losses with planning permission at 1st April 2016	0
	c) Deduction to account for potential lapsed permissions	-54	
	c) estimated development from proposed site allocations	5327	
	7	Total houses deliverable 1/4/2016 to 31/3/2032 (5a-5b+5c+6a-6b)	<b>7788</b>
	8	Over provision 2016 to 2032	<b>105</b>
	9	Windfall allowance beyond 5 years - 1/4/2021 to 1/4/2032 (based on past delivery)	682
	10	<b>Total over provision 2016 to 2032</b>	<b>787</b>

**2.2.** The SHLAA is designed to be a continuous process of managing a supply of deliverable housing land. The NPPF requires local authorities to:

- “identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide five years-worth of housing against their housing requirements with an additional buffer of 5% (moved forward from later in the plan period) to ensure choice and competition in the market for land. Where there has been a record of persistent under delivery of housing, local planning authorities should increase the buffer to 20% (moved forward from later in the plan period) to provide a realistic prospect of achieving the planned supply and to ensure choice and competition in the market for land; and
- Identify a supply of specific, developable sites or broad locations for growth, for years 6-10 and, where possible, for years 11-15.”

**2.3** The SHLAA feeds in to the housing land monitoring report. It aims to inform in the following outputs:

1. The identification of a minimum of a 5 year supply of deliverable sites for each of the partner authorities.
2. The identification of a minimum of a 6 to 10 year supply of developable sites supported by identified barriers to delivery where it is known when these barriers can be mitigated.
3. The identification of an 11 to 15 year (or more) land supply of developable sites supported by identified barriers to delivery where it is known when these barriers can be mitigated. Alternatively, where a supply of developable sites up to 15 years cannot be identified broad locations for future growth will be identified.

The Housing Land Monitoring report contains full details of the housing land supply.

**2.4** It is difficult to estimate the timescale of sites which are contrary to policy because policy may change through the Local Plan process. Therefore a category, called ‘May be Suitable if Policy Changes/Mitigation’ has been created for sites where policy is a major constraint to development. The policies constraining sites in this tranche may be of the following nature:

- Green Belt
- Countryside
- Protected Existing Employment
- Employment Allocations
- Allotments
- Open Space
- Safeguarded Land
- Retail Allocations
- Mature Landscape Areas.

Sites assessed as ‘May be Suitable if Policy Changes/Mitigation’ would not necessarily become suitable at any point in the future. In many cases, sites of this nature may never be suitable.

### 3. The SHLAA Process

- 3.1** Site identification is the first stage of the SHLAA assessment. Some sites within and adjacent to the main urban areas have already been identified through the planning process. In addition, a call for sites was undertaken in July 2011 and October 2014. This involved an advertisement campaign and a mail out to property agents.
- 3.2** Based upon the guidance, the key stages of the SHLAA assessment, required to deliver the core outputs are as follows:
- Site Identification - Identify all sites from the full range of sources of housing potential across Ashfield District.
  - Estimating Potential - Undertake a robust analysis of the housing potential of each site identified using an approach consistent between partnering authorities as well as specific to local development conditions and housing needs.
  - Assessment of Deliverability and Developability - Assess each site identified against a range of criteria to determine when and whether sites are likely to be developed.
  - Identify and Overcome Barriers to Deliverability - Set out in the reporting process, key actions necessary to overcoming specific barriers to the deliverability of development on sites.
- 3.3** The Council will ensure that all new opportunities emerging from key sources are identified and assessed on a regular basis. Key sources of sites are listed in Section 4 of this document and in the methodology document.
- 3.4** In addition to these sources, the Council has a dedicated SHLAA website page which provides officer contact details for the development industry to submit sites to be included within the assessment as and when they are known. Clearly some of these sources can only be identified through physical site surveying, the use of aerial photography or OS maps at a local level.
- 3.5** Where information is held in an existing planning document or the site is already within the development process, the respective housing figure contained within the document or development scheme will be used to estimate the site's potential.
- 3.6** Where no information is held, an assumption has been made about the amount of housing that could be delivered on a site. This is based on past completions, of which the density details are contained within Policy HG3 of Ashfield Local Plan Review (2002). Infrastructure requirements have also been factored into the total housing figure.
- 3.7** Planning officers have completed an assessment of each site through a consistent deliverability and developability test<sup>3</sup> using a variety of information sources including a physical site survey. As part of this process Officers have liaised with the Highway Authority, the Council's Development Management team, Environmental Health team, Conservation Officer and Tree Officer and the Coal Authority and Network Rail. The Council has also liaised with land owners and agents regarding the availability and deliverability of sites submitted to ensure the assessment accurately reflects the status of each site.
- 3.8** As part of the assessment process, the Council consulted landowners and agents of sites submitted for consideration as residential allocations on the draft results of the SHLAA in April/May 2015. The Council were particularly keen to understand how landowners were looking to address physical constraints relating to access. As a result of this consultation the

---

<sup>3</sup> Details can be found in Appendix 1 of the Nottingham Outer SHLAA Methodology (July, 2008)

Council has been able to make a more informed judgement on the deliverability of development.

- 3.9** Planning Practice Guidance also stresses that a judgement should be made about the financial viability of a site and the capacity of the developer to complete and sell the housing constructed over a certain period. The Council commissioned Nationwide CIL Services to undertake a Local Plan & CIL Viability Assessment in December 2013. The Study undertook a comprehensive approach to viability, assessing the viability of individual residential development site set out in the Local Plan Submission Document. Based upon the methodology and assumptions with the Study, it concluded that only one site demonstrated significant negative viability in the 0-5 year delivery period. This study has now been updated (July 2016) and it indicates that all sites are viable.
- 3.10** In calculating the 5 year housing land supply the sites have been split into two categories, sites with planning permission and sites without planning permission. Sites with planning permission are considered deliverable and in the majority of cases a commencement date has been set within the first five year tranche. However, whilst there is no reason to believe that any specific permission may not be implemented, it is accepted that there will be a number which will never come to fruition. Therefore a discount rate has been applied based on past permission granted over the last 10 years. Details are included in the 2016 Housing Land Monitoring Report. With regard to the delivery timescale of sites without planning permission, the Council has made an informed decision based on dialogue with the landowner and through analysis of past completions.
- 3.11** Identifying and overcoming barriers to delivery is essentially the final stage of the annual SHLAA process and is designed to ensure the land supply of deliverable sites is maintained. The barriers to deliverability will be set out in the 'Overall Final Conclusion' in each individual site report.
- 3.12** Sites which do not adjoin the main urban area boundary or named settlement boundary have not been assessed. This approach accords with the assessment method set out in the Nottingham Core SHLAA Methodology (2008).
- 3.13** The land supply of deliverable and developable sites is included in and monitored through the Housing Land Monitoring process which feeds into the Annual Monitoring Report. Factors constraining the deliverability of developable sites are clearly identified and addressed on an annual basis to maintain the rolling 5 year land supply of deliverable sites.

### **Windfall Allowance**

- 3.14** The NPPF states that "Local planning authorities may make an allowance for windfall sites in the five-year supply if they have compelling evidence that such sites have consistently become available in the local area and will continue to provide a reliable source of supply. Any allowance should be realistic having regard to the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment, historic windfall delivery rates and expected future trends, and should not include residential gardens". The Council has analysed past windfall delivery and has concluded that it is appropriate to include a windfall allowance. Justification for this approach is included in the 2016 Housing Land Monitoring Report.

## 4. Key Sources

### Sites within the Planning Process

#### 4.1 Existing Housing Allocations

The table below includes sites allocated for housing in Ashfield Local Plan Review (2002) which have not yet been developed. Some sites have planning consent and development has either commenced or is due to commence. Some sites do not have planning consent but the landowner is still intending to bring development forward in the future. The land owners of all existing Housing Allocations without planning permission have been informed of the SHLAA process and have been invited to submit their sites. Two sites are no longer available for development due to landownership constraints.

Housing Allocations in Hucknall in Ashfield Local Plan Review (2002)		
SHLAA Site Reference	ALPR Ref. and Site Name	Current Status
H20	HG1Ho Papplewick Lane	The majority of the site has planning consent for development. A small area, owned by Ashfield District Council, does not currently have planning consent. Whilst the site is available the site cannot currently be accessed from the highway. It will form part of the latter phase of the larger development.
H24	HG1Hp Linby Road former allotments	The site does not have planning consent for residential development. It is in multiple ownership and there are access constraints which require third party land. Development is not deliverable in the short term but it may come forward in the longer term if land ownership constraints can be overcome.
H49	HG1Hb Broomhill Farm	Part of the site has full planning consent for 141 dwellings and development has commenced. The remaining land (7.1Ha) does not have planning consent but it is still available and development is deliverable.
H91	HG1Hh Brickyard	Whilst the landowner has indicated that site is available, development is significantly constrained by poor access to the public highway. Access would be via a level crossing. Network Rail has indicated that a large development would require the installation of a bridge. This would impact on the viability of any future scheme. It is unclear if this constraint could be mitigated.
H97	HG1He High Leys Road	Part of the site has now been developed. The majority of the remaining land is available (submitted by landowners) but there are access constraints which may affect the timescale for delivery of development. However landownership details are not available for a small part of the site.
N/A	HG1Hj Garden Road	The site has full planning consent and development is almost complete.

Table 4. Ashfield Local Plan Review (2002) Housing Allocations

#### 4.2 Existing Employment Allocations

Following a review of employment land allocations, through the ADC Employment Land Forecast, the recommendation is to retain the majority of sites allocated for employment use in the Ashfield Local Plan Review (2002). Where a site may potentially be suitable, employment allocations submitted for consideration will be assessed as 'May be suitable subject to policy change/mitigation'. Some sites allocated for employment have already been lost to housing development. Details of sites are set out below in Table 4.

SHLAA Site Reference	ALPR Employment Allocation Ref. and Site Name	Current Status
H5	EM1Ha Rolls Royce	The site has outline planning consent for 900 dwellings.
H7	EM1Hg Wigwam Lane Central	The site has been submitted for consideration for housing development. It is assessed as 'Could be suitable if policy changes'. Whilst the landowner has indicated that site is available, development is significantly constrained by poor access to the public highway. Access would be via a level crossing. Network Rail has indicated that a large development would require the installation of a bridge. This would impact on the viability of any future scheme. It is unclear if this constraint could be mitigated.
H80	EM1Hd Land adjacent to Hucknall Football Club, Watnall Road	The site has been submitted for consideration for housing development. It is assessed as 'Could be suitable if policy changes'.
H100	EM1Hj Annesley Road/A611	The site has been submitted for consideration for housing development. It is assessed as 'Could be suitable if policy changes'.
N/A	EM1Hk Daniels Way, Hucknall	The site has outline planning consent for 50 dwellings

Table 5. Ashfield Local Plan Review (2002) Employment Allocations

#### 4.3 Other Land Allocations

A desktop review of all other existing land allocations has been undertaken to try to identify suitable sites. No sites were identified or submitted to the SHLAA process.

#### 4.4 Green Spaces

A small number of allocated green spaces have been submitted to the SHLAA process. Such sites have been assessed as 'May be suitable subject to policy change/mitigation' where there are no other constraints which would render them unsuitable. This does not necessarily mean that the sites are suitable or would be suitable in the future. Policy decisions need to be made based on need i.e. there may be an over or under provision of open space within an area. This is something that would need further consideration through the site selection process.

Open areas are informal green space which in the majority of cases are not used for recreational activities. The purpose of an open area is to maintain an open break between settlements. Sites have been assessed as 'May be suitable subject to policy change/mitigation' as this policy will need to be reviewed on a site by site basis through the Local Plan process.

SHLAA Site Reference	ALPR Recreation Space Ref. and Site Name	Designated type of recreation space	Current Status
H48	RC5Ha Ruffs Farm Allotments	Allotments	Allotments (disused)
H80	RC3HI Hucknall Town Football Club, Watnall Road	Formal Open Space	Formal Open Space

**Table 6. Ashfield Local Plan Review (2002) Designated recreation space**

#### **4.5 Sites with planning permission for development which have not been started**

An assumption has been made, based on the definition of deliverable development, set out in the NPPF, that the majority of sites with planning permission will commence development within the next 5 years.

#### **Sites Not in the Planning Process**

#### **4.6 Sites submitted by landowners, agents, and other interested parties**

A large number of sites have been submitted to the SHLAA process by landowners, agents and developers. The majority of these sites currently have policy constraints and are considered unsuitable on that basis. These sites will need to be reviewed through the Local Plan process to determine which sites are the most suitable to be taken forward as allocations in the Ashfield Local Plan.

## 5. Gypsy and Traveller Sites

- 5.1 In March 2012, the Government published the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (PPTS). The NPPF says, “To deliver a wide choice of high quality homes, widen opportunities for home ownership and create sustainable, inclusive and mixed communities, local planning authorities should plan for a mix of housing based on current and future demographic trends, market trends and the needs of different groups in the community”.
- 5.2 Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (PPTS) also requires us to:
- assess the need for Traveller accommodation in our District
  - set targets in our Local Plan for meeting the identified need
  - identify deliverable sites to provide five years’ worth of accommodation against our target, and
  - identify developable sites or broad locations for the next six to ten years and where possible 11-15 years to meet the need.
- 5.3 PPTS identifies that, if we cannot show five years’ worth of deliverable sites against our target, we need to give this significant weight in favour of granting temporary planning permission for Traveller accommodation. This is also likely to be a consideration in favour of granting planning permission for Traveller accommodation.
- 5.4 The need for Traveller accommodation in the District is set out in the Ashfield Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessment (TAA), October 2015. In view of the need to plan for the future needs of different groups in the community, and the requirements of PPTS to assess and plan to meet our need for Traveller accommodation, we have now included Traveller site assessments within the SHLAA alongside those for settled housing sites.
- 5.5 Whilst we have to plan for our traveller accommodation needs, PPTS says that in doing this we need to protect local amenity, the environment and the Green Belt from inappropriate development.
- 5.6 A ‘Call for Sites’ invited submissions for sites to be considered for Gypsy and Traveller use in March-April 2014. Four sites were submitted but none of them were within the Hucknall area. The SHLAA for the north Ashfield areas contains details of sites submitted for consideration.

## **6. Annual Update**

### **Five Year Supply of Deliverable Sites**

- 6.1 The results from the SHLAA feed in to the Housing Land Monitoring Report which provides details in relation to the 5 year housing land supply in Ashfield district. This process enables the Council to actively plan, monitor and manage housing supply to ensure that it can deliver a flexible supply of land for housing. Ashfield District's 5 year land supply mainly consists of sites with planning permission.
- 6.2 With regard to sites with planning permission, the base date for monitoring completions and commitments is 1<sup>st</sup> April. The five year land supply runs from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2016 to 31<sup>st</sup> March 2021. This is based on known completions data at 1<sup>st</sup> April 2016.
- 6.3 Following the completion of the 2016 Housing Land Monitoring Report, it is apparent that the District has sufficient land available within the urban area to meet the housing requirement for the next 5 years. Tables 2 set out the Council's position with regard to the 5 year housing land supply.

### **Supply of Developable Sites Years 6-10 and 11+**

- 6.4 The NPPF also indicates that Local Planning Authorities should identify specific developable sites for years 6-10 and where possible for years 11 to 15. The Housing Land Monitoring Report contains details of land availability for years 6 to 15.
- 6.5 Through the housing monitoring process it is apparent that there is not enough land available within the main urban area or named settlements for the 15 year plan period. Consequently, as part of the Local Plan site allocation process, it has been necessary to consider sites submitted to the SHLAA process which have been assessed as 'May be suitable if policy changes' in order to identify sites to be taken forward as housing allocations.
- 6.6 Section 8 of this report provides details of the sites submitted for consideration for housing in the emerging Local Plan. Whilst the SHLAA site assessments provide details of the suitability and deliverability of sites, they do not make a recommendation about which sites are the most suitable to be taken forward as housing allocations. The Site Selection Technical Paper (2016) provides details of the approach taken to the allocation of sites. As part of the site selection process, account has been taken of evidence in the Sustainability Appraisal, Landscape Assessments and Green Belt Review (2015) and other relevant background evidence.

### **Additional buffers and historic completions**

- 6.7 An additional 5% buffer (moved from later in the plan period) has been applied to ensure choice and competition in the market, consistent with the requirements of the NPPF. Where local authorities have a record of persistent under delivery, this buffer should increase to 20%. The Council has assessed past housing delivery against housing requirement. It is evident that past performance cannot be described as 'persistent under delivery'. Justification for this approach is included in the Housing Land Monitoring Report (2016).
- 6.8 Keeping the overall assessment up to date is a continuous process. The key objective of the SHLAA Review is to monitor the progress of sites through the planning and development process and changes in circumstances regarding any deliverability constraints.

## 7. Deliverability Assessment

### 5 Year Supply of Deliverable Housing Sites

7.1 Paragraph 47 of the NPPF defines deliverable development:

“To be considered deliverable, sites should be available now, offer a suitable location for development now, and be achievable with a realistic prospect that housing will be delivered on the site within five years and in particular that development of the site is viable. Sites with planning permission should be considered deliverable until permission expires, unless there is clear evidence that schemes will not be implemented within five years, for example they will not be viable, there is no longer a demand for the type of units or sites have long term phasing plans.”

7.2 As part of the SHLAA process, land owners, agents and developers have completed a SHLAA submission form which sets out in detail the constraints of development and the timescale for the delivery of development. The form specifically asks whether the site is constrained by:

- Landownership issues;
- Legal issues; or
- Physical constraints.

7.3 As part of the SHLAA process, the landowners, agents and/or developers of sites were asked about the deliverability of development on their site. The information received has helped to inform the timeframe for delivery of development on each site. Where sites have no significant policy or physical constraints, they have been included in the 0 to 5 year category of deliverable sites. Where information is available to suggest that a site may not be deliverable within the first 5 years, sites have been moved to a more realistic timescale or have been removed if necessary, taking into consideration the constraints.

7.4 The Council commissioned Nationwide CIL Services to undertake a Local Plan and CIL Viability Assessment in December 2013. The Study undertook a comprehensive approach to viability, assessing the viability of individual residential development site set out in the Local Plan Submission Document. Based upon the methodology and assumptions with the Study, it concluded that only one site demonstrated significant negative viability in the 0-5 year delivery period. Given the range of sites covered by the Study it is considered that all sites put forward within Ashfield are viable unless it has been identified that there are significant abnormal costs identified with the site in question.

#### 7.5 Supply of Developable Sites for 6-10 Year and 11+ year

Where there is evidence to suggest that a site will not or cannot be delivered within the first 5 years of the Local Plan, sites have been placed in the 6 to 10 year or the 11 to 15 year timeframe unless the evidence specifically indicates that development could not be delivered on the site.

## 8. Sites Assessment Results

8.1 Table 6 sets out the site reference number for each site submitted to the SHLAA process. Site assessment reports are included in the Appendices. All sites included in Table 6 have been taken through the SHLAA process. The majority of the sites submitted are not currently suitable for development due to policy constraints mainly relating to Green Belt policy.

SHLAA Ref.	Site Name
H1	Land North of Wood Lane
H2	Land off Common Lane, Hucknall
H3	Land off Badger Close, Hucknall
H4	Off Watnall Road, Hucknall
H5	Rolls Royce, Watnall Road
H6	Linby Boarding Kennels, Church Lane, Hucknall
H7	Brickyard
H8	Mill Lane, Bestwood/Hucknall
H9	Land Behind 224 Nottingham Road
H10	Butlers Hill
H11	Land off Nottingham Road, Hucknall
H12	Land Off Charnwood Grove
H13	Whyburn Farm
H14	Land at Forest View Drive, Hucknall
H15	Westholme, Forest View Drive, Wood Lane, Hucknall
H16	Land at Forest View Drive, Hucknall
H17	Lynwood, Forest View Drive, Hucknall
H19	Land off Moor Road, Bestwood
H20	Land South of Papplewick Lane
H22	Land at Nottingham Road
H23	Rear of 92-96 Papplewick Lane
H24	Linby Road Allotments
H25	Land off Nottingham Road, Hucknall
H31	F. J. Bamkin, King Edward Street
H48	Ruffs Farm, Watnall Road
H49	Broomhill Farm
H51	Land to the rear of 220 Nottingham Road
H52	Land to the rear of 222 Nottingham Road
H80	Hucknall Town Football Club, Watnall Road
H81	Land adjacent to A611, Hucknall
H82	Land at 450 Moor Road, Bestwood
H83	Land off Wood Lane, Hucknall
H88	Land off Bolsover Street
H89	Land at Forest View Drive
H90	Grange Farm, Moor Road
H91	Land off The Limes, Brickyard
H97	High Leys Road
H98	Seven Stars Public House, West Street, Hucknall
H99	Farley's Lane, Hucknall
H100	Annesley Road, Hucknall
H106	Farley's Lane, Hucknall

Table 7: Sites submitted to the SHLAA process

8.2 The 2016 Ashfield District Housing Land Monitoring Report contains full details of the housing trajectory for the District. This includes sites with planning permission and sites submitted to the Council for consideration as housing allocations through the SHLAA process which are within the urban area with no major policy or physical constraints. NB. This does not include site allocations included in the emerging Local Plan Preferred Approach.

**8.3 Sites submitted to SHLAA process which are proposed housing allocations**

There are a number of sites without planning consent which have been assessed as being suitable for allocation. These sites have been included in the housing trajectory.

Proposed Site Allocations				
SHLAA Ref.	Site Location	Policy considerations	Greenfield/Brownfield	Approx. Yield (dwellings)
H20	Land south of Papplewick Lane, Hucknall	Housing allocation. Principle of development has been established.	Greenfield	26
H31	Former Bamkin factory site	Site located within main urban area where the principle of development has been established. Lapsed planning consent for residential development.	Brownfield	14
H48	Ruffs Farm, Watnall Road	Allotment site with no statutory protection. Not in use as an allotment site for over 8 years.	Greenfield	10
H49	Broomhill Farm, Nottingham Road	Housing allocation. Principle of development has been established.	Greenfield	151
H80	Hucknall Town Football Club, Watnall Road	Site located within main urban area where the principle of development has been established. Lapsed planning consent for residential development.	Brownfield/Greenfield	108
H88	Land off Bolsover Street, Hucknall	Site located within main urban area where the principle of development has been established. Potential loss of an employment site.	Brownfield	16
H97	High Leys Road, Hucknall	Housing allocation. Principle of development has been established.	Greenfield	10
H98	Seven Stars Public House and land adjoining West Street and Ogle Street	Site located within main urban area where the principle of development has been established.	Brownfield/Greenfield	25
H100	Lands adjacent to Arrows Centre, Annesley Road, Hucknall	Site located within main urban area where the principle of development has been established. Site allocated for employment use. It has been marketed for a prolonged period.	Greenfield	60

H9, H51, H52, H81, H99, H106	South of Broomhill Farm/North of A611, Hucknall	Green Belt	Greenfield	480
<b>TOTAL DWELLINGS</b>				<b>900</b>

**Table 8. Proposed Housing Allocations**

8.4 Table 9 includes sites with minor policy constraints but with severe physical constraints.

<b>Sites with Minor Policy Constraints and Major Physical constraints</b>					
<b>SHLAA Ref.</b>	<b>Site Location</b>	<b>Policy/ Physical constraint</b>	<b>Greenfield/B rownfield</b>	<b>Area (Ha)</b>	<b>Approx Yield (dwellings)</b>
H24	Linby Road Former Allotments	Significant access constraints. Third party land required for access and site in multiple ownership (some unknown)	G	0.7	20
H91	Brickyard	Significant access constraints (currently only accessible via a level crossing). Network Rail has indicated that they would not support development unless a bridge was incorporated in the scheme.	G	0.7	20
<b>TOTAL DWELLINGS</b>					<b>40</b>

**Table 9. Site with minor policy constraints but with severe physical constraints**

8.6 Table 10 includes sites with major policy constraints and with physical constraints.

<b>Sites with Major Policy and/or Physical constraints</b>					
<b>SHLAA Ref.</b>	<b>Site Location</b>	<b>Policy/ Physical constraint</b>	<b>Greenfield/B rownfield</b>	<b>Area (Ha)</b>	<b>Approx Yield (dwellings)</b>
H1	Land North of Wood Lane	Green Belt, significant	G	0.5	16

		access constraints			
H2	Land off Common Lane, Hucknall	Green Belt	G	30	150
H3	Land off Badger Close, Hucknall	Green Belt, significant access constraints	G	3.6	81
H4	Off Watnall Road, Hucknall	Green Belt	G	8.7	197
H12	Land Off Charnwood Grove	Green Belt	G	3	107
H13	Whyburn Farm	Green Belt	G	229	4500
H14	Land at Forest View Drive, Hucknall	Green Belt, significant access constraints	G	0.3	10
H15	Westholme, Forest View Drive, Wood Lane, Hucknall	Green Belt, significant access constraints	G	1.9	64
H16	Land at Forest View Drive, Hucknall	Green Belt, significant access constraints	G	0.07	2
H17	Lynwood, Forest View Drive, Hucknall	Green Belt, significant access constraints	G/B	0.2	7
H83	Land off Wood Lane, Hucknall	Green Belt, significant access constraints	G	1.9	56
<b>TOTAL DWELLINGS</b>					<b>5190</b>

**Table 10. Sites constrained by planning policy**

### 8.8 Unsuitable sites

Table 11 includes sites assessed as being unsuitable and/or undeliverable. This category includes sites within floodzones 2 and 3 (where any part of the site is within the floodzone), sites designated as formal open spaces, and sites designated as Local Wildlife Sites. There are also a small number of sites with other constraints. The reasoned justification provides a brief summary of the reason why the site is considered to be unsuitable.

Unsuitable sites				
SHLAA Ref.	Site Location	Policy constraint	Greenfield/Brownfield	Reasoned Justification
H6	Linby Boarding Kennels, Church Lane, Hucknall	Green Belt	G/B	This site is available. However the site's suitability is constrained by its Green Belt status and its achievability is influenced by the need for access upgrades. Development of the site would, in effect, merge Hucknall with Linby. It is

				therefore considered to be unsuitable for residential development.
H7	Brickyard	Employment allocation	G	The site is allocated for an Employment and residential development is contrary to planning policy. It is also constrained by its adjacency to a Cement Plant and Industrial Estate, whilst achievability is severely constrained by poor access (via a level crossing) with very limited opportunity for mitigation. The highway would require major improvement works as part of any future development. Part of the site is within Floodzone 3 and Floodzone 2. The NPPF indicates that development should be directed away from areas at highest risk. Ashfield's SFRA report recommends that sites should not be allocated in areas of highest flood risk. Consequently, the sequential test and exceptions test (as defined by the NPPF) would need to be passed prior to the site being considered suitable for allocation.
H8	Mill Lane, Bestwood/Hucknall	Green Belt, NPPF Part 10 in relation to flooding	G	This site is available. However the site's suitability is constrained by its Green Belt status. The EA Flood Map indicates that the whole site is within Floodzone 2. Ashfield's SFRA indicates that sites in Floodzones 2 and 3 should not be allocated. The NPPF indicates that development should be directed away from areas at highest risk. Ashfield's SFRA report recommends that sites should not be allocated

				in areas of highest flood risk. Consequently, the sequential test and exceptions test (as defined by the NPPF) would need to be passed prior to the site being considered suitable for allocation.
H10	Butlers Hill	Poor access and bad neighbours.	G	This site is available. However the site's suitability is constrained by poor neighbouring uses (waste disposal unit). Additionally the site's achievability is severely compromised by poor access with no apparent mitigation. The site could only be accessed via an industrial estate or a level crossing.
H11 (H11 has been extended to include SHLAA site H18 and adjoining land to the north of the site)	Land off Nottingham Road, Hucknall	Green Belt, NPPF Part 10 in relation to flooding	G	This site is available. However, the site is unsuitable for development because it would unacceptably close the gap between Bulwell and Hucknall, and would require removal of its Green Belt status. There is also an issue relating to flood risk; the Environment Agency's flood zone maps show the site to be in Flood Zone 3. The NPPF indicates that development should be directed away from areas at highest risk. Ashfield's SFRA report recommends that sites should not be allocated in areas of highest flood risk. Consequently, the sequential test and exceptions test (as defined by the NPPF) would need to be passed prior to the site being considered suitable for allocation. With regard to highway issues, extensive infrastructure works to

				the bypass would be required to provide suitable access.
H22	Land at Nottingham Road	Parts of the site are not available	G	This site is potentially suitable, as it falls within the Hucknall Main Urban Area. However, development is severely constrained by landownership issues. Development is not currently deliverable as some landowners are opposed to releasing their land for development. Therefore, there is uncertainty regarding the developability of the site due to land ownership constraints.
H82	Land at 450 Moor Road, Bestwood	Green Belt, NPPF Part 10 in relation to flooding	G	The site is designated Green Belt land and is partly within flood zone 2 and 3. The National Planning Policy Framework indicates that development should be directed away from areas at highest risk. Ashfield's SFRA report recommends that sites should not be allocated in areas of highest flood risk. Consequently, the sequential test and exceptions test (as defined by the NPPF) would need to be passed prior to the site being considered suitable for allocation. As such, is unsuitable for development.

**Table 11. Unsuitable sites**

### 8.6 Excluded sites

Table 12 provides details of the sites which have been excluded from the assessment due to the fact that they do not adjoin a settlement boundary i.e. isolated sites. This approach complies with the Nottingham Core Methodology (2008).

Excluded sites				
SHLAA Ref.	Site Location	Policy constraint	Greenfield/Brownfield	Reasoned Justification
H19	Land off Moor Road, Bestwood	Green Belt	G	This site is available. However the site's

				<p>suitability is constrained by its Green Belt status. The site does not adjoin the main urban area and is therefore unsuitable. The site is also in floodzone 2. Consequently allocation of the site would be contrary to the NPPF and recommendations of the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

**Table 12. Excluded sites**

## 9. Housing Trajectory

### Hucknall Housing Sites: Projected Delivery Rates

Local Plan Ref	Planning Application Ref	SHLAA Site Ref	Site Name	Dwellings at 1st April 2016	Current Year 16/17	Year 2 17/18	Year 3 18/19	Year 4 19/20	Year 5 20/21	Year 6 21/22	Year 7 22/23	Year 8 23/24	Year 9 24/25	Year 10 25/26	Year 11 26/27	Year 12 27/28	Year 13 28/29	Year 14 29/30	Year 15 30/31	Year 16 31/32
----------------	--------------------------	----------------	-----------	-----------------------------	--------------------	--------------	--------------	--------------	--------------	--------------	--------------	--------------	--------------	---------------	---------------	---------------	---------------	---------------	---------------	---------------

### Allocations without Planning Permission

HA3a		9, 51, 52, 81, 99	Land South of Broomhill Farm/north of A611	480					70	70	70	70	70	70	60					
HA3b		20	Land South of Papplewick Lane	26											26					
HA3c		31	Former Bamkin factory site	14				14												
HA3d		48	Ruffs farm, Watnall Road	10						10										
HA3e		49	Broomhill Farm, Nottingham Road	151			35	35	35	35	11									
HA3f		88	Land at Bolsover Street	16					16											
HA3g		97	High Leys Road	10						10										
HA3h		98	Seven Stars Public House and adjoining land, West Street	25				25												
HA3i		100	Land adj. Arrows Centre A611/Annesley Road	60				35	25											
HA3MU		80	Hucknall Town Football Club, Watnall Road	108								35	35	35	3					
<b>Total Allocations without Planning Permission</b>				<b>900</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>146</b>	<b>125</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

### Allocations with Outline Planning Permission

HA3t (part)	V/2013/0123	H0265/5	Rolls Royce, Watnall Road	630			27	70	70	70	70	70	70	70	70	43				
HA3j	V/2014/0590		Daniels Way	50				35	15											
<b>Total Allocations with Outline Permission</b>				<b>680</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

**Allocations with Full Planning Permission**

<b>HA3k</b>	V/2014/0443 V/2015/0086	H0260/ 25	100 nottingham road	<b>37</b>				37											
<b>HA3l</b>	V/2007/0518, V/2007/0519, V/2008/0166, V/2008/0272, V/2008/0557, V/2010/0351, V/2013/0070, V/2013/0071, V/2014/0350																		
		H0133	Land off Papplewick Lane	<b>110</b>	70	40													
<b>HA3o</b>	V/2008/0783, V/2014/0429	H0200	135-137 Beardall Street Hucknall	<b>14</b>	14														
<b>HA3p</b>	V/2011/0188, V/2014/0631	H0238	Grange farm, moor road	<b>14</b>				14											
<b>HA3q</b>	V/2013/0409		Broomhill farm, west of Nottingham Road	<b>90</b>	35	35	20												
<b>HA3s</b>	V/2014/0432		The Harrier, Christchurch Road	<b>10</b>			5	5											
<b>HA3t (part)</b>	V/2014/0652	H0265/ 5	Rolls Royce, Watnall Road	<b>171</b>	56	48	48	19											
<b>HA3t (part)</b>	V/2015/0267	H0265/ 5	Rolls Royce, Watnall Road	<b>99</b>	30	36	33												
<b>HA3u</b>	V/2015/0444		Lingford Street	<b>33</b>			33												
<b>Total Allocations with Full Permission</b>				<b>578</b>	<b>205</b>	<b>159</b>	<b>190</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>0</b>										

<b>All allocated sites</b>	<b>2158</b>	<b>205</b>	<b>159</b>	<b>252</b>	<b>238</b>	<b>231</b>	<b>195</b>	<b>151</b>	<b>175</b>	<b>175</b>	<b>175</b>	<b>159</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
----------------------------	-------------	------------	------------	------------	------------	------------	------------	------------	------------	------------	------------	------------	-----------	----------	----------	----------	----------

<b>All small sites with Full Permission</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>0</b>											
---	-----------	-----------	----------	-----------	-----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------

<b>All Small sites with Outline Permission</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>0</b>											
--	-----------	----------	----------	----------	-----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------

<b>ALL HUCKNALL SITES</b>	<b>2242</b>	<b>219</b>	<b>161</b>	<b>288</b>	<b>270</b>	<b>231</b>	<b>195</b>	<b>151</b>	<b>175</b>	<b>175</b>	<b>175</b>	<b>159</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
---------------------------	-------------	------------	------------	------------	------------	------------	------------	------------	------------	------------	------------	------------	-----------	----------	----------	----------	----------

**Sutton/Kirkby Housing Sites: Projected Delivery Rates**

Local Plan Ref	Planning Application Ref	SHLAA Site Ref	Site Name	Dwellings at 1st April 2016	Current Year 16/17	Year 2 17/18	Year 3 18/19	Year 4 19/20	Year 5 20/21	Year 6 21/22	Year 7 22/23	Year 8 23/24	Year 9 24/25	Year 10 25/26	Year 11 26/27	Year 12 27/28	Year 13 28/29	Year 14 29/30	Year 15 30/31	Year 16 31/32
<b>Allocations without Planning Permission</b>																				
SKA3a		SM44	North of Kingsmill Hospital	250				35	35	35	35	35	35	35	5					
SKA3b		S47	Blackwell Road, Huthwaite	65				35	30											
SKA3c		S55	Ashland Road West	235		25	35	35	35	35	35									
SKA3d		S108, S350, S51, S61	Clegg Hill Drive, Huthwaite	100				35	35	30										
SKA3e		S60	Newark Road/Coxmoor Road	266						35	35	35	35	35	35	35	21			
SKA3f	lapsed outline V/2009/0559	S0422 S66	Land at priestic Road/Northern View	24											24					
SKA3g		S72 & S351	Rookery Farm, Alfreton Road, Sutton	184							35	35	35	35	35	9				
SKA3h		S68, S71 & S337	Beck Lane, Skegby	400				30	60	60	60	60	60	60	10					
SKA3i		S83	Clare Road, Sutton	50				35	15											
SKA3j		S93	Fisher Close/Stanton Crescent, Skegby	100					35	35	30									
SKA3k		S94	Hilltop Farm, Skegby	20						10	10									
SKA3l		S112 & S316	Alfreton Road, Sutton	117							35	35	35	12						
SKA3m		S114	The Avenue, Sutton in Ashfield	15											15					
SKA3n		S320	Quantum Clothing North St Huthwaite	90			35	35	20											
SKA3o		S374	Brand Lane, Stanton Hill	216				35	35	35	35	35	35	6						
SKA3p		SM378	Cauldwell Road, Mansfield	207					35	35	35	35	35	32						
SKA3q		S379	Land off Common Road	20				20												
SKA3r		S407	Former Social Club, Davies Avenue	19			19													
SKA3u	V/2008/0655	S0390 1/92	Land at Cross Row / Brand Lane, Stanton Hill	12				12												
SKA3ah		K23, K33	East of Sutton Parkway Station, Lowmoor Road, Kirkby in Ashfield	495						80	80	80	80	80	80	15				

SKA3ai		K28	Wheatley's Yard, Lowmoor rd	62					35	27											
SKA3aj		K406	Warwick Close, Kirkby	24			24														
SKA3ak		K37, K318	Land between 118 and 128 and rear 130 Skegby Road, Annesley	23				23													
SKA3al		K79	Mowlands, Kirkby	900					80	80	80	80	80	80	80	80	80	80			
SKA3am		K333	Kirkby House, Kirkby House Drive, Kirkby in Ashfield	16			16														
SKA3an (part)		K334 K359	Laburnum Ave, Kirkby	24				24													
SKA3ao		K325	Walesby Road, Kirkby	150			35	35	35	35	10										
SKA3ap		K404	former allotments land at Diamond Ave	67			35	32													
<b>Total Allocations without Planning Permission</b>				<b>4151</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>113</b>	<b>393</b>	<b>449</b>	<b>540</b>	<b>567</b>	<b>475</b>	<b>430</b>	<b>375</b>	<b>284</b>	<b>139</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>80</b>	
<b>Allocations with Outline Planning Permission</b>																					
SKA3v	V/2011/0503	S0498	land off Gillicroft street/St Andrews Street & Vere Avenue, Skegby	180			70	70	40												
SKA3x	V/2013/0094		land at Unwin Road (co-op site)	18				18													
SKA3y	V/2012/0566		between pleasley road/mansfield road	37				35	2												
SKA3z	V/2013/0647		land at 57 stoneyford road	50				35	15												
SKA3ac	V/2013/0550		rear of 249-251 Alfreton Road, sutton	102				35	35	32											
SKA3ad	V/2014/0175	S0334	Off High Hazels Drive	22				22													
SKA3an (part)	V/2015/0066		Corner of Laburnum Avenue, Kirkby	7				5	2												
SKA3aq	V/2014/0661		Charles Trent Ltd, Sidings road, Kirkby	81				35	35	11											
SKA3ar	V/2014/0530		off Southwell Lane, Kirkby	60				35	25												
SKA3as	V/2009/0382	K0196	Studfold Farm Land to the North of Lindleys Lane Kirkby In Ashfield	3				3													
<b>Total Allocations with Outline Permission</b>				<b>560</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>293</b>	<b>154</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>						

**Allocations with Full Planning Permission**

SKA3s	V/2008/0663 V/2012/0043	S0243	Station House, Outram Street	28	28														
SKA3t	V/2009/0295, V/2014/0543	S0329	Former Courtaulds Factory, Unwin Road	30	30														
SKA3as (part)	V/2008/0113	K0109	Land at Studfold Farm Lindley's Lane, Kirkby-in-Ashfield	36	35	1													
SKA3at (part)	V/2011/0184	K0167	Annesley Colliery Newstead Road	1	1														
SKA3aw	V/2014/0239		Former larwood nursing home, main Road,	10	5	5													
SKA3au	V/2013/0656	K0227	land east of Sutton Road and South of Kings Mill Road (Larwood)	188	35	35	35	35	35	13									
SKA3at (part)	V/2010/0433 V/2014/0090	K0322	Annesley Colliery Newstead Road	53	35	18													
SKA3aa	V/2012/0297		off mansfield road/Unwin Road (north of coutaulds site)	50			35	15											
SKA3ae	V/2014/0208		Adj bluebell PH, Carsic Lane	11			11												
SKA3ag	V/2014/0565		Royal Forester's PH, Coronation Street	14			14												
<b>Total Allocations with Full Permission</b>				<b>421</b>	<b>169</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>128</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>0</b>								

<b>All allocated sites</b>	<b>5132</b>	<b>169</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>278</b>	<b>736</b>	<b>638</b>	<b>596</b>	<b>567</b>	<b>475</b>	<b>430</b>	<b>375</b>	<b>284</b>	<b>139</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>80</b>
<b>All small sites with Full Permission</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>								
<b>All small sites with Outline Permission</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>							
<b>ALL SUTTON/KIRKBY SITES</b>	<b>5275</b>	<b>195</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>347</b>	<b>779</b>	<b>639</b>	<b>596</b>	<b>567</b>	<b>475</b>	<b>430</b>	<b>375</b>	<b>284</b>	<b>139</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>80</b>

Rurals Housing Sites: Projected Delivery Rates

Local Plan Ref	Planning Application Ref	SHLAAS Site Ref	Site Name	Dwellings at 1st April 2016	Current Year 16/17	Year 2 17/18	Year 3 18/19	Year 4 19/20	Year 5 20/21	Year 6 21/22	Year 7 22/23	Year 8 23/24	Year 9 24/25	Year 10 25/26	Year 11 26/27	Year 12 27/28	Year 13 28/29	Year 14 29/30	Year 15 30/31	Year 16 31/32
----------------	--------------------------	-----------------	-----------	-----------------------------	--------------------	--------------	--------------	--------------	--------------	--------------	--------------	--------------	--------------	---------------	---------------	---------------	---------------	---------------	---------------	---------------

**Allocations without Planning Permission**

RA2a		V15, V16 & V17	Land to the rear of 64-84 Church Lane, Underwood	21					21											
RA2b		V141	Land off Westdale Road, Jacksdale	15					15											
RA2c		V140	Land off Westdale Road, Jacksdale	60				35	25											
RA2d		V84, V87	Park Lane, Selston	110				35	35	35	5									
RA2e		V346, V347, V349	Land rear of the Bull & Butcher PH, Selston	137					35	35	35	32								
<b>Total Allocations without Planning Permission</b>				<b>343</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>0</b>							

**Allocations with Full Planning Permission**

RA2f	V/2014/0035	R0	Former Brick & Tile PH, Palmerston Street, Underwood	15	15																
<b>Total Allocations with Full Permission</b>				<b>15</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>0</b>															

<b>All allocated sites</b>				<b>358</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>0</b>								
<b>All small sites with Full Permission</b>				<b>39</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>All small sites with Outline Permission</b>				<b>7</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>ALL RURALS SITES</b>				<b>404</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>133</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>0</b>								

### District Housing Sites Summary: Projected Delivery Rates

	Dwellings at 1st April 2016	Current Year 16/17	Year 2 17/18	Year 3 18/19	Year 4 19/20	Year 5 20/21	Year 6 21/22	Year 7 22/23	Year 8 23/24	Year 9 24/25	Year 10 25/26	Year 11 26/27	Year 12 27/28	Year 13 28/29	Year 14 29/30	Year 15 30/31	Year 16 31/32
All allocated sites	7648	389	243	530	1044	1000	861	758	682	605	550	443	182	101	80	80	80
						3206											
All small sites with Full Permission	213	48	6	132	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
						213											
All small sites with Outline Permission	60	0	0	0	57	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
						60											
ALL DISTRICT SITES	7921	437	249	662	1128	1003	861	758	682	605	550	443	182	101	80	80	80
						3479											



## **Appendix 1: Site Reports**

N.B. Due to the large quantity of sites, reports are available to view in a separate document on the Council's website.

## Appendix 2: Local Authority Contact Details

Local Authority	Contact	Telephone	E-mail
Ashfield District Council	Debbie Broad	01623 457382	<a href="mailto:d.broad@ashfield-dc.gov.uk">d.broad@ashfield-dc.gov.uk</a>
Ashfield District Council	Lisa Furness	01623 457382	<a href="mailto:l.furness@ashfield-dc.gov.uk">l.furness@ashfield-dc.gov.uk</a>

## Appendix 3: Accessibility Analysis

### Introduction

This appendix gives details of the datasets and the accessibility modelling procedures used to score and rank each identified housing site in the site suitability assessment process.

### Background to the choice of destinations/services used in the assessment process

Research undertaken by Rural Innovation & Community Futures for Lancashire County Council in 2006 has shown that rural residents in Lancashire have a 'hierarchy' of accessibility needs relating to their expectations of the way services are provided. People generally expect certain facilities to be provided on their doorstep or perhaps within a short walking distance for convenient and quick access, but then are prepared to travel to other facilities which are not available locally.

Such facilities which people expect to be provided locally/within a convenient walking distance can be GP Surgeries/Health Centres, Post Offices, Primary Schools, local shopping stores/corner shops, and Banks/ATMs to access cash. Facilities which people expect to travel to can be Secondary Schools, Further Education Colleges, Food Supermarkets/Superstores, Hospital, and work destinations.

The results of the survey are given in Table 1 below. Although the findings relate to residents' views in a rural area, it can be argued that such findings could be equally applicable to urban areas and town and country 'fringe' areas.

Additionally, a good general measure of accessibility to services using public transport is the population within walking distance of a bus stop with a desired service frequency level.

The choice of destination sets from which accessibility from potential housing sites to destinations is measured therefore takes account of these points. Accessibility is measured by distance from the housing site to its nearest appropriate destination in metres, or by travel time by public transport to the nearest destination in minutes. The distance or travel time output for each housing site is then ranked or scored according to key time and distance thresholds given in the main methodology documents for the Nottingham Outer and Core SHLAAs.

'Local – on demand' Home/within 10 mins walk	'Service Centre' Within 30 mins travel	'Distant' Within 60 mins travel
Primary School (86%)	Further Education (72%)	Higher Education (45%)
Nursery/Childcare (81%)	Hospital (71%)	
Post Office (76%)	Employment Services (71%)	
GP/Health Centre (74%)	Advice Services (64%)	
Food Shop (74%)	Training (60%)	
Cash (71%)	Secondary School (60%)	
Community Hall (67%)	Library (53%)	
Pub (65%)	Dentist (51%)	
District Nurse (62%)	Specialist Health Care (43%)	
Ante Natal/Health Visitor (61%)		
Pharmacy (60%)		
Bank/Building Society (60%)		
Specialist Health Care (50%)		

**Table 1: Customer Hierarchy of Local Service Accessibility**

Note: % figures show percentage of respondents that placed the service in this category.

Source: 'Defining fair access to rural service provision in the North West' (Rural Innovation & Community Futures, for Lancashire County Council, 2006).

## Accessibility Modelling Process

The accessibility modelling for the site suitability assessments has been carried out using a software package called 'Accession'. Accession principally calculates the journey times between a set of origins and destinations using the timetabled Public Transport Information to complete the journeys. The software can also be used to calculate distances and typical driving times between origins and destinations using a digitised road network in GIS format and standard (default) driving speeds provided for different classes of roads.

The total travel time by public transport includes the time taken to walk from the initial origin point to a bus stop or train station, the time in waiting to connect to a service, the time spent on the actual journey, and the time taken to walk from the final bus stop or train station to the destination point. Also included in the total journey time is any time associated with interchanging between services.

The standard Accession calculation calculates for each origin/destination pair the fastest travel time that can be achieved, sampled at 10 minute intervals in the time period specified. The fastest travel time that can be achieved between each O/D pair from all these samples over the total time period is then output and used in the accessibility assessments. The base datasets loaded into Accession and used in calculating the distance and travel times between identified housing sites and services/facilities are given in Table 2 below:

Data	Description
Origin Data	Point locations of housing sites supplied by Ashfield District Council Planning Department
Destination data	Point locations of destinations, see tables 4 & 5 below for further details
Public Transport data	Bus & Tram ATCO-CIF file generated by Nottinghamshire County Council in April 2008. Heavy Rail ATCO-CIF file dated April 2008 provided by East Midlands Travelline Data Manager
Road network	Ordnance Survey (OS) OSCAR digitised road network supplied by Nottinghamshire County Council

**Table 2: General data used in Accession**

The calculation parameters used in Accession model typical public transport travelling times in the site suitability assessments and are given in Table 3 below:

Parameter	Value	Description
Maximum walking distance	800 metres distance/ 10 minutes walking time (at standard speeds)	The maximum distance which can be walked from an origin point to a Public Transport Service (Bus, Tram or Rail).
Walk speed	4.8 km/h	This is the default standard
Modes	Bus/Heavy Rail/Tram	The modes used in the calculation
Max interchange distance	500 metres	The maximum distance allowed to interchange between services / modes
Day/time	Monday 0800-1000	The time period for the calculation. Only journeys beginning and ending in this time frame are applicable. This time period allows for journeys in the peak and just outside the peak.  The journey time for the <u>Outward journey only</u> (i.e. from origin to destination) has been included in the accessibility assessments.
Sampling Interval	10 mins	The frequency which Accession calculates the fastest total journey time between each Origin/Destination pair in the time period window. The fastest total journey time out of the sampled times is then used in the Accessibility analyses.

**Table 3: Calculation Parameters used to model typical public transport travel times**

If an assessment for an O/D pair is outside of these parameters a 'not accessible' value is returned. For example, if a housing site point is greater than 800 metres (set for the maximum walking distance) from a public transport node, or directly to a destination, then it is deemed to be not accessible. If the housing site is greater than 800 metres from a public transport node but within 800 metres directly of a destination point, it can still connect straight to this by walking and will be given an accessibility value (albeit a low one).

In the Accession runs for this project, the maximum walking distance which can be walked from an origin point to connect to a Public Transport service has been set at 800 metres. It should be pointed out that a value of 400 metres has been used in the calculation of the accessibility indicators for the Greater Nottingham Local Transport Plan. For the purposes of this study however, it is assumed that people would walk further to a bus stop with a better choice of services/greater service frequency, which could reduce overall travelling time and hence increase accessibility.

If a journey cannot be made completely within the specified time period, again a 'not accessible value' is returned. A journey can be made at anytime within the time period provided it begins and ends within that period. Therefore, the frequency of services is not necessarily of issue, rather the opportunity of making the journey. A route served by 4 services an hour is effectively treated the same as a route served by one service an hour as long as the service allows the opportunity for the journey to be completed entirely within the defined time period.

This issue of service frequency perhaps becomes apparent when assessing accessibility in rural areas, where the question is whether a service exists later in the day to enable a return journey to be made. Accession can be used to calculate journey times for the return journey (destination to origin) and also for different time periods throughout the day. An average journey time for each O/D pair over the time periods could then be used in the accessibility assessments, and perhaps include in the final assessments the average journey time of those O/D pairs which have a minimum of 2 journeys (outward and return) throughout the day.

An indication of service frequency can be obtained by looking at accessibility/walking distances from origin points to bus & tram stops/rail stations with a minimum desired service frequency standard e.g. bus services running hourly, half hourly, every 10 mins. This has been incorporated into the accessibility assessments for this study (see tables 4 and 5 below).

### Destination datasets

Table 4 below lists details of the destination sets used in the site assessment processes for the Nottingham Core Housing Market Area (HMA) in Ashfield District.

Destination Set	Basis of Calculation	Data Sources
Public Transport Accessibility (access to bus stops with desired service frequency level)	Distance (metres)	<p>Point locations of bus stops with desired service frequency levels taken from Public Transport Database (ATCO-CIF file) generated by Nottinghamshire County Council Summer 2008.</p> <p>Each bus stop to have a minimum of :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 6 scheduled departures by all services in each of the time periods 0600-0900 hrs and 1500-1800hrs;</li> <li>• 3 scheduled departures by all services in each of the time periods 0900-1200 hrs and 1200-1500 hrs.</li> </ul> <p>All services to operate Mondays to Fridays or Mondays to Saturdays</p>
Public Transport Accessibility (proximity to tram stops)	Distance (metres)	Nottinghamshire County Council Strategic Transport & NET Team (taken from Public Transport Database (ATCO-CIF file) generated by Nottinghamshire County Council Summer 2008
Public Transport Accessibility (proximity to Railway Stations)	Distance (metres)	Nottinghamshire County Council Strategic Transport & NET Team

**Table 4: Destination datasets: Nottingham Core HMA**

## Appendix 4: Site Assessment Panel Membership & Minutes

### Site Assessment Panel Minutes - Tuesday 6<sup>th</sup> January 2009

#### Attendance:

Bob Rivers (BR)	House Builders Federation & Bovis Homes,
Anabel Rooksby (AR)	Peveril Homes,
Gaynor Jones-Jenkins (GJJ)	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust,
Melys Griffiths (MG)	Savills,
Peter Harley (PH)	Derwent Living,
Naomi Wing (NW)	Environment Agency,
James Lidgett (JL)	Environment Agency,
Lisa Bell (LB)	Ashfield District Council,
Chris Maidment (CM)	Ashfield District Council,
Dave Lawson (DL)	Broxtowe Borough Council,
Adam Reddish (AR)	Erewash Borough Council,
Tom Dillarstone (TD),	Gedling Borough Council,
Dave Berry (DB)	Nottingham City Council,
Kate Proctor (KP)	Nottingham City Council,
Phillip Marshall (PM)	Rushcliffe Borough Council,
Richard Cooper (RC) (Chair)	Nottinghamshire County Council,
Nina Hillyer (NH)	Nottinghamshire County Council,
Andrew Johnston (AJ)	Erewash Borough Council.

#### 1. Introductions

\*\* – introduced what the intentions of the Panel were, in that it seeks an independent view, attendees are invited to represent their area of interest, members are requested to declare any interests in sites or areas. The Panel is advisory and will produce notes on the key outcomes of each session which will be sent to each Panel member in Draft form for agreement.

#### 2. The Nottingham Core HMA and Hucknall

\*\* – introduced the SHLAA, stressing that it identifies sites which could be developed in the future and not sites that will be developed, in addition the SHLAA aids Local Authorities in identify a 5 year housing land supply. The Partnership of the Councils was formed in order to produce the SHLAA. The SHLAA will be monitored and updated annually. This current SHLAA will be adopted by March 2009.

#### 3. The State of the Market

\*\* – opened the discussion and asked where the Panel think the housing market is heading and if they think there is any development potential remaining. Thoughts on the housing numbers predicted in the SHLAA were also welcomed.

\*\* – \*\*\*\*\* are still building for the rental market, targeted at shared ownership, with 80% market level rents, aimed at those who cannot get a mortgage at this present time. They are not intending to build/buy houses for sale or shared ownership until at least 2010.

\*\* – most house builders are curtailing their building programmes until late 2009 early 2010. Market housing is still shifting to Housing Associations, there is a general presumption that this stick is however starting to dry up.

\*\* – the try before you buy market is strong as generally people still aspire to own property.

\*\* – people are still having problems getting mortgages.

\*\* – believes that landowners are being unrealistic in their aspirations of what their land is worth.

\*\* – land values not just linked to house sale prices, but also the price of hard and soft infrastructure (including S106 provisions). Residential planning permission is not as lucrative as it once was.

\*\* – asked whether the Panel considered there to be any particular areas of the market that had been adversely affected, or if any areas had shifted upwards recently.

\*\* – The apartment is now saturated and the 3 storey dwellings market is drying up.

\*\* – momentum of affordable housing has picked up and some niche and smaller developments are continuing to sell.

\*\* – the top end of the market is still moving, and smaller developers appear to be doing better than large volume house builders. This could be due to PPS3/planning requirements on larger sites.

\*\* – \*\*\*\*\* \*\*\*\*\* are currently renting out stock rather than pay rates on empty properties, with the view that tenants will buy once the market picks up. In addition they are looking at site re-designs.

\*\* – expects the market to bottom late 2009.

Discussion above will be anonymised if necessary and reduced in length

Following discussion \*\* said that the opinions expressed would be taken into the districts' overall consideration of how to express delivery numbers.

#### **4. City Centre Capacity**

\*\* – introduced this subject, indicating that one comment received indicated there should be across the board discounting in the City Centre in addition to current estimates based on site-specific information gathered for the Study.

\*\* – Generally evidence points to the fact that the City Centre market is saturated and the market is suffering, he therefore agrees that discounting should occur as part of the SHLAA.

\*\* – agreed with \*\*.

\*\* – RSLs are not buying apartments.

\*\* – Will provide group with suggested discounting rates that \*\*\* head office are aware of from other studies.

\*\* – asked, but there was no view expressed about what scale of discounting or reduction from previous building rates should apply.

***ACTION-\*\* to investigate where other studies have applied discounting. Districts to investigate other studies where City Centre supply is significant (e.g. Sheffield).***

## 5. Small Sites

\*\* – a comment received noted that there was no threshold for such sites in the SHLAA, the Panel's view was sought about whether smaller sites are considered to be less deliverable, or should be discounted in some way?

**Panel** - As landowners have been contacted as part of the SHLAA, it was considered that this is the best indication of whether sites will come forward. Generally smaller sites have been selling well over the past year as there is less pressure on such sites from S106.

## 6. Green Belt

\*\* – circulated to Panel information relating to the 'Treatment of Major Policy Constraints' and asked if people agreed with the approach that sites should be assessed separately if deliverable but subject to whether a major policy were to change. This would apply to other sites with policy constraints such as allocated employment sites and MLAs.

**Panel** – generally in agreement with the approach; that for sites where a policy (such as Green Belt or protected employment sites for example) is the only major constraint for development, then the reasoned judgment should be altered to 'may be suitable if policy changes'. This category would be used until their status changes, e.g. relevant development plan documents identify them as allocations or a study determines their undeliverability/unsuitability.

## 7. Existing Evidence Base

\*\* – circulated information regarding the 'Treatment of Evidence from other Studies' – comments are requested for the next meeting on the 14<sup>th</sup> January 2009.

## 8. Flood Risk

\*\* – For the purposes of the SHLAA EA did not need to apply the sequential testing to the sites, however the work the EA produced has been valuable. He raised the question of whether SFRA maps or FR maps are used, authorities view was that SFRA information is considered to be more up to date and therefore would be used in preference to flood maps where available.

\*\* – Responded that in theory the sequential test should be applied through the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA), however, the SFRA Partnership took the view that the evidence base should be prepared and the flood risk established by the SFRA prior to considering specific sites. Therefore, she raised the question about how sequential testing fitted into the SHLAA process and said that other Councils have applied it at this stage. The EA wanted to apply sequential testing at this evidence stage and felt that the SHLAA presented this opportunity. The EA want to learn how best to engage in the process and how to get the best results.

***ACTION – A meeting to be arranged between districts and the EA to explore whether or how sequential testing can be applied in the SHLAA.***

\*\* – individual site representations had been received in relation to mitigation and that this would be carried out. In general districts are not accepting the deliverability of sites without proof or evidence of adequate mitigation; mitigation needs to be proven through the planning process.

\*\* – Agreed; potentially all sites can be mitigated, it is not the function of the SHLAA to assess this (ref. Paragraph 3.42 of the PPS 25 Practice Guide).

## 9. Transport Assessments

\*\* – some comments regarding highways point out that many sites are ‘undeliverable’ - is this a fair comment? At what point does a site become undeliverable?

**Panel** – generally agreed that if enough money was ploughed into a scheme it could be delivered. It was agreed that where significant issues arise sound justification needs to be provided to back-up statements relating to why sites are considered undeliverable. Otherwise they should be considered undeliverable.

#### **10.AOB**

\*\* – asked that a review of specific sites be carried out as some sites conflict with EA comments.

***ACTION*** – \*\* *will identify sites of concern and report back to next meeting.*

\*\* – raised concerns over re-consultation if some sites are examined again.

\*\* – expressed the view that as this was the purpose of having a draft stage it should be no problem revising assessments as long as this was justified.

#### **11. Date of next meeting**

14<sup>th</sup> January 2009, County Hall, Committee Room A (please note this is not the same room and is located within the Riverside Block).

### **Site Assessment Panel Minutes - Wednesday 14<sup>th</sup> January 2009**

#### **Attendance:**

Bob Rivers (BR)	Home Builders Federation & Bovis Homes
Annabel Rooksby (AR)	Peveril Homes
Gaynor Jones-Jenkins (GJJ)	Notts Wildlife Trust
Melys Griffiths (MG)	Savills
Peter Harley (PH)	Derwent Living
Naomi Wing (NW)	Environment Agency
James Lidgett (JL)	Environment Agency
Lisa Bell (LB)	Ashfield District Council
Chris Maidment (CM)	Ashfield District Council
Kate Proctor (KP)	Nottingham City Council
Dave Lawson (DL)	Broxtowe Borough Council
Adam Reddish (ARe)	Erewash Borough Council
Andrew Johnston (AJ)	Erewash Borough Council
Tom Dillarstone (TD)	Gedling Borough Council
Phillip Marshall (PM)	Rushcliffe Borough Council
Liz Beardsley (LBe)	Rushcliffe Borough Council
Richard Cooper (RC) (Chair)	Nottinghamshire County Council
Nina Hillyer (NH)	Nottinghamshire County Council

#### **1. Introductions**

\*\* - intention of this meeting is to discuss individual site specific issues. Some extra sites have been added which will be dealt with along with the other sites.

#### **2. Minutes of Last Panel Meeting**

\*\* – clarified flood risk section – will send changes to group.

\*\* – to provide additional wording for the minutes to LB relating to sites that where the main barrier to delivery relate to policy constraints and the rewording of the delivery period from 'beyond 15 years' to 'may be suitable if policy changes'.

\*\* – changes to text re city centre capacity section; add "suggested" discounting rates from \*\*\* head office, "if possible". Also, under ACTION, districts to investigate "how this issue has been addressed in" other studies where city centre supply is significant.

\*\* – consistency may be an issue so this may be discussed.

\*\* – Raised a conflict of interest in terms of site refs 14, 37 and 458.

### **3. Site Specific Discussion**

#### **Erewash**

Sites 36, 66, 14 and 77 were discussed at the meeting. Site 46 was deleted – issues relating to its draft reasoned judgement and placement within housing tranche were resolved at the first panel meeting. The principle concern related to the robustness of the common Core HMA-wide evidence base and how it should be applied. The Panel were satisfied with the approach taken in how the evidence base generally had been utilised in producing the SHLAA.

Erewash Borough, with the EA's agreement, grouped together sites 36, 66, 77 given that similar issues related to each one.

\*\* – Stated that these sites would encounter policy objections on flood risk grounds if residential development took place. All sites here are located within the 1 in 100 year flood risk plain and formed part of the functional flood plain, which has the highest level of protection from development and is only appropriate for water-compatible uses. NW reaffirmed that in light of the SFRA assessments there would be a policy presumption against housing on these sites. Erewash assessment work through SHLAA recognises the high flood risk but also concludes sites have potential for residential development, in sites 66 and 77's case, due to the sites being classed as 'white land', which is in short supply around Long Eaton.

\*\*\* – Queried the presentation data/material in the SFRA relating to Site 66 & 77. In EBC's view, the functional floodplain only incorporates identified areas which are within a 1 in 20 flood risk area.

\*\* – Stated that the source of flooding to these site is from Golden Brook not River Trent hence not necessarily showing up when EBC reviewed the Greater Nottingham SFRA maps.

\*\*\* – Stated that EBC are satisfied to take a steer from EA regarding the deliverability/suitability of the two sites. Will look at all available SFRA data and other planning/sustainability policies and come to a conclusion.

\*\* – Mentioned that SHLAA should not necessarily be used as a vehicle to made 'trade-offs' between different planning objectives. Need to concentrate on factual information.

\*\* – determined Rushcliffe sites in functional flood plain as non-deliverable.

Panel in agreement that both sites should be classed as non-deliverable until changes occur on the ground (flood alleviation measures for example) – Erewash to look at this again, but acknowledged that only factors/information known to Council at the time of assessment could help determine a final judgement

Panel agreed that site 36 at Sawley is still undeliverable after Panel discussion – EA agreed right that the correct conclusion had been reached in current SHLAA.

#### **Site 14**

\*\* - Highlighted issue of how sequential test is applied. Not in functional flood plain but in 100 year flood plain instead and immediately downstream of a flood storage reservoir. There are several issues in terms of flooding and future flood risk.

\*\* – this site still with \*\*\*\*\* , \*\*\*\*\* pulled out – development of site for housing is no longer imminent.

***ACTION - Erewash (\*\*\*) to review timescales of site 14 in light of discussion and discuss with agents to come to a more realistic delivery timescale.***

\*\* – is a “health warning” appropriate in SHLAA?

\*\* – SHLAA feeds into 5 and 15 year land supply. If we take a realistic approach, won't have an immediate land supply. Figures are there but not being built (??).

Panel satisfied with group's approach to market issues and accounting for it in the best way we can.

#### **Rushcliffe**

##### **Site 69**

- Green belt site
- Policy designation annex C, PPG2 – restricted to B class uses
- Sustainability & location issues – 40% of site has never been developed
- SINC on site
- Highway network issues
- Beyond 15 years tranche in SHLAA

\*\* – asked for confirmation that policy E7 is saved.

\*\* – yes, E7 one of 6 saved policies in place until Core Strategy is in place.

\*\* – should we be treating this site any different than other sites with policy constraints? Consistency issue. GB, SINC etc.

\*\* – asked why included in the first place, not adjacent to the PUA.

\*\* – Authorities have agreed to assess all sites brought forward in the call for sites process

\*\* – Would be inconsistent to say it's not deliverable in SHLAA process.

**Panel** - agreed that Rushcliffe have put forward a sound argument in assessment.

\*\*\* – development should not be allowed in SINC. Sensitive from an environmental point of view and borders country park. Would like to see site undevelopable.

\*\* – Maybe unsustainable but correct assessment should be 'suitable pending policy change' (not just GB policy, also employment). Panel agreed.

### **Site 188**

\*\* – Hierarchy of maps is causing problems, the site lies out the SFRA catchment area. Site flooded in 1947 and 2000. The source of flooding is likely to be surface water drainage coming from Radcliffe on Trent, though exact source is unclear. If it is surface water drainage there is not the same policy presumption against housing as with other sections of the functional flood plain.

### **Panel Decision**

Environment Agency and Rushcliffe BC to agree how the site will be dealt with.

### **Site 352**

\*\* – potential conflict of interest.

### **Panel Decision**

Overall there is an issue in relation to how Transport Assessments (TA) are dealt with, therefore once TA consistency is established a fuller conclusion can be drawn.

### **Site 1 (Additional site)**

Highways/transport is the main issue with the site.

\*\* – sites over 80 dwellings require a TA.

### **Panel Decision**

Could be suitable if policy changes.

### **Gedling**

### **Site 49**

Highways/transport is the main issue with the site.

### **Panel Decision**

Could be suitable if policy changes.

### **Sites 454 (a) 458 (d) and 462 (e)**

\*\* – Conflict of interest as client owns site 458 (d).

\*\*\* – are working with the landowner, site is still very productive agriculturally.

### **Panel Decision**

No overall conclusions to be drawn.

### **Sites 33, 36, 37 and 47**

### **Panel Decision**

Could be suitable if policy changes.

## **4. AOB**

\*\* - The panel agreed that a consistent approach to independent studies that have (or have not) been accounted for in reaching a SHLAA conclusion was needed and the wording presented to the last meeting (reproduced below) could be the basis for that.

"The (name) study was undertaken by consultants (name) in order provide independent conclusions about the (subject of study). The Borough Council is satisfied that this approach

demonstrates an acceptable level of independent advice and consistency across all authorities involved in the SHLAA study. With this in mind, all Nottingham Core HMA Councils are keen to ensure that the approach taken to independent studies is consistent. Therefore, we are of the opinion that the assessment of sites for (subject of study ) which have been appraised as part of that study should not be re-classified for the purposes of this SHLAA unless a formal planning decision (e.g. a council's interim planning guidance or appeal decision) has altered the situation."

\*\*\* – difficult to have an ecological input at this stage.

\*\* – explained next steps for the SHLAA.

\*\* – found the exercise very useful.

## Appendix 5: Glossary of Terms and Abbreviations

**Agricultural Land:** Agriculture is defined by Section 336(1) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as including: horticulture, fruit growing, seed growing, dairy farming, the breeding and keeping of livestock (including any creature kept for the production of food, wool, skins or furs, or the purpose of its use in the farming of land), the use of land as grazing land, meadow land, osier land, market gardens and nursery grounds, and the use of land for woodlands where that use is ancillary to the farming of land for other agricultural purposes. The quality of agricultural land is traditionally assessed by DEFRA to fall into one of six grades, in order that the Planning System can consider the effect of development proposals on agriculture.

**Annual Monitoring Report:** A report which is produced annually to establish what is happening in the district now and what may happen in the future, comparing trends against existing Local Plan policies to determine if changes need to be made.

**Ashfield Local Plan:** The Council are currently in the process of producing a new Local Plan which will eventually replace the Ashfield Local Plan Review (2002).

**Ashfield Local Plan Review / ALPR & Proposals Map:** The District Wide Local Plan for Ashfield, adopted in November 2002. A Local Plan comprises a Written Statement and a Proposals Map. The Written Statement details the Authority's policies and proposals for the development and use of land together with reasoned justification for these proposals. The Proposals Map sets out the specific areas of land and their boundaries to which the policies included in the Written Statement apply. Paragraph 214 of the National Planning Policy Framework paragraph determines that policies within the Ashfield Local Plan Review, 2002 are out-of-date. However, by virtue of paragraph 215, due weight can be given to relevant policies in Ashfield Local Plan Review, 2002, according to their degree of consistency with the National Planning Policy Framework. (The closer the policies in the Plan are to the policies in the Framework, the greater the weight that may be given).

**Conservation Area:** An area designated by a Local Planning Authority under Section 69 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act, 1990, regarded as being an area of special architectural or historic interest, the character or appearance of which is desirable to preserve or enhance.

**Defensible Boundary:** A defensible boundary is one that is considered to prevent the unchecked sprawl of development. Often this will be a physical feature such as a river, a road, a belt of mature trees or woodland.

**DCLG - Department for Communities and Local Government:** The Central Government department responsible for housing, urban regeneration, planning and local government. The department was formerly known as the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister.

**DEFRA - Department for Environment Food and Rural Affairs:** The Central Government department with responsibility for rural communities, farming, promoting sustainable development and achieving a healthy natural environment.

**East Midlands Regional Plan:** The former East Midlands Regional Plan has now been revoked by the Government. It formed the regional strategic planning policy document for the counties within the East Midlands. N.B. The housing requirement for Ashfield set out in the EMRP has now been superseded. Ashfield District Council has now set and approved the housing requirement for the district.

**Green Belt:** An area of land surrounding a city or town having five distinct purposes:

1. To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas;
2. To prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another;
3. To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;
4. To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns, and;
5. To assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

Further advice relating to Green Belts is given in the National Planning Policy Framework; Section 9 Protecting the Green Belt.

**Greenfield:** Land that has not been used for urban development. Typically it was last used for agriculture and is located next to or outside the existing built-up areas, though it may also occur in urban areas.

**Green Infrastructure Strategy:** Green Infrastructure is the network of protected sites, green spaces and linkages which provide for multi-functional uses relating to ecological services, quality of life and economic value. The council is currently preparing a Green Infrastructure & Biodiversity Strategy that will consider how to deliver these networks in Ashfield.

**Hectare / Ha:** An area 10,000 square Metres or 2.471 Acres. This is roughly equivalent to two football pitches.

**Housing Land Monitoring Report:** This report is produced by the Council annually, after 31<sup>st</sup> March by the Council, to monitor residential development in the District.

**Housing Market Area / HMA:** Geographical areas defined by household demand and preference for housing types. HMAs are also considered to reflect the links between where people live and where people work.

**Landscape Character Assessment / LCA:** A Landscape Character Assessment determines which areas are of sufficient landscape quality to be protected (See **Mature Landscape Area**). A Landscape Character Assessment has been carried out for the District by TEP consultants and the results of this are available online.

**Listed Building:** A building or structure of special architectural or historic interest included on a list prepared by the Secretary of State for Culture, Media and Sport under Section 1 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act, 1990. Consent is normally required for its demolition in whole or part, and for any works of alteration or extension (both internal and external) which would affect its special interest.

**Local Development Scheme:** A document setting out the timescales for the production of the Local Development Documents that comprise the **Local Plan** and the evidence bases that underpin these documents.

**Local Plan:** A portfolio of Local Development Documents which set out a locally distinctive spatial strategy for the development of the District.

**Local Wildlife Site/LWS (formerly known as SINCs):** Site of local importance for nature conservation or geology identified by the **Nottinghamshire Biological and Geological Records Centre**.

**Mature Landscape Area:** Areas identified by the County Council as being of landscape importance on the basis that they represent those areas least affected by intensive arable production, mineral extraction, commercial forestry, housing, industry, roads etc. (See also **Landscape Character Assessment**).

**National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF):** The NPPF, which is the Government's new national planning guidance, was published on 27<sup>th</sup> March 2012 and replaces all Planning Policy Statements. Local Plan policies which are not consistent with the NPPF are now out of date. Further details can be found on the Council's website.

**Nottingham City Region Employment Land Study:** This study considers the quality and quantity of existing employment land in the Greater Nottingham area.

**Nottinghamshire Biological and Geological Records Centre / NBGRC:** The centre responsible for the mapping and surveying of LWS sites in Nottinghamshire.

**Previously Developed Land / PDL:** The NPPF defines PDL as: Land which is or was occupied by a permanent structure, including the curtilage of the developed land (although it should not be assumed that the whole of the curtilage should be developed) and any associated fixed surface infrastructure. This excludes: land that is or has been occupied by agricultural or forestry buildings; land that has been developed for minerals extraction or waste disposal by landfill purposes where provision for restoration has been made through development control procedures; land in built-up areas such as private residential gardens, parks, recreation grounds and allotments; and land that was previously-developed but where the remains of the permanent structure or fixed surface structure have blended into the landscape in the process of time.

**Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (Level 1):** Planning Policy Statement 25; Development & Flood Risk, published by the **Department for Communities and Local Government** in December 2006, required Local Authorities to prepare a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment in consultation with the Environment Agency. This considers all sources of flooding in the District and the consequent flood risk throughout the District.

**Sub-Regional Centre:** The revoked East Midlands Regional Plan identified Sub-Regional Centres as performing 'a complementary role to the PUAs and have been selected on the basis of their size, the range of services they provide, and their potential to accommodate further growth. They have the capacity to support sustainable development objectives through:

- The use of design-led approaches such as master planning and town centre renewal activity to enhance existing character and community infrastructure;
- additional development in accordance with Policy 2 (Promoting Better Design);
- providing a range of services to support surrounding hinterlands; and
- being the most accessible centre in an area with a range of transport modes.'

**Sustainable Urban Extension:** A large extension to the existing urban area. These may be considered more sustainable than small developments, in that they are large enough to support

and encompass a range of uses besides residential, such as employment and retail, thereby reducing the need to travel.

**Transport Assessment and Transport Statements:** A transport assessment or transport statement may be required to be submitted with a planning application for certain types of development which have an impact on the highway and transportation network. The NPPF states that all developments which generate significant amounts of movement should be supported by a Transport Statement or Transport Assessment.

**Tree Preservation Order:** Tree Preservation Orders are applied to trees that are considered important for their amenity value. The order makes it a criminal offence to carry out any works to a protected tree without planning permission.

**Urban Capacity Study:** The Urban Capacity Study approach preceded the SHLAA in considering how much residential development could be accommodated within the existing urban area.

**Viability:** This refers to the financial viability of a development. In order to be viable a development will need to make a profit for the developer, after all of the costs associated with development have been taken into account. Costs are likely to relate to land costs, building costs, finance costs, highways costs and planning obligations.



If you require translation or interpretation into sign language, Braille, languages other than English or other accessible formats such as large print, please contact the Planning Policy and Projects Section at Ashfield District Council on 01623 457383.

**Copyright Notice** All maps and plans in this study report are reproduced from Ordnance Survey material with the permission of Ordnance Survey on behalf of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office © Crown Copyright. Unauthorised reproduction may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings. Ashfield District Council Licence No. 100018975 (2010)