



**Ashfield District Council**

**Local Plan**

**Statement of Consultation**

**July 2013**

## **Contents**

1. Introduction
2. Statutes and Regulations
3. Duty to Co-Operate
4. Ashfield Local Development Framework Consultations
5. Ashfield Local Plan 2010-2023 Preferred Approach Consultation
  - Form of Consultation
  - Summary of Responses
  - Key changes made to the Local Plan

## **Appendices**

Appendix One:  
Ashfield Local Plan 2010-2023 Preferred Approach Consultation. Summary of responses, the Council response to issues raised and proposed changes to the Local Plan.

Appendix Two:  
List of bodies and persons invited to make representations

Appendix Three:  
List of Respondents

## Introduction

- 1.1 This Statement of Consultation sets out the details of publicity and consultation undertaken to prepare and inform the Ashfield District Council Local Plan. This Statement fulfils the requirements of Regulation 22 (1)c of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 to prepare a statement setting out how the Local Planning Authority (LPA) has complied with Regulation 18 of the same Regulations in preparation of the Local Plan.
- 1.2 The purpose of this Statement is to describe the consultations undertaken at each of the previous stages of the preparation of the Local Plan. The Statement summarises which bodies and persons were invited to make representations up to and including the most recent, Preferred Approach stage, how they were invited to do this, a summary of the main issues raised and how they have been taken into account by the Council.
- 1.3 Previous public consultations took place in relation to the review of the Ashfield Local Plan (2002) as part of the 'Local Development Framework' (LDF) process, following the national guidance of the time. There have since been significant changes to the planning process, most significantly the Government's shift from Regional Strategies and Planning Policy Guidance Notes and Statements to the Localism agenda, and the preparation of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) document and associated technical guidance.
- 1.4 In response to the Government's agenda, the Council has agreed to take a new approach and produce a new form of Local Plan which will capture the shift to Localism. The Local Plan has a shorter time frame for delivery with the expectation of producing the second phase of the plan alongside Ashfield's communities and neighbourhoods to realise the Government's vision. This new ten year plan (which runs to 2024) will contain strategic policies, development management policies and site allocations, and will enable the Council to manage growth and development effectively within the District over the coming years.
- 1.5 This document identifies the Regulations which have required the consultations to be made throughout the plan making process, describes how they were undertaken, and then summarises the main issues raised and responses to the consultations. The remainder of the document provides a comprehensive presentation of the most recent responses, to the Local Plan Preferred Approach, enabling those who made representations to see how their comments have been taken into account.

## 2.0 Statutes and Regulations

- 2.1 Preparation of the Ashfield District Council Local Plan has been undertaken according to the following statutes, regulations and guidance:
- a) The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004
  - b) The Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004 (amended 2008)
  - c) Planning Policy Statement 12 (PPS12)
  - d) The Localism Act 2011 (which amended certain sections of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act, 2004)
  - e) The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012
  - f) The National Planning Policy Framework 2012 (NPPF).
- 2.2 The initial stages of preparation were undertaken as part of the Ashfield Development Framework process where the Council was looking to take forward a Core Strategy followed by site allocations and development management development plan documents. With changes in legislation the Council determined to take forward a Local Plan which integrates the strategic policies, site allocations and policies for development management in a single document.
- 2.3 The Local Plan has to meet the requirements of the aforementioned statutes and the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012. Regulation 18 requires the identification of each stage of preparation and consultation which took place to be noted as follows:
- (Regulation 18)
- preparation of evidence base (started in January 2007 and continuing)
  - leaflet to all households: "The Ashfield Development Framework; Does it affect me?" published in April 2009 and delivered by a private company to all households in Ashfield with a freepost response to be included on the Council's database
  - preparation of Core Strategy Issues and Options (up to June 2009)
  - consultation on Core Strategy Issues and Options (June/July 2009)
  - preparation of Spatial Growth Options (up to October 2009)
  - consultation on Spatial Growth Options (October/November 2009)
  - leaflet sent to all households in Ashfield on the Ashfield Local Development Framework (October 2009)
  - preparation of Core Strategy Preferred Option (up to March 2010)
  - consultation on Core Strategy Preferred Option (March/April 2010)
  - preparation of Local Plan Preferred Approach (up to September 2012)
  - consultation on Local Plan Preferred Approach (September/November 2012)
  - preparation of Local Plan Publication (up to July 2013).

- 2.4 Following the Publication of the Local Plan, the Regulations require the following stages to take place leading up to adoption of the Local Plan by the Council, with anticipated dates:
- (Regulation 19/20)
- consultation on the Local Plan Publication; for legal compliance and soundness (August/September 2013)
- (Regulation 22)
- submission of the Local Plan Publication (November 2013)
- (Regulation 24)
- Examination in Public of the Local Plan (January 2014)
- (Regulation 26)
- adoption of the Local Plan by the Council (May 2014).
- 2.5 The Regulations state that the Council, in its role as local planning authority, must notify a range of agencies, organisations and individuals at each stage of the Local Plan preparation process, and invite them to submit representations on its content. These representations must then be considered in the development of the Local Plan.
- 2.6 Bodies to be notified include regulatory agencies, physical infrastructure delivery agencies, social infrastructure delivery agencies, major landowners, housebuilders and developers, minerals and waste management agencies, voluntary bodies, neighbouring local planning authorities, county councils and parish councils. In addition, the Council publicises each consultation stage and invites representations from the public, including residents of Ashfield and any other groups or organisations.
- 2.7 Regulation 35 of the most recent 2012 Local Plan Regulations states that the Council must make available the Local Plan Publication document, and supporting documentation, at their principal office and other places within there are, and published on the Council's website. These requirements are the minimum for consultation and the Council's Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) establishes more detailed guidelines for engagement which have been taken place.
- 2.8 The SCI was originally prepared in 2006, and updated in 2010, to set out the Council's standards and policies for involving the community in the planning process. The SCI lists the different groups the authority has consulted and describes the various methods used to engage and communicate with people.
- 2.9 The SCI is currently being updated and it is anticipated that the document will be adopted by the Council in August 2013. The document will be prepared in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, the Localism Act 2011 and the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012. The document sets out the Council's policy and approach to public consultation and involvement

in the preparation of the Local Plan and the planning applications it determines.

- 2.10 The Council also produced a Community Engagement Plan for the Local Plan Preferred Approach stage (September 2012).

### 3 Duty to Co-operate

- 3.1 In addition to the above consultation requirements, Section 110 of the Localism Act 2011 makes a number of amendments to the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, the effect of which is to place a legal duty on local planning authorities to cooperate with neighbouring authorities, county councils and other prescribed bodies when planning for sustainable development.
- 3.2 The additional prescribed bodies with which local planning authorities outside London are required to cooperate are set out in Regulation 4 of Part 2 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012. They comprise:
- Local Planning Authorities, either neighbouring or making up the Housing Market Area
  - Environment Agency
  - English Heritage
  - Natural England
  - Civil Aviation Authority
  - Homes and Communities Agency
  - Primary Care Trusts and successor bodies
  - Office of the Rail Regulator
  - Highways Agency
  - Highway Authorities
  - Local Enterprise Partnerships
  - Local Nature Partnerships
- 3.3 The Duty to Co-operate forms part of the 'Tests of Soundness' against which an independent inspector will assess the documents during a Public Examination. It is considered essential that the Council can demonstrate effective collaborative working with neighbouring authorities, key stakeholders and other organisations during the preparation of both its Local Plan and the evidence base that supports it.
- 3.4 There is a long history of joint working and cooperation between Ashfield District Council and neighbouring authorities in Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire, as well as other stakeholders some of which are included in the list of prescribed bodies. The preparation of Ashfield's Local Plan encompasses an aligned approach to the Core Strategies in Greater Nottingham, with on-going and constructive engagement between constituent and neighbouring authorities and relevant organisations as the Plan throughout the progression of the Plan.
- 3.5 Ashfield has worked closely with the Greater Nottingham Local Authorities of Broxtowe, Erewash, Gedling, Nottingham City and Rushcliffe and with Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire County Councils to develop a robust housing strategy for the Nottingham Core Housing Market Area which covers Greater Nottingham. Ashfield has continued the development of the key policy areas of the Local Plan, including

housing and employment provision, in alignment with the Greater Nottingham Councils throughout the development of the document up to the current publication stage.

- 3.6 Ashfield has also worked closely with Mansfield District Council and Newark and Sherwood District Council, which cover the Nottingham Outer Housing Market Area, to identify the housing requirement for this sub regional area. Ashfield is bound by two further Local Authorities; Bolsover and Amber Valley. Discussions with these councils have also taken place on a regular basis to ensure a similar approach to planning across boundaries.



#### 4.0 Ashfield Local Development Framework Consultations

4.1 The Local Plan preparation process has involved a number of stages and at each stage the Council has actively sought input from consultees to help shape the policies and proposals of the plan. The Local Plan process still relies and builds on relevant information and comments received from previous Ashfield Local Development Framework (LDF) consultations as well as updating the content in line with the new approach to planning.

4.2 Four main consultations have taken place leading to the preparation of the Local Plan Publication, as follows:

- The Ashfield Development Framework – The Core Strategy Issues and Options (June 2009)
- The Ashfield Development Framework Core Strategy – Area Based Spatial Growth Options (October 2009)
- The Ashfield Development Framework – The Core Strategy The Preferred Option (March 2010)
- Ashfield Local Plan 2010 - 2023 Preferred Approach (September 2012)

Each of the above consultations was carried out in accordance with the guidance provided within the Council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement (2006 and 2010, subsequently revised in 2013).

4.3 In bringing forward the Ashfield Local Development Framework, the Council worked closely with the Greater Nottingham authorities of Broxtowe, Erewash, Gedling, Nottingham City and Rushcliffe. In addition, regular meetings were held with other neighbouring authorities. Summaries of the main issues raised by the above consultations and how those representations have been taken into account are identified below.

#### **The Ashfield Development Framework – The Core Strategy Issues and Options (15<sup>th</sup> June 2009 to 31<sup>st</sup> July 2009)**

##### Key issues raised by representations

4.4 The Core Strategy Issues and Options document was published in June 2009 and went out to consultation commencing on 15<sup>th</sup> June 2009 and ending on 31<sup>st</sup> July 2009. The Issues and Option consultation document included:

- jointly agreed strategic elements for Greater Nottingham agreed with the Greater Nottingham Authorities,
- Locally important issues and options relating to the whole of the District.

The consultation document set out a range of potential approaches that could be taken to specific issues. It also made provisions for respondents to identify any other issues or options relating to these areas.

- 4.5 A summary leaflet was published covering the main strategic issues and options, which also included a questionnaire. Ten separate leaflets covering the main strategic issues and options listed below were also published, each including a separate questionnaire. The main strategic issues were identified as follows:
- Accommodating Growth
  - Nottingham-Derby Green Belt and Countryside
  - Regeneration
  - Economy and Employment Land
  - The Role of Nottingham City and Town Centres
  - Neighbourhoods and Place Shaping
  - Transport and Accessibility
  - New Infrastructure to Support Growth
  - Green Infrastructure and Landscape Character
  - Climate Change.
- 4.6 1635 formal comments were received from 78 organisations and individuals. There was also a large amount of informal verbal comments received from manned exhibitions, workshops and community groups. The range of respondents included Government Office for the East Midlands (GOEM), Environment Agency and English Nature, as well as land owners and the general public. The responses to the consultation were set out in:
- Issues and Options for the Core Strategy Consultation Responses Report, September 2009 and
  - Issues and Options for the Core Strategy Consultation Record of Public Consultation Discussions, September 2009.
- 4.7 There was general support for the Sustainable Urban Extension (SUE) study and the sites identified in it, but there was concern about the amount of development around Hucknall and its impact. There was also support for utilising both smaller and a few larger urban extensions, but little support for large urban extensions only.
- 4.8 Main concerns raised were in respect of the lack of infrastructure (social and physical), transport, the growth of Hucknall, empty properties, gypsy and traveller sites provision and mixed use developments.
- 4.9 The majority of respondents thought that the Green Belt and Countryside should not be released for development with particular objections to the proposed site at Whyburn Farm, Hucknall. Some thought that the Green Belt policy was too restrictive in the villages.
- 4.10 With regard to regeneration issues, a mix of responses was received identifying the need for social regeneration and the need for the villages to grow to sustain additional amenities. The decline of own centres was also highlighted as an issue and a priority for policy intervention. .

- 4.11 Responses also suggested the need for flexibility in relation to employment sites; to make sure that sufficient provision would be available for future requirements. It was also suggested that large housing urban extensions should accommodate some employment growth.
- 4.12 The majority of the respondents agreed that major new developments should be located in or close to existing urban areas and only permitted together with the provision of major new public transport infrastructure.
- 4.13 At this stage, the responses received helped to identify those issues facing the Council which the Core Strategy needed to address. The Council then began to work on the Spatial Growth Options document, which further developed the issues and options document, setting out a proposed spatial vision and spatial objectives together with a number of possible options to enable the Council to deliver the growth required.

### **The Ashfield Development Framework – Core Strategy Area Based Spatial Growth Options (26<sup>th</sup> October 2009 to 30<sup>th</sup> November 2009).**

#### Key issues raised by representations

- 4.14 The Spatial Growth Options stage was consulted on in November 2009 and went out to consultation commencing on 26<sup>th</sup> October 2009 and ending on 30<sup>th</sup> November 2009. A total of 437 comments were received from 230 individuals and organisations. A Spatial Options for the Core Strategy Consultation Response Document dated December 2009 was made public. The Report identified the respondents and summarised the responses received.
- 4.15 There was also a large amount of verbal comments received from community groups and presentations. The range of respondents included GOEM, Environment Agency, Highways Agency, and English Heritage, as well as land owners and the general public.
- 4.16 The document presented three 'scenarios' as future development opportunities for Hucknall, Sutton and Kirkby and the Villages. These were:

#### Hucknall

- Option H1 – Minimum Requirement (3,600 dwellings to 2026)
- Option H2 – Growth to Assist Regeneration (Higher than Regional Plan Requirement)
- Option H3 – Higher Growth (Allow for longer term planning – 2013)

#### Sutton and Kirkby

- Option KS1 – Focus Growth on Major Urban Extensions

- Option KS2 – Spread Development Throughout Kirkby & Sutton
- Option KS3 – No Growth in the Green Belt

#### The Villages

- Option V1 – Business as Usual
- Option V2 – Small Growth to Sustain Facilities
- Option V3 – Large Settlement Extension

- 4.17 A total of 25% of all comments received related to the Hucknall options, with Option H1 (minimum growth) being the most favoured.
- 4.18 There was general concern regarding any development on Green Belt land within the district.
- 4.19 The location of the Rolls Royce site and its proximity to Hucknall Town Centre (NET and train station) raised concerns. Each of the three available large sites (Options 1 to 3) were located some distance from the Town Centre (Option H3 being located the furthest away). As no large site options (over 500 dwellings) were available, it was considered important that the Council worked with prospective developers and infrastructure providers to ensure that public transport services would be provided and enhanced.
- 4.20 The Government Office (GOEM) submitted specific comments regarding the growth options and stated that Option H3 (Higher Growth – Whyburn Farm) was not a realistic option as it would have been in excess of the Regional Plan figures, and the impact on Hucknall Town Centre, when considering sites in Gedling, would have been too great on the Sub-Regional Centre of Hucknall.
- 4.21 The Environment Agency submitted comments with regard to Flood Zones and a Flood Risk Assessment was required for each option to determine the risks and any mitigation measures which may be necessary.
- 4.22 The Highways Agency submitted comments regarding the impacts on the Strategic Road Networks, and advised that a district wide Transport Study was to be commissioned to ensure that the impact of the increase in travel demand was addressed.
- 4.23 The Coal Authority submitted comments with regard to potential problems caused by past mining activity located towards the south-western corner of the Whyburn Farm site, and the requirement for further investigation works to be carried out if these areas were to be considered for future development.
- 4.24 31% of all comments received related to the Kirkby and Sutton Options, with Option KS3 (no growth in the Green Belt) being the most favoured.

- 4.25 The Highways Agency raised the same comments relating to the Kirkby and Sutton Options as per the Hucknall Options.
- 4.26 The Coal Authority submitted comments with regard to potential issues caused by past mining activity in certain areas of Kirkby and Sutton, and the requirement for further investigation works to be carried out if these areas were to be considered for future development.
- 4.27 Comments were also received from English Heritage with regard to the historic environment within and surrounding Kirkby and Sutton. Reference to the Conservation Areas, the scheduled monuments and the historic parks and gardens which surround the area was requested to be made in the Core Strategy Preferred Option document.
- 4.28 Comments were also received suggesting that the open break (highlighted as Area G – north of Kings Mill Hospital) between Sutton and Mansfield should be protected.
- 4.29 44% of all comments received related to the villages, with Option V1 (business as usual – minimum growth) being the most favoured.
- 4.30 Previous comments received from the Coal Authority and English Heritage for both the Hucknall and Kirkby and Sutton areas, were repeated for the Villages.
- 4.31 The Highways Agency submitted comments highlighting their preference to minimising growth in the villages to minimise the impact on the Strategic Road Networks.
- 4.32 Concerns were also raised regarding infrastructure, services and highway capacity, to ensure that there should be no detrimental impact on existing infrastructure and services and new roads should be provided where necessary.

Key changes made as a result of representations

- 4.33 All the issues raised were carefully considered and had an important influence on the evolution of the Core Strategy. The Preferred Option document reflects the views of the LDF Steering Group members, local community groups, residents, statutory consultees and other organisations. The preferred option for each area arising out of the Spatial Growth Options stage were as follows:
- Hucknall – H1 Minimum Requirement
  - Sutton and Kirkby – KS2 Spread Development
  - Rural Area – V1 Business as Usual

## **The Ashfield Development Framework – The Core Strategy Preferred Option Consultation (1<sup>st</sup> March 2010 to 30<sup>th</sup> April 2010)**

### Key issues raised by representations

- 4.34 The Core Strategy Preferred Option stage was consulted on in March 2010 and went out to consultation commencing on 1<sup>st</sup> March 2010 and ended on 12<sup>th</sup> April 2010. However, following representations from the public, the period for comments to be submitted was extended to 30<sup>th</sup> April 2010. A total of 1,685 representations were received from 1,104 organisations and individuals. A Core Strategy Preferred Option Consultation Responses Document dated September 2012 was made public which identified all the comments received following the consultation.
- 4.35 With regard to the introductory text, vision and strategic objectives contained within the document, the majority of comments received from key stakeholders suggested minor text changes and additions to the text. There was general support for the strategic objectives and vision.
- 4.36 A number of comments from local residents were received raising concerns regarding the lack of public consultation, housing requirements being inappropriate and general comments relating to increased traffic congestion.
- 4.37 In respect of the Core Policies, the following key issues were raised:
- The impact of the two proposed urban extensions in Kirkby and Sutton regarding possible flooding and increased CO<sup>2</sup> emissions due to additional traffic. Objections were also received from developers and agents regarding the proposed targets for sustainable energy, on financial viability grounds
  - General objections regarding the need for additional housing, the use of greenfield land, increase in traffic, loss of countryside, and there being not enough jobs to support growth
  - General support for delivering economic prosperity, but objections were made by developers and agents suggesting that their sites should be considered, including strategic employment land off Nottingham Road, Annesley and part of Whyburn Farm, Hucknall.
  - Traffic flow in Kirkby Town Centre was raised as an issue. There were also objections relating to the proposed large strategic housing sites and their impact on the existing highway network.
  - Concerns were raised over the size and location of rural affordable housing, particularly in relation to the proximity of local

services and facilities, and there being no maximum level of affordable housing on site.

- There was particular support for the inclusion of training and workforce development and the need for new or extended health facilities.
- General support was received in relation to the Design and Place making policy, but some concerns were raised by local residents regarding the impact of new developments on the existing character of an area.

4.38 There was general support from statutory consultees and local residents in respect of the Hucknall area based policies.

4.39 There was overall support for Policies H1, H3 and H4. The main objections were made by the developers and agents of large and small sites in Hucknall with regard to the Rolls Royce site being unviable and not deliverable. Other objections to Policy H2 related to housing numbers, increased traffic and congestion and the lack of public consultation. There were also objections in relation to the reliance on the provision of the strategic high quality employment land at Rolls Royce, and the potential loss of jobs at Rolls Royce.

4.40 With regard to the Kirkby and Sutton area based policies, there was general support for Policies KS1, KS3 and KS4.

4.41 The majority of objections were received from individuals and organisations relating to Policy KS2 – Kirkby and Sutton Housing Growth. This policy comprised two sustainable urban extension allocations at:

- West of Kirkby, South of A38
- East of Kirkby/Sutton, off Lowmoor Road

4.42 As well as the individuals and organisations, two residents groups (Sutton Junction Residents Association (SJRA) and Kirkby in Ashfield Residents Association (KARA)) raised issues and objections to the Policy KS2. Issues raised included:

- Contaminated site
- Danger of greater flooding
- Traffic grid lock
- Density of housing
- Infrastructure issues
- Loss of views
- Loss of green space
- Education
- Loss of footpaths
- Coalescence of Sutton and Kirkby

- 4.43 There was general support for the policies relating to the villages, with comments from statutory consultees and local residents.
- 4.44 The majority of objections were received from agents and developers stating the housing requirements were too low and should have been increased to maintain and expand the existing service and facilities.

Key changes made as a result of representations

- 4.45 Since the time of the consultation on the Core Strategy Preferred Options report, there have been significant changes to national policy with regard to the way Councils are required to plan for the future of their area. Most significantly, the Government has abolished Regional Strategies, and replaced Planning Policy Guidance Statements with the Localism agenda and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).
- 4.46 In response to the Government's agenda, Ashfield District Council decided to take a new approach to the planning of the district and to produce a new form of local plan which would capture the shift to localism. The Council is determined to plan in a positive way reflecting both the Councils vision for housing and economic growth and the response from the local community. The Local Plan Preferred Approach published in September 2012 is the first stage in this new Local Plan and it has a shorter times frame for delivery with the expectation of a review (or second phase plan) within a short time of the adoption of this Local Plan.
- 4.47 The Local Plan process still relies and builds on relevant information and comments received from previous LDF consultations as well as updating the content in line with the new approach to planning. The previous LDF consultations have helped to shape the Local Plan Preferred Approach 2012 document, which sets out how the Council considers the district should develop over the period to 2024.
- 4.48 Development in Ashfield will be primarily focused towards locations within or adjoining the main urban areas of Kirkby-in Ashfield, Sutton-in-Ashfield and Hucknall. These are the larger and more accessible towns.
- 4.49 There are no Sustainable Urban Extensions proposed for Kirkby-in Ashfield and Sutton-in-Ashfield. The allocations of land for housing development outside the urban areas are those identified from the Strategic Housing Land Availability assessment as deliverable and suitable and through the Sustainability Appraisal as the most sustainable options.
- 4.50 To support consultation, the Council maintains a database on which all consultees are recorded according to the SCI and this is regularly updated as further bodies or individuals make representations. Additions



to the Local Plan database may be made by contacting the Council's Forward Planning team.

4.51 The following list sets out the types of groups and organisations on the Local Plan database.

- Local Strategic Partnership
- Other services within Ashfield District Council and Nottinghamshire County Council
- Members of Parliament
- Parish Councils
- Resident Associations
- Non-statutory local stakeholders and civic societies
- Relevant community groups and organisations
- Working groups and partnerships
- Voluntary bodies
- Landowners
- Developers, house builders and representative organisations;
- Registered providers of social housing
- Interest groups and societies
- Religious groups
- Disabled groups
- Youth and older persons organisations
- 'Seldom heard' groups
- Bus Operators
- Sports England and relevant local sports groups and bodies
- Business Forums
- Individual residents making representations.

## 5.0 Ashfield Local Plan 2010-2023 Preferred Approach Consultation (26<sup>th</sup> September to 9<sup>th</sup> November 2012)

### Form of Consultation

5.1 Consultation on the Local Plan Preferred Approach was held for a period of six weeks between 26<sup>th</sup> September and 9<sup>th</sup> November 2012. The following elements comprised the full consultation undertaken:

:

- Copies of Summary Leaflet and Frequently Asked Questions to:
  - Ashfield District Councillors
  - Ashfield Nottinghamshire County Councillors
  - Mark Spencer MP
  - Gloria De Piero MP
  - Philip G. Marshall, Chief Executive
  - Joanne Wright, Corporate Performance Manager
  - Carys Turner-Jones, Corporate Communications Manager
  - Diana Bowden, Electoral Services Manager
  - David Greenwood, Deputy Chief Executive (Resources)
  - Sharon Lynch Corporate Finance Manager
  - Jim Glover, Interim Revenues and Customer Services Manager
  - Ruth Dennis, Assistant Chief Executive (Governance)
  - Farzana Akhtar, Senior Solicitor
  - Simon Oldham, Democratic Services Manager
  - Mike Joy, Scrutiny Manager
  - Craig Bonar, Service Director– Corporate Services
  - Jenni French, Business Contingency and Sustainability Manager
  - Elaine Saxton, Asset Manager
  - Matthew Kirk, Estates Manager
  - Trevor Watson, Service Director – Economy
  - Theresa Hodgkinson, Leisure and Community Development Manager
  - Mark Armstrong, Town Centres Manager
  - Sarah Daniel, Principal Projects Officer
  - Paul Talbot, Strategic Projects and Trust Development Manager
  - Peter Kandola, Housing Strategy & Development Manager
  - Edd de Coverly, Service Director– Environment
  - Chris Booth, Environmental Health Manager
  - Rebecca Whitehead, Community Protection Manager
  - Paul Thomas, Regeneration Manager
  - Samantha Dennis, Service Lead – Waste and Environment
  
- E mail with an attached letter to:
  - Sarah Ball, Clerk to Council Selston Parish Council
  - J.Barlow, Clerk to the Council Annesley & Felley Parish Council

- Announcements on 26<sup>th</sup> September 2012
  - Acacia Radio
  - Takeover Radio
  
- Letters:
  - Approximately 1,700 letters and summary leaflets sent to all on the Local Plan consultation database
  - Holgate School, Hucknall
  - Ashfield School, Kirkby-in-Ashfield
  - Selston Arts College
  - Sutton Centre School
  - Hucknall National School
  
- Consultation Events:
  - Developer, Landowner and Infrastructure Provider Event; 8<sup>th</sup> October 21012
  - Kirkby and Sutton Community Groups Consultation Event; 15<sup>th</sup> October 2012
  - Hucknall Community Groups Consultation Event; 10<sup>th</sup> October 2012
  - Villages Community Groups Consultation Event; 31<sup>st</sup> October 2012
  
- Displays for the duration of the consultation period at:
  - Hucknall Library
  - Sutton in Ashfield Library
  - Selston Library
  - Kirkby in Ashfield Library
  - Kirkby in Ashfield Council Offices
  
- Documents and Poster delivered to:
  - Council Offices, Fox Street, Sutton in Ashfield
  - Council Offices, Watnall Road, Hucknall
  - Selston Cash Office/HealthCentre
  - Jacksdale Library
  - Annesley Woodhouse Library
  - Huthwaite Library
  - Skegby Library
  - Edgwood Road, Hucknall Library
  
- Newspapers:
  - Chad: Article published on Wednesday 19<sup>th</sup> September 2012 on “Have your say on Ashfield’s future”.
  - Chad: Public notice published on Wednesday 26<sup>th</sup> September 2012 “Consultation on the Preferred Approach Document”.

- Chad: Article published on Wednesday 3<sup>rd</sup> October 2012 “Debate opens on district’s future”.
- Ripley and Heanor News: Public notice published on Thursday 27<sup>th</sup> September 2012 “Consultation on the Preferred Approach Document”
- Eastwood Advertiser: Public notice published on Friday 28<sup>th</sup> September 2012 “Consultation on the Preferred Approach Document”
- Hucknall Dispatch: Public notice published on Friday 28<sup>th</sup> September 2012 “Consultation on the Preferred Approach Document”.
  
- Posters of the Local Plan Preferred Approach erected at:
  - Rural Community Centres
  - Other Community Centres
  - Leisure Centres
  - Selston Parish Council
  - Titchfield Park Visitors Centre, Hucknall
  - Kingsway Park Visitors Centre, Kirkby
  - Sutton Lawn Visitors Centre
  - Selston Golf Course.
  - Huthwaite Post Office, Market Street
  - Selston Post Office
  - Jacksdale Post Office
  - Underwood Post Office
  - Forest Road Post Office, Annesley
  - Nuncargate Road Post Office, Annesley
  - Hucknall Town Centre post Office
  - Kirkby Post Office advised they could not put up a poster due to regulations.
  - Doctors Surgery, off Morrisons, Kirkby
  - Woodlands Medical Practice, Ashfield’s Estate
  - Willowbridge Surgery, Brook Street, Sutton
  - Ashfields Medical Practice, Market Place Sutton
  - Health Centre, New Street, Huthwaite
  - The Pantiles Medical Centre, Church Lane/Street, Sutton
  - Surgery, Skegby Road
  - Doctors Surgeries, Mansfield Road, Skegby
  - Underwood Surgery
  - Jacksdale Surgery
  - Selston Health Centre
  - Torkhill Medical Centre, Farley Lane Surgery, Hucknall
  - Oakenhall Medical Practice, Bolsover Street, Hucknall
  - Co-operative Store, Selston.
  - Asda, Sutton
  - Idlewells Centre
  - Morrison’s, Kirkby
  - Tesco, Hucknall

- Postcards to:
  - All primary school children in the primary schools in the District for them to take home to parents (10,725 in total).
- Site Notices at all proposed new housing sites (not at sites with either full or outline planning permission, or if the site is an existing allocation in the current Local Plan (2002)), as follows:

<b>HUCKNALL</b>		<b>Location</b>
HG1Ha	Off Papplewick Lane	N/A - Existing Allocation
HG1Hb	Garden Road	N/A - Full Planning Permission
HG1Hc	Lime Tree Avenue/Farleys Lane	N/A - Full Planning Permission
HG1Hd	Land at King Edward Street	N/A - Outline Planning Permission
HG1He	135-137, Beardall Street	N/A - Outline Planning Permission
HG1Hf	Washdyke Lane	N/A - Outline Planning Permission
HG1Hg	Surplus Land at Rolls Royce, Watnall Road	1 – Corner of Olympus Court and Watnall Road. 2 – On Watnall Road adjacent bus stop (near Westville Drive). 3 – On by-pass
HG1Hh	Hucknall Town Football Club, Watnall Road	N/A - Outline Planning Permission
HG1Hi	180 Watnall Road	N/A - Full Planning Permission
HG1Hj	Rear of 355-371a, Watnall Road,	N/A - Full Planning Permission
HG1Hk	Rear of 364 to 376, Watnall Road	N/A - Outline Planning Permission
HG1Hl	Grange Farm, Moor Road, Bestwood	N/A - Outline Planning Permission
HG1Hm	Forge Mill, Mill Lane, Bestwood	N/A - Full Planning Permission
HG1Hn	Bolsover Street, Hucknall	1 – Entrance to site on Bolsover Street
HG1Ho	Standard Motor Products, Occupation Road	1 – Occupation Road
HG1Hp	Rear 162-220 Nottingham Road	1 – Nottingham Road
HG1Hq	Ruffs Farm, Watnall Road	1 – On Watnall Road
HG1Hr	Land at Broomhill Farm (Phased Development)	1 – Corner of Lime Tree Road and Pine Grove. 2 – On Nottingham Road. 3 – On Nottingham Road.
<b>KIRKBY &amp; SUTTON</b>		<b>Location</b>
HG1Ka	Lindleys Lane, Kirkby	N/A - Full Planning Permission
HG1Kb	Diamond Avenue, Kirkby	N/A - Existing Allocation
HG1Kc	Former Annesley Colliery,	N/A - Full Planning Permission

	Newstead Road	
HG1Kd	Opposite Vernon Farm, Derby Road, Kirkby	1 – Bourne Avenue. 2 – Marshall Avenue. 3. Derby Road
HG1Ke	Derby Road (Off Abbey Road/Richmond Road)	1 – Derby Road. 2 – Abbey Road. 3 – Richmond Road
HG1Kf	Summit Close, Kirkby	1) Lamp Column on Lindrick Road opposite Pierpont Place. 2) Post of the Industrial Estates Sign.
HG1Kg	Skegby Road, Annesley Woodhouse	Gatepost at the entrance to the site.
HG1Kh	Kirklands Residential Home, Fairhaven, Kirkby	Lamp post outside of residential home
HG1Ki	Larwood Park, South A38, Kirkby	N/A - Full Planning Permission
HG1Sa	Rear Hilltop Farm, Main Street, Huthwaite	See photo (available on request)
HG1Sb	Greenwood Falls Farm, Mill Lane, Huthwaite	N/A - Full Planning Permission
HG1Sc	Off Mill Lane, Huthwaite	N/A - Existing Allocation
HG1Sd	Land of Common Road, Huthwaite	See photo (available on request)
HG1Se	High Hazles Drive, Huthwaite	Outline Planning Permission
HG1Sf	Off Lynton Drive, Sutton	N/A - Existing Allocation – Full Planning Permission
HG1Sg	Off The Avenue, Sutton	1) Telegraph Pole fronting 2A The Avenue next to the junction with Off the Avenue 2) On 3 railed timber fence Pendean Way facing down the road, adjacent lamp post, opposite 7 Pendean Way.
HG1Sh	Off Alfreton Road South, Sutton	Telegraph Pole adjacent lane with footpath between 356 & 358 Alfreton Road.
HG1Si	Rookery Lane Farm, Rookery Lane, Sutton	1) Telegraph Pole in front of Sylton House 317 Alfreton Rd. 2) Telegraph pole fronting 363 Alfreton Rd. 3) Lamp Column Junction Rookery Lane/Alfreton Rd. 4) Telegraph post outside 287 Alfreton Rd.
HG1Sj	Silverhill Lane, Sutton	See photo (available on request)
HG1Sk	Tibshelf Road, Sutton	See Photo (available on request)
HG1Sl	Molyneux Farm, Fackley Road, Sutton	See photo (available on request)
HG1Sm	Cross Row, Stanton Hill, Sutton	N/A - Outline Planning Permission
HG1Sn	Land at Priestsic Road and	N/A - Outline Planning Permission

Ashfield District Council - Statement of Consultation

	Northern View	
HG1So	Former Government Buildings, Outram Street	N/A - Full Planning Permission
HG1Sp	Station House, Outram Street, Sutton	N/A - Full Planning Permission
HG1Sq	The Twitchell, Sutton	N/A - Full Planning Permission
HG1Sr	Former Courtaulds Factory, Unwin Road	N/A - Full Planning Permission
HG1Ss	West of Beck Lane, Sutton	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Telegraph Pole on MARR route front 113 Beck Lane (near Westfield Garden Centre).</li> <li>2) Lamp column fronting Hazeldene, 301 Mansfield Road, near Chancery Close, Skegby.</li> <li>3) Telegraph Pole junction Moreland Close and Pleasley Lane, Skegby.</li> <li>4) Lamp column before 2The Haven" 1 Pavilion Gardens.</li> <li>5) Telegraph pole junction Hardwick Close and Pleasley Road.</li> <li>6) Lamp Column Chancery Close closest to junction Mansfield Road.</li> <li>7) Telegraph pole opposite 1 Omrberley Avenue.</li> <li>8) Lamp column adjacent to the drive of 23 Beck Lane.</li> </ol>
HG1St	North West of Kingsmill Hospital, Sutton	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Lamp Column 57 on the footpath on Skegby Lane.</li> <li>2) Lamp Column 5 on the access road to the residential properties outside 178.</li> <li>3) Lamp Column 21A on the junction of Skegby Lane/Kings Mill Road East traffic lights (opposite Fox &amp; Crown public house).</li> </ol>
HG1Su	Millward House, Eastfield Side, Sutton	Lamp column adjacent entrance, Zoom Trade, Eastfield Side
HG1Sv	Rushley Farm, Nottingham Road, Mansfield	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Telegraph pole by entrance to Thieves Wood Lane</li> <li>2) Lamp Column A60 right of Rushley Manor drive.</li> </ol>
HG1Sw	Kirkby Folly Road (former Pretty Polly Site)	Full Planning Permission
HG1MU a	South of West Notts College (mixed use)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Light Column (9) just before the Ashfield District Sign Cauldwell Road travelling towards Derby Rd.</li> <li>2) On metal post &amp; rail to the field junction A60 with Cauldwell Road opposite Newark Road.</li> </ol>

Ashfield District Council - Statement of Consultation

HG1Sn	Land at Priestsic Road and Northern View	N/A - Outline Planning Permission
HG1So	Former Government Buildings, Outram Street	N/A - Full Planning Permission
HG1Sp	Station House, Outram Street, Sutton	N/A - Full Planning Permission
HG1Sq	The Twitchell, Sutton	N/A - Full Planning Permission
HG1Sr	Former Courtaulds Factory, Unwin Road	N/A - Full Planning Permission
HG1Ss	West of Beck Lane, Sutton	<p>9) Telegraph Pole on MARR route front 113 Beck Lane (near Westfield Garden Centre).</p> <p>10) Lamp column fronting Hazeldene, 301 Mansfield Road, near Chancery Close, Skegby.</p> <p>11) Telegraph Pole junction Moreland Close and Pleasley Lane, Skegby.</p> <p>12) Lamp column before 2The Haven" 1 Pavilion Gardens.</p> <p>13) Telegraph pole junction Hardwick Close and Pleasley Road.</p> <p>14) Lamp Column Chancery Close closest to junction Mansfield Road.</p> <p>15) Telegraph pole opposite 1 Omrberley Avenue.</p> <p>16) Lamp column adjacent to the drive of 23 Beck Lane.</p>
HG1St	North West of Kingsmill Hospital, Sutton	<p>4) Lamp Column 57 on the footpath on Skegby Lane.</p> <p>5) Lamp Column 5 on the access road to the residential properties outside 178.</p> <p>6) Lamp Column 21A on the junction of Skegby Lane/Kings Mill Road East traffic lights (opposite Fox &amp; Crown public house).</p>
HG1Su	Millward House, Eastfield Side, Sutton	Lamp column adjacent entrance, Zoom Trade, Eastfield Side
HG1Sv	Rushley Farm, Nottingham Road, Mansfield	<p>3) Telegraph pole by entrance to Thieves Wood Lane</p> <p>4) Lamp Column A60 right of Rushley Manor drive.</p>
HG1Sw	Kirkby Folly Road (former Pretty Polly Site)	Full Planning Permission
HG1MUs	South of West Notts College (mixed use)	<p>3) Light Column (9) just before the Ashfield District Sign Cauldwell Road travelling towards Derby Rd.</p> <p>4) On metal post &amp; rail to the field junction A60 with Cauldwell Road</p>



		opposite Newark Road.
<b>Selston, Jacksdale and Underwood</b>		<b>Location</b>
HG1Vb	Off Portland Road, Selston	Lamppost directly in front of site on Portland Road.
HG1Vc	Westdale Road/Rutland Road, Jacksdale	1) Lamppost on corner of Rutland Road 2) Lamppost on the bend at Westdale Road (NE corner of site) 3) Lamppost on Westdale Road (just before Cheshire Way)
HG1Vd	Westdale Road, Jacksdale	Lamppost in front of bungalows at Palmerston Street
HG1Ve	Church Lane, Underwood	Metal access gate to field.
HG1Vf	Main Road, Underwood	Lamppost/road sign directly in front of site.
HG1Vg	Winter Closes, Underwood	1) Gatepost on Winter Closes 2) Lamppost on western side of Main Street, close to public house 3) Lamppost at Cordy Lane (close to works station)
HG1Vh	Rear 64-68 Church Lane, Selston	Lamppost on opposite side of road, (behind yellow sand bin)
HG1Vi	Land at Station Road, Selston	Lamp post on opposite side of Station Road.

## Summary of Responses

- 5.2 Feedback from the consultation on the Core Strategy Preferred Option (2010), as well as the previous LDF consultations have helped to shape the Local Plan Preferred Approach document. Summaries of the main issues raised as part of the previous consultation were provided at the beginning of each relevant chapter and policy of the Preferred Approach document.
- 5.3 The Local Plan Preferred Approach document gained 1300 representations from 635 respondents.
- 5.4 Most of the policies within the document received general support, including the creation of new homes and employment in the district. The vast majority of objections were largely contained to specific sites and were submitted by local residents that would be directly affected by the proposed development.
- 5.5 In particular, there was general opposition from local residents to proposed residential developments at:
- Nottingham Road, Hucknall
  - Rolls Royce, Hucknall

- Derby Road, Kirkby
  - Opposite Vernon Farm, Derby Road, Kirkby
  - Skegby Road, Annesley Woodhouse
  - Rookery Farm, Sutton
  - Silverhill Lane, Sutton
  - Tibshelf Road, Sutton
  - Fackley Road, Sutton
  - Becks Lane, Sutton
  - Rushley Farm, Sutton
  - Alfreton Road, Selston
  - Winter Closes, Underwood
- 5.6 There was a significant amount of concern in relation to the cumulative impact of development in Ashfield and other Districts on roads and motorway junctions, leading to congestion.
- 5.7 The ACCESS group raised issues regarding the potential increase in traffic density and air pollution from the proposed housing and other development along the A611 Corridor from its junction near the A60/A617 near the West Notts Technical College to the B6009 junction at Hucknall.
- 5.8 There was general concern that Policy EV1 (Green Belt and Countryside) applies the Green Belt test (very special circumstances) to the defined Countryside, and that the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) provides extensive guidance on the importance of Green Belts and includes the 'very special circumstances' test. However, it does not set out a 'very special circumstances' test for proposed development in the countryside. The two designations are very different and it was felt to be inappropriate to have a policy test which covers both designations.
- 5.9 Opposition to the timescale of the plan being too short and not complying with paragraph 157 of the NPPF, with the soundness of the plan being compromised. It was also considered that the timescale may lead to a disjointed approach to housing delivery across the Greater Nottingham area, and consideration of a fifteen year timescale should be given, in line with Mansfield, Gedling and Broxtowe Councils.
- 5.10 A number of suggestions were made by other Local Authorities that the timescale should be lengthened to bring it line with adjoining authorities to enable a consistent approach to planning in the Nottingham area.
- 5.11 The timetable demonstrates the Local Plan will not be adopted before 2014 so the timescale should be extended to at least 2024 to demonstrate a ten year housing supply as required by the NPPF.

- 5.12 Concerns were raised over specific possible cases of surface water run off and the potential contamination of water by the new road proposed at Rolls Royce.
- 5.13 Objections to the loss of Green Belt, agricultural and open countryside.
- 5.14 Some alternative employment sites were proposed as a result of the consultation. However, there are sufficient existing sites allocated throughout the District to meet the anticipated demand and no changes are proposed.
- 5.15 The Council's decision to prepare a Local Plan was welcomed by the Whyburn Group and considered to follow the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 5.16 There was support for the plan from Natural England concerning the emphasis on public transport, walking and cycling, and the protection and enhancements of environmental assets.
- 5.17 The Theatre Trust supported the inclusion of theatres as an element of social infrastructure.
- 5.18 There was general support for the plan and policies from English Heritage, National Trust, Natural England, Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust and Nottinghamshire County Council, with minor changes recommended to the text.
- 5.19 Gedling Borough Council supports the proposed employment allocations, including Rolls Royce and considers they are consistent with the Greater Nottingham Aligned Core Strategy Policy. The comments identify that Hucknall, as a Sub Regional Centre has a key role both in growing and diversifying the local economy as part of Greater Nottingham area.
- 5.20 Mansfield District Council identified that the employment and economic regeneration approaches aligns with the Mansfield and Ashfield joint Economic Strategy.
- 5.21 Selston Parish Council understand the need for additional building within the rural areas as this is imposed by central government, but it objects to the possible large scale building proposed for the Green Belt land.
- 5.22 General support from Derbyshire County Council was expressed in terms of the preferred housing target. It advised that higher growth could significantly compromise the main Green Belt purpose and there are unlikely to be any significant cross boundary implications for Amber Valley and Bolsover districts due to the modest scale of provision.

- 5.23 There was support from the National Farmers Union with regard to the rural economy and Green Belt policy.
- 5.24 Network Rail supports the Green Belt policy, particularly in respect of railway installations within rural locations. This is considered to be consistent with the advice in the NPPF allowing essential local transport infrastructure in the countryside.
- 5.25 Selston Parish Council has expressed concerns about the lack of retail and community services in Selston and Underwood; the number of new homes planned for the area will also impact on the existing services. The Parish Council has made a request for a retail allocation to be included in the housing allocation on Alfreton Road, Selston (Policy HG1Va).

### **Key changes made to the Local Plan Preferred Approach**

- 5.26 The Local Plan Preferred Approach has been subject to a number of changes to the wording of policies and text to reflect:
- Comments of consultees and respondents to Local Plan Preferred Approach.
  - Editing and formatting to the wording of the policies and text to give uniformity to the Plan.
  - Updating of the information set out in the Plan.
  - Changes considered to be necessary to reflect national planning policy guidance.
- 5.27 The Local Plan has been extended to run from 2010 to 2024 to cover a ten year period. The consequence is that additional housing figures have been identified as follows:
- Hucknall; 2,460 dwellings for the period 2010 to 2024.
  - Sutton-in-Ashfield and Kirkby-in-Ashfield; 4,438 dwellings for the period 2010 to 2024.
  - Selston, Jacksdale and Underwood; 742 dwellings for the period 2010 to 2024.

No changes have been made in relation to employment land as the demand figures reflected a period to 2026. As such, this reflected the Council's emphasis on growth.

- 5.28 The Portrait of Ashfield has been amended to include additional information in the area profiles on the historic character of Hucknall, Sutton-in-Ashfield/, Kirkby-in-Ashfield and Selston, Jacksdale and Underwood.

- 5.29 The Vision and Strategic objectives reflect the Preferred Approach, although some of the strategic objectives have been subdivided to give greater clarity.
- 5.30 Most of the objections received were in relation to the residential site allocations from local residents. Whilst the Council recognises the concerns and objections of those residents, decisions have to be balanced with the wider needs of the District as a whole and the potential to deliver improvements, as well as national planning guidance.
- 5.31 Sites were assessed in relation to the Council's Vision, the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) the Sustainability Appraisal (SA). (Please see the specific responses in Appendix A, the SHLAA for the relevant part of the District and the SA for proposed allocated sites and alternative sites put forward). For this reason, and on the basis of evidence provided, the Council still considers the majority of the housing site allocations set out in the Local Plan Preferred Approach are the most appropriate sites for future development.
- 5.32 Due to issues with regard to access, ownership, environmental issues and highway constraints, the following housing sites have been removed from the Local Plan:
- HG1Sg – Land at the Avenue, Sutton
  - HG1Sa – Rear of Hilltop Farm, Huthwaite
  - HG1Kh – Kirklands Residential Home, Fairhaven, Kirkby
  - HG1Hp – Land Rear of 162 – 220 Nottingham Road, Hucknall
  - HG1Vi – Land At Station Road, Selston
- 5.33 A number of large housing sites (over 10 dwellings) have gained planning permission since the Preferred Approach stage. These sites will contribute to the Council's housing land supply and in particular to the five year housing supply. It is proposed that the following sites are included as allocations under policy HG1:
- HG1 Sa - Stoneyford Road, Stanton Hill (planning permission);
  - HG1Sg - Former Sutton Pools Complex, Brook Street, Sutton (planning permission);
  - HG1Sy - Sheepwash Lane/Coxmoor Road, Sutton (planning permission);
  - HG1Sx - Eastfield Side/Mansfield Road, Sutton (resolution for approval subject to a Section 106 Agreement);
  - HG1S0 - Land off Vere Ave, Sutton and Gilcroft Street/St Andrew's Street, Skegby (planning permission);
- 5.34 Additional employment sites were put forward, as follows:
- Wyburn Farm, Hucknall approximately 18 ha,
  - Land off Hamilton Road/Coxmoor Road, Sutton-in-Ashfield approximately 6 ha
  - Land off Hamilton Road adjacent to Oakham Business Park, Sutton in Ashfield approximately 10 ha,

- Land adjacent to Caulderwell Wood, Northern Sherwood Way, Sutton in Ashfield approximately 14 ha
  - Land off Pinxton Lane, Kirkby in Ashfield approximately 34 ha (Mowlands)
  - Winter Closes, Underwood approximately 1.8 ha.
- 5.35 None of these sites have been taken forward, reflecting either the additional analysis undertaken in the Local Economy Summary Paper Supplementary Analysis or that planning permission has been granted for residential development.
- 5.36 The Preferred Approach set out a combined policy covering the Green Belt and Countryside. This has been separated into a Green Belt Policy (EV1) and a Countryside Policy (EV2) within the Local Plan. Both the Green Belt and Countryside are considered to be important assets to the District. It is accepted that it is not appropriate to apply the same policies to Countryside as those which apply to Green Belt as this does not accord with advice in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).
- 5.37 A change to the policy on water quality has been made to emphasise that opportunities should be taken to restore and enhance watercourses.
- 5.38 A significant change is to include the safeguarding of land for minerals which has been included in Policy SP2. The Coal Authority and Nottinghamshire County Council minerals planners have pointed to the need to protect minerals. This is a requirement in the NPPF in relation to minerals.
- 5.39 Rolls Royce is identified as a mixed use site to reinforce the link between the employment and housing requirements.
- 5.40 Policy EV12 Historic Environment Policy includes additional criteria on the re-use of heritage assets, new shop-fronts, and the protection of valued existing shop-fronts.
- 5.41 Policy PJ3 - Rural Business Development, part of the Policy relating to reuse of rural builds has been removed as it is covered by Green Belt and Countryside policies.
- 5.42 Policy PJ5 Education Skills and Training has been amended to give greater emphasis to educational needs and contributions towards educational requirements.
- 5.43 Policy HG4 Open Space has been amended to refer to new residential development contributing towards open space rather than green space. The policy also has been amended so that contributions can be made towards town centre and public realm improvements where it is inappropriate to provide open space on site.

- 5.44 The town centre boundary of Hucknall has been amended to align with the proposed Inner Relief Road.
- 5.45 Reference to Low Street/High Pavement, Sutton as a Business and Community Quarter as been removed as this may change when the Masterplan is reviewed. There is also a requirement for a large supermarket in Sutton town centre and it would be better to be more flexible with regard to future development if this site.
- 5.46 A new policy on the Protection of Community Facilities has been included to reflect the emphasis in the NPPF and the Localism Act on community assets.
- 5.47 Minor changes are also proposed to the Policies Map to incorporate comments received regarding town centre boundaries, the deletion and addition of housing sites, and changes to open areas.
- 5.48 The table below sets out the Policies in the Local Plan Preferred Approach and how they have been taken forward into the Local Plan Publication document.

Local Plan Preferred Approach		Local Plan Publication document	
Policy	Title	Policy	Title
<b>Strategic Policies</b>		<b>Strategic Policies</b>	
SP1	Sustainable Development Principles	SP1	Sustainable Development Principles
SP2	Strategy for Growth	SP2	Overall Strategy for Growth
SP3	Settlement & Town Centre Hierarchies	SP3	Settlement & Town Centre Hierarchies
<b>Area Based Strategic Policies</b>		<b>Area Based Strategic Policies</b>	
SPH1	Green Infrastructure in and around Hucknall	SPH1	Hucknall Green Infrastructure
SPH2	Hucknall Housing Growth	SPH2	Hucknall Housing Growth
SPH3	Economy and Jobs in Hucknall	SPH3	Hucknall Economy and Jobs
SPH4	Hucknall Town Centre	SPH4	Hucknall Town Centre
SPKS1	Green Infrastructure in and around Kirkby and Sutton	SPSK1	Sutton-in-Ashfield & Kirkby-in-Ashfield Green Infrastructure
SPKS2	Kirkby and Sutton Housing Growth	SPSK2	Sutton-in-Ashfield & Kirkby-in-Ashfield Housing Growth
SPKS3	Economy and Jobs in Kirkby and Sutton	SPSK3	Sutton-in-Ashfield & Kirkby-in-Ashfield Economy and Jobs
SPKS4	Kirkby and Sutton Town Centres	SPSK4	Sutton-in-Ashfield & Kirkby-in-Ashfield Town Centres
SPV1	Green Infrastructure in and around Selston, Jacksdale and Underwood	SPV1	Selston, Jacksdale and Underwood Green Infrastructure
SPV2	Selston, Jacksdale and Underwood Housing Growth	SPV2	Selston, Jacksdale and Underwood Housing Growth
SPV3	Economy and Jobs in Selston, Jacksdale and Underwood	SPV3	Economy and Jobs in Selston, Jacksdale and Underwood
<b>Development Management Policies</b>		<b>Development Management Policies</b>	

**Ashfield District Council - Statement of Consultation**

Adapting to Climate Change		Adapting to Climate Change	
CC1	Energy Use, Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Generation	CC1	Energy Use, Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Generation
CC2	Water Resource Management	CC2	Water Resource Management
CC3	Flood Risk	CC3	Flood Risk
Protecting and Enhancing the Environment		Protecting and Enhancing the Environment	
EV1	Green Belt and Countryside	EV1	Green Belt
		EV2	Countryside
EV2	Reuse or Adaptation of Existing Buildings in the Green Belt and Countryside	EV3	Reuse or Adaptation of Existing Buildings in the Green Belt and Countryside
EV3	Protection and Enhancement of Landscape Character	EV12	Protection and Enhancement of Landscape Character
EV4	Green Infrastructure, Biodiversity and Geological Conservation	EV4	Green Infrastructure, Biodiversity and Geological Conservation
EV5	Protection of Green Spaces and Recreational Facilities	EV5	Protection of Green Spaces and Recreational Facilities
EV6	Protection of Open Areas	EV6	Protection of Open Areas
EV7	Trees, Woodlands and Hedgerows	EV7	Trees, Woodlands and Hedgerows
EV8	Provision and Protection of Allotments	EV8	Provision and Protection of Allotments
EV9	Recreational Equine Development	EV9	Recreational Equine Development
EV10	Agricultural Land Quality	EV10	Agricultural Land Quality
EV11	The Historic Environment	EV11	The Historic Environment
Providing Jobs		Providing Jobs	
PJ1	Business and Economic Development	PJ1	Business and Economic Development
PJ2	Allocations, Significant Business Areas and Protection of Economic Development Sites	PJ2	Business and Employment Development Sites
PJ3	Rural Business Development	PJ3	Rural Business Development
PJ4	Agricultural, Forestry or Horticultural Development, Farm Diversification and Commercial Equine Development	PJ4	Agricultural, Forestry or Horticultural Development, Farm Diversification and Commercial Equine Development
PJ5	Education, Skills and Training	PJ5	Education, Skills and Training
Shopping		Shopping	
SH1	Retail, Leisure and Commercial Development Principles and Town Centre Uses	SH1	Retail, Leisure and Commercial Development Principles and Town Centre Uses
SH2	Local and Minor Shopping Centres and Single Shops	SH2	Local Shopping Centres and Shopping Parades and Single Shops
SH3	Food, Drink and the Evening Economy	SH3	Food, Drink and the Evening Economy
Providing Homes		Providing Homes	
HG1	Housing Land Allocations	HG1	Housing Land Allocations
HG2	Provision for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople	HG2	Provision for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople
HG3	Affordable Housing	HG3	Affordable Housing
HG4	Public Green Space in New Residential Development	HG4	Public Open Space in New Residential Development
HG5	Housing Mix and Density	HG5	Housing Mix and Density
HG6	Conversions to Houses in Multiple Occupation, Flats and Bedsits	HG6	Conversions to Houses in Multiple Occupation, Flats and Bedsits
HG7	Residential Annexes	HG7	Residential Annexes
HG8	Residential Extensions	HG8	Residential Extensions



**Ashfield District Council - Statement of Consultation**

Contributing to Successful Development		Contributing to Successful Development	
SD1	Design Considerations for Development	SD1	Design Considerations for Development
SD2	Amenity	SD2	Amenity
SD3	Recycling and Refuse Provision in New Development	SD3	Recycling and Refuse Provision in New Development
SD4	Infrastructure Provision and Developer Contributions	SD4	Infrastructure Provision and Developer Contributions
SD5	Telecommunications	SD5	Telecommunications
SD6	Contaminated Land and Unstable Land	SD6	Contaminated Land and Unstable Land
SD7	Environmental Protection	SD7	Environmental Protection
SD8	Traffic Management and Highway Safety	SD8	Traffic Management and Highway Safety
SD9	Parking	SD9	Parking
SD10	Advertisements	SD10	Advertisements
		SD11	Provision & Protection of Health and Community Facilities

5.49 The detailed responses to the Local Plan Preferred Approach are summarised in Appendix 1 and these have been taken into account in the preparation of the Local Plan Publication.

## APPENDIX ONE

### **THE ASHFIELD LOCAL PLAN 2010-2013 PREFERRED APPROACH CONSULTATION, - SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS, THE COUNCIL RESPONSE TO ISSUES RAISED AND PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE LOCAL PLAN.**

Ashfield Local Plan 2010-2023 Preferred Approach Consultation. Detailed summary of responses, the Council response to issues raised and proposed changes to the Local Plan.

- 1 This appendix summarises the 1300 representations made in response to the Local Plan Preferred Approach, the response by the Council to those representations and proposed changes to the Local Plan arising from those representations.
- 2 It is set out according to the following main headings:
  - General comments
  - Introduction
  - Portrait of Ashfield, Strategic Objectives and Vision
  - Specific policies within the Local Plan Preferred Approach
  - Appendices
  - Questions at meetings with various groups during the consultation.
- 3 Selston Parish Council undertook their own consultation with parishioners in October 2012 with three separate consultation events being held by the Parish Council at Selston, Underwood and Jacksdale. The representations made to the Parish Council organised events have been submitted by the Parish Council as a separate consultation document called the 'Community Response Statement.' The individual responses contained in this document cannot be taken to be a response from the individual in question to Ashfield District Council consultation on the Local Plan Preferred Approach. However, it is acknowledged that the 'Community Response Statement' forms an important aspect of Selston Parish Council's response to the Local Plan Preferred Approach.

## General comments

### General Comments Received

- Suggestions that 'The Preferred Approach should be put before secondary schools or/and college students who could view and debate any of the issues.
- General comment with regards to the website not working correctly.
- The Whyburn Group welcomes the Council's decision to prepare a Local Plan, which more closely (than a core strategy) follows the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework.
- Concerns that a lot more consultation with local people needs to take place. If it is necessary to undertake this amount of development, then the infrastructure round Hucknall needs to be addressed, first to enable the traffic working on the site to access it.
- While it can be acknowledged that people are living longer and thereby occupying houses for longer, the above two factors are a key reason of the need for more new housing. Immigration and birth control should be tackled by both Central and Local Government, before drawing up Local Housing plans for more housing.
- Already called upon the Council to extend the consultation period for 6 months, due to the completely inadequate notification to residents alerting them to these very extensive plans.
- Letter took a bit of understanding, the leaflet was easier to understand but had too much information and the on-line consultation comment form system required only one comment per form.
- The consultation response form and information has been poorly constructed and many neighbours have shown confusion and misunderstood how to complete the form.
- None of the areas shown in Kirkby in Ashfield seem to have been present in the Technical Paper 'Green Belt Review' of September 2012.
- Have shown and kept an interest in the Local Plan from the Ashfield Development Framework in 2009 and have been informed of developments, however many residents have not taken this interest and have therefore been given little opportunity until it affects them directly.

### Response:

- The Council is always seeking ways to improve its consultation and engagement with residents and others in the community. A consultation strategy was used to try to reach as many people as possible through newspapers, radio, letters and contacts with schools, exhibitions and leaflets. Information was available in hard copy form and hand written forms were accepted as a response to the Plan.

- Postcards were distributed to schools within the district advising of the Ashfield Local Plan Preferred Approach consultation period, advising how they could have their say.
- The Council's website was monitored and any technical issues were rectified at an early stage throughout the consultation period.
- A detailed survey of all Green Belt boundaries has been undertaken to inform the minor changes proposed in the Preferred Approach document. A full strategic review will be published at the next stage of the Local Plan process.
- The impact on infrastructure of the proposed developments has been assessed through the Ashfield Transport Study Update and continues to be assessed through the development of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan which is being prepared by the Council, and through discussions with infrastructure providers.

**Changes to the Local Plan:**

- Continue to monitor, review and amend as necessary consultation methods as the Local Plan progresses to ensure that the Council is meeting its duty to consult, as set out in the Statement of Community Involvement.

Number of Comments		Number of Respondents	
11		8	
Objection to Policy	Support the Policy	Comment on the Policy	
0	0	11	

**List of Respondents**

Mr S Swift, H Nicoll, Mr B Holmes, S Wyatt, Mr M Bee, Dr D Cross, J Toseland, Mr and Mrs R & G Louth

## Introduction

### Responses received relating to Introduction.

#### Support

- Support for the Plan from Natural England concerning the aim for public transport, walking and cycling and protection and enhancements of environmental assets.
- Theatre Trust pleased with inclusion of theatres as element of social infrastructure.
- Support for the decision to make decisions based on sound evidence, not known at this stage whether the Infrastructure can support this.
- Mansfield DC supports close interaction between Mansfield, Sutton and Kirkby –need to continue close cooperation.

#### Concerns/comments

- Development appears to be strategically placed to take advantage of public transport, but concern about cumulative impact of development in Ashfield and other Districts on M1 junctions, and the residual impacts of development – need to refer to mitigation measures necessary at M1 junctions and needs more detail on transport infrastructure.
- Mansfield DC comment that growth proposed is reasonable.
- Approach to timescale is short term.
- Habitat Regulations Assessment Scoping Report should have been done at the beginning of the process. (including Sherwood Forest SPA
- Nottinghamshire County Council-timescale could be extended to 2028 to coordinate with other councils and meet NPPF.
- Nottinghamshire County Council wants to be consulted on Habitats Regulations document.
- Nottinghamshire County Council considers that the Local Plan timescale of 10 years is sufficient as it compares well with the Regional Plan housing requirements. However, it would benefit from a longer timescale to allow planning across the whole of Nottinghamshire to be in alignment.
- Paragraph 2.28 may be the right place to add reference to the number of national heritage assets in Ashfield District.
- Reference is made in paragraphs 1.16 and 1.17 to the production of Habitats Regulations Assessment. It is unclear where this document is on the website. It is assumed that Natural England has been consulted.

#### Object

- The timescale of the plan is too short and not in line with NPPF paragraph 157 and the soundness of the plan and the need to consider a 15 year timescale- (Gedling DC and Broxtowe BC suggest 2028).
- Timescale leads to disjointed approach to housing delivery across the Greater Nottingham area, the Plan does not set out a clear strategy for long term growth, does not deliver enough housing and employment

growth, the short timescale narrows the choice of potential development sites ,excluding the larger more sustainable sites.

- Housing growth not based on objectively assessed needs.
- Plan does not take account of duty to cooperate and need to meet unmet needs of neighbouring authorities.
- Housing allocations are not justified by the SA-which is inconsistent, inaccurate and not sound.
- Concern about poor publicity and not enough consultation on the plan, discriminates against those with disabilities, web site user unfriendly, not many people know about the proposals, length and complexity of plan deters comments.
- Including DM policies in plan make it lengthy and cumbersome
- Impact of the policies and proposals on the historic environment need to be taken into account in the SA.
- Lack of information and acknowledgement of the traffic issues and the impact of new development on the already congested roads.
- Current infrastructure cannot cope-new development will make matters worse (especially schools and roads).
- Use of land along the MARR for development would be better use of existing infrastructure.
- The timescale does not allow for the Green Belt to be properly considered and for its long term permanence to be established.
- The A611 through Annesley Woodhouse/Annesley to the M1 Junction 27 motorway junction is already at full capacity. This is evidenced by the Third Transport Plan Evidence Base, (Figure 76, page 97) shows the A61 1 as the most consistently worst performing roadway over 5 years.
- The problems of traffic congestion and its associated air quality and safety problems are rising in the District. Significant action is required to encourage greater use of alternative modes of travel. Failure to acknowledge these cumulative affects is contrary to the ethos portrayed of having: A Greener Nottinghamshire/ Ashfield, A Safer Nottinghamshire/Ashfield with, Health and well being for all.
- The Council should, prior to submission of the proposed plan to the Inspector, support the Plan proposals with a Traffic Assessment which examines the road and junction capacity from the A611 Junction of A60/A617 near the West Notts Technical College to the B6009 junction at Hucknall and takes into account the proposed developments of the sites within Ashfield and those residential sites which abut in Gedling and Mansfield.
- ACCESS raised that there is a lack of consistency in the Local Plan in relation to naming of settlements. Within some paragraphs Annesley Colliery village (Conservation Area) is referred to as Annesley, in other instances as New Annesley. Additionally, within some statements Annesley Woodhouse is deemed to not include Nuncargate and Kirkby Woodhouse, whilst in other paragraphs/statements the inference is that these latter two settlements are included within Annesley Woodhouse.

**Response:**

- Reason for the timescale of the Plan is set out in paragraph 1.9 of the Local Plan Preferred Approach and will be addressed in more detailed in a technical note to accompany the Local Plan Publication Draft in the spring of 2013.
- The housing/employment requirement for the 10 year plan is set out in the Local Plan and explained more fully in the Housing Technical Paper and the Local Economy Summary Paper (August 2012).
- The Council has complied with the Duty to Cooperate and a Technical Note is being produced which sets out the steps the Council have taken to ensure that the necessary work has been undertaken.
- The Sustainability Appraisal is based on a consistent approach which has been independently assessed as part of a peer review. A revised SA will be published at the next stage of the Plan which will take account of comments made about the SA.
- The historic environment was thoroughly assessed as part of the work on the SA.
- The Council is always seeking ways to improve its consultation and engagement with residents and others in the community. For the Preferred Approach consultation, a consultation strategy was used to try to reach as many people as possible through newspapers, radio, letters, and contacts with schools, exhibitions and leaflets. Information was available in hard copy form and hand written forms were accepted as a response to the Local Plan consultation.
- References to particular housing sites will be considered as part of the review of the SH1 policy.
- It is recognised that traffic is a substantial issue for a number of larger sites. A Transport Assessment was undertaken in 2010 based on the requirements of an increase in by 11,200 dwellings. The Transport Study has now been updated. As part of this process additional work was undertaken to examine the impact of the planned development and measures necessary to mitigate the effects of the growth. It is not considered appropriate to include reference to the mitigation measures for transport impact in the Introduction to the Plan.
- An integrated part of planning for sustainable development is taking into account the physical, economic, social and environmental infrastructure necessary to enable the development to progress. The Council has undertaken an Infrastructure Capacity Study and has had meeting with infrastructure providers such as the Education Authority and PCT. The Council is currently working on an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which looks to identify: what infrastructure is required, how it will be provided, where/when is infrastructure needed and when can any constraints be overcome.
- The Green Belt boundary will be thoroughly reviewed as part of the next Local Plan, following the adoption of this Local Plan-in line with the Council's approach to the timescale of the plan and the need to consider longer term housing and employment growth.

- Habitat Regulations scoping report has been undertaken. It considers the impact and effect of any proposed development and policy on the relevant sites. The Council has liaised with Natural England throughout the production of the HRA scoping report and will continue to consult with them as necessary.
- An infrastructure capacity study has been undertaken covering Greater Nottingham and Ashfield. Additional work is currently being undertaken on an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which will look at infrastructure issues in relation to the proposed developments. The Council has undertaken a Transport Study which examined the impact of the 11,200 dwellings proposed under the Regional Spatial Strategy. Additional has been and continues to be undertaken to take account of the policies and proposed site allocations in the Local Plan.
- The Council will look to have a consistent approach to the name of settlements in any future consultation documents.
- It is not considered necessary to include a reference to the number of heritage assets in the District in the introduction as this information may become out of date during the timescale of the Plan. In particular, undesignated heritage assets will quickly become out of date due to the iterative approach taken by the Council to the identification of local heritage assets. The Area Based Policies have been amended to include information about the heritage of the District.

**Changes to the Local Plan:**

- Ensure there is a consistent approach through the Local Plan to the naming of the Annesley settlements.

Number of Comments		Number of Respondents	
84		65	
Objection to Policy	Support the Policy	Comment on the Policy	
26	47	10	



List of Respondents

Gedling DC, Mansfield DC, Severn Trent Water Ltd, The Highways Agency  
Oxalis Planning Ltd, URS Infrastructure and Environment UK Ltd, The  
Theatre Trust, English Heritage, Natural England, Barton Willmor, Pegasus  
Planning Group Ltd, Peacock and Smith, Nottinghamshire County Council  
Peter, Joan and Deborah Olko, John Woolley, R Storer, H.Nicoll, M Rich, D  
Rose, L West, Mr and Mrs Stewert, C. McPhail.S. Jones, D. Warren, Mr and  
Mrs Townsey, Annesley Community Committed to Ensuring Sustainable  
Settlements (ACCESS), Mr Robert Collier, Mrs Julia Collier, Mr Peter Olko,  
Mrs Joan Olko, Miss Deberah Olko, Mr William, Cooper, Ms Ann Cooper, Mr  
& Mrs M & P Dear, Mrs Margaret Lathall, Mr John Shaw, Mrs Micaela Stanley,  
Mrs Anne Chalkley, Mr Stewart Chalkley, Mr Stephen Jacksdale, Mrs Alison  
Jackson, Mrs Pauline Cumberland, Mr Donald Bailey, Mr Mark Raynor, Mr  
Philip Wood, Mrs Margaret Johnson, Mrs Thompson, Mr John Lowe, Miss  
Becky Chaukley, Mr David Connah, Mrs Patricia Starling, Mrs Valerie Alcock,  
Mr David Alcock, Mr & Mrs R & M Hufton, Ms Julie Craft, Mrs Madeline  
Allsop, Mr Dick Bend, Mrs Margaret Bend, Mrs Pauline Hodson, Mr Peter  
Ward, Mrs Elizabeth Ward, Mr Roger Dean, Mrs Patricia Shaw, Ms Kathryn  
Shaw, Mr John Bolger, Mr Richard Shaw, Mr & Mrs M & M Lowe, Mrs Edna  
Pearson, Mr & Mrs A & D Rhodes.

## Portrait of Ashfield, Strategic Objectives, Vision

### Responses received relating to Portrait

#### Support:

- Support for regeneration and for an economically strong and diverse district
- Support for economic growth, but there are limited opportunities for local settlements to support new business growth in villages
- Support from Selstonn Parish Council for the Vision but concerns were expressed regarding the policy and site allocations to support this Vision in the rural area
- Support for Vision to cater for the needs of the rural areas especially access to services and education. Parish Council identify that a consolidated replacement school sites for Westwood Infants and Jacksdale Primary and a new school site for Underwood schools are long standing priorities within the Parish. The Parish Council support Green Belt release for new housing conditional on the Parish visibly benefiting from new development and schooling.
- Support for the Vision's intention to cater for the needs of rural areas and the provision of fair and equal access to jobs and services. However, concerns expressed that there are no specific employment allocations in the rural area to support this Vision.
- Support for addressing climate change, protection of natural assets and the environment
- Support for regeneration and economically diverse, and strong district
- Add list of designated and undesignated sites to Para 2.28 and improve the information in this paragraph
- Rephrase paragraph regarding the natural environment to add weight.
- SO1 is welcomed.

#### Object:

- The housing requirement identified in the plan is not sufficient due to the short time horizon, thus failing to set out a clear strategy to meet future housing requirements in accordance with the NPPF and the plan is thus not sound. Wants more housing and employment growth along the MARR
- The housing requirement should be in general conformity to the Regional Spatial strategy and be for a 15 year time horizon and include the under provision from the 2006-10 period thus requiring an additional 3648 to the end date of 2029.
- Additional dwellings needed to 2029 require a change to the current distribution of proposed development and the majority of the 3648 dwellings could be accommodated in SUEs .
- Lack of clear statement of the role of environmental assets especially in terms of their adding to the quality of life and the reinforcement of the distinctiveness of place and as a valued resource including need to define and characterise the wider historic environment and environmental

characteristics (both urban and rural) including features of local importance, heritage resources, townscape, landscape character and archaeology, and how these are changing in the portrait.

- Include list of heritage assets in the Plan.
- Role of habitat creation as well as protection of habitats and species needs to be emphasised
- Inappropriate in a vision to include reference to the strategic development sites of Rolls Royce and land adjacent to the MARR-or include strategic green infrastructure sites in the vision for parity.
- Need for greater proactive vision and policies to support local retail and employment in villages
- Show the 2 registered parks and gardens at Annesley hall and Hardwick Hall on the key Diagram.
- Section 2.28 regarding the natural environment is rather scant. Supporting text for Policy EV4 (8.53 to 8.63) could be added here.
- SO10 should be strengthened and there needs to be clarity about PDL use and the fact that habitats of value may have regenerated.
- SO11 needs rewording for accuracy
- Use smaller sites for housing nearer to bus and rail links and not large sites.
- SO6 should refer specifically to green infrastructure.
- SO8 needs to include reference to climate change adaptation
- Rename SO12 as Heritage Assets and reference to districts distinct built environment should be districts distinct historic environment.
- SO14 should include additional wording on sustainable design

#### Comments

- SO3 – the ‘local distinctiveness, settlement identity and measures that might be used to develop a strong sense of place requires research through proper historic characterisation project. NCC is happy to contribute expertise to a project that would do this.
- The Vision - The penultimate paragraph deals with the natural environment in the context of growth; it is suggested that this should be reframed to read something like: “Ashfield will be a place rich in wildlife, and growth will be accommodated in a manner that achieves the protection, restoration, enhancement and management of environmental assets, including Green Infrastructure networks, priority habitats and populations of priority species.”
- Concern from Selston Parish Council

NB there are representations in this section related to Winter Closes which have been transferred to the relevant housing section.

**Response:**

- Reason for the timescale of the Plan is set out in paragraph 1.9 of the Local Plan Preferred Approach and will be addressed in more detailed in a technical note to accompany the Local Plan Publication Draft in the summer of 2013.
- The housing/employment requirement for the 10 year plan is set out in the Local Plan and explained more fully in the Housing Technical Paper (Sept 2012) and the Local Economy Summary Paper (August 2012)
- The reasoned justification for not proposing the development of Sustainable Urban Extensions as the Local Plan Preferred Approach is set out in a Technical Note.
- Local Heritage Assets are covered by Policy EV11 of the Local Plan. Paragraph 8.119 of the supporting text to Policy EV11 states that “A list of non-designated local heritage assets will be published in a separate document.....” It is considered that this is the correct approach as the list will need to maintained and updated on a regular basis as new sites are identified.
- It is acknowledged that there needs to be a reference in the objectives about previously developed land (PDL) and the fact that habitats of value may have regenerated.
- It is considered that there are adequate references to habitat creation in the Plan Vision and Strategic Objectives (SO). The Vision refers to “the protection, restoration and enhancement of environmental assets (definition of environmental assets is included in the glossary of the Plan as: Physical features and conditions of notable value occurring within the District) and SO11 refers to “protecting, enhancing and expanding Ashfield’s network of green infrastructure, including its distinctive landscapes, woodlands, geology, archaeological, heritage, biodiversity, habitats and wildlife species...”. In addition, the supporting text to Policy EV4 – Green Infrastructure, Biodiversity and Geological Conservation refers to the need for development proposals to consider the protection and enhancement of biodiversity and geodiversity.
- It is acknowledged that there needs to be greater clarity of the role of environmental assets in terms of their adding to the quality of life and reinforcing the distinctiveness of place. It is proposed to make an additional reference to the supporting text of Policy EV4 to refer to the benefits of bringing wildlife into urban areas can have on quality of life etc.
- It is considered appropriate to include the Rolls Royce site and the land adjacent to the MARR within the vision as they are the key strategic regeneration and growth sites for the district.
- It is considered that the Vision adequately supports local retail and employment in villages. The vision states that ‘The needs of the rural areas including Selston, Jacksdale and Underwood will be catered for, providing a fair and equal access to jobs and services across the district.’ However, it is acknowledged that this may be lacking in the supporting objectives.
- The two registered parks and gardens at Annesley Hall and Hardwick Hall are shown on the Policies Map. It is not considered necessary to shown them on the Key Diagram. The purpose of the key diagram is to shown

areas for growth, key transport links, strategic site allocations and the hierarchy of town centres.

- It is not considered necessary to repeat the supporting text from Policy EV4 (8.53 to 8.63) in the paragraph 2.28.
- It is not considered necessary to include a reference to climate change adaptation as this is sufficiently covered within the document.
- It is agreed to include a reference to green infrastructure in SO6.
- SO12 deals with all built assets, not just heritage assets, and therefore it is not considered appropriate to rename it.
- SO14 already refers to ‘...sustainable and inclusive design...’. However, it is proposed to rename SO14 to “Sustainable and High Quality Design.
- The changes suggested to the strategic objectives are set out below.

### **Changes to the Local Plan:**

- Reference to the wider historic environment and environmental characteristics (both urban and rural) including heritage resources, townscape, landscape character and archaeology, will be added to the Strategic Area Based Policies for Hucknall, Sutton and Kirkby, and Jacksdale, Selston and Underwood.
- Split SO2: Vibrant Town Centres in to 4 separate objectives:
  - Sutton-in-Ashfield Town Centre
  - Hucknall Town Centre
  - Kirkby-in-Ashfield Town Centre
  - Local Shopping Centres
- SO6 a reference to green infrastructure will be added in order to recognise its value and importance to health and well being.
- SO11 will be amended to recognise that biodiversity of natural assets can occur in urban situations and on previously developed land. Amend to read:  
“To protect, enhance and expand Ashfield’s network of green infrastructure, including its distinctive rural and urban landscapes, woodlands, geology, archaeological heritage, biodiversity, habitats and indigenous wildlife species;...”.
- Add new SO - Legacy and Natural Resources, to read:  
“To ensure development proposals fully consider the District’s coal mining legacy issues to ensure the stability of the land and to consider the conservation and enhancement of natural resources.”
- SO14 to be renamed “sustainable and high quality design” and add words after crime “and the protection of the environment” and after “an attractive area to live in “ add “ results in better health and wellbeing, particularly through the quiet enjoyment of nature”
- Add a reference in paragraph 2.28 to designated sites listed in the Appendices to the Local Plan.
- Policy EV4, add at the end of paragraph 8.60 the following text, “Good design for biodiversity can help bring wildlife into urban areas and be of benefit for quality of life, health and wellbeing as well as contribute to achieving Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) targets.”

<b>Number of Comments</b>		<b>Number of Respondents</b>	
<b>42</b>		<b>16</b>	
<b>Objection to Policy</b>	<b>Support the Policy</b>		<b>Comment on the Policy</b>
<b>18</b>	<b>18</b>		<b>8</b>

**List of Respondents**  
 English Heritage, National Trust, Pegasus Planning Group Ltd, National Trust Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust, The Tyler-Parkes Partnership, Phoenix Planning (UK ) Ltd (for Nottinghamshire County Council) Selston Parish Council, Environment Agency, Natural England, Barton Willmore Planning, Theatre Trust, Nottinghamshire County Council, A.Burton, C.McPhail, S. Jones

## Strategic Policies

### Policy SP1: Sustainable Development Principles

#### Responses received relating to Policy SP1

##### Support:

- Environment Agency welcomes principles of SP1-but wants words added on energy/water efficiency to point 4.
- Wildlife Trust wants more emphasis in point 5 to refuse development of a piecemeal nature which would damage Biodiversity Action Plan habitats or species.
- Natural England supports the Policy.
- Support for sustainable development principles.
- May need to clarify that 'sustainable development', as referenced in section 4(a) of this policy, is defined as per the NPPF.
- Support for Policy SP1 from residents largely in Annesley Woodhouse but with comments:
  - There are concerns about infrastructure.
  - The need for the Transport Impact Assessment highlighted in Para 3.10 for major developments be carried out throughout the District including the impact of development sites outside the District.
  - Concern that developments along Derby Road, and other development whose traffic will using the road will seriously affect traffic movements.
  - Request that the following text be inserted with this section "Following approval by the Inspector, of the Preferred Plan, all approved/allocated sites of above 40 dwellings will have a development plan generated. The generation of this plan will be undertaken by ADC and local residents so that a brief is produced which takes account of the local character etc., where the development is to take place. This development plan will act as a guide to potential developers." The principle of this embodies Community involvement (localism) at the earliest stage."

##### Object:

- To any further development at Selston –no pedestrian provision along access roads, poor street lighting and no public transport.
- All other objections lodged related to specific allocated housing sites or suggested alternative sites and have been transferred to the relevant summaries under HG1.

**Response:**

- It is recognised that traffic is a substantial issue for a number of larger sites. A Transport Assessment was undertaken in 2010 based on the requirements of an increase in by 11,200 dwellings. Additional work is currently being undertaken to examine the impact of the housing and employment land allocations proposed and measures necessary to mitigate the effects of the growth.
- An integrated part of planning for sustainable development is taking into account the physical, economic, social and environmental infrastructure necessary to enable the development to progress. The Council has undertaken an Infrastructure Capacity Study and has had meeting with infrastructure providers such as the Education Authority and PCT. The Council is currently working on an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which looks to identify: what infrastructure is required, how it will be provided, where/when is infrastructure needed and when can any constraints be overcome.
- Sustainable development is defined in the glossary to the Local Plan
- Development briefs will be prepared for the larger sites allocated in the plan. It would be impractical in terms of resources to undertake master plan of site as small as 40 dwellings. However, additional work will be undertaken in relation to larger allocation it is proposed to be taken forward.
- The proposal to refuse development which would damage Biodiversity Action Plan habitats or species is already covered in Policy EV4 so there is not need to amend policy SP1.
- References to particular housing sites will be dealt within the relevant policies.

**Changes to the Local Plan:**

- Add to the end of Point 4 a (f) contributes to energy and water efficiency.

Number of Comments		Number of Respondents	
54		54	
Objection to Policy	Support the Policy	Comment on the Policy	
1	51	2	



### List of Respondents

Hugh Nicoll-10 responses related to objection to allocation West of Becks Lane, Mary Rutter-Selston, Natural England, Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust, Environment Agency, Barton Wilmore Planning, Marrons, Nottinghamshire County Council, Mr Robert Collier, Mrs Julia Collier, Mr Peter Olko, Mrs Joan Olko, Miss Deberah Olko, Mr William Cooper, Ms Ann Cooper, Mr & Mrs M & P Dear, Mrs Margaret Lathall, Mr John Shaw, Mrs Micaela Stanley, Mrs Anne Chalkley, Mr Stewart Chalkley, Mr Stephen Jacksdale, Mrs Alison Jackson, Mrs Pauline Cumberland, Mr Donald Bailey, Mr Mark Raynor, Mr Philip Wood, Mrs Margaret Johnson, Mrs Thompson, Mr John Lowe, Miss Becky Chaukley, Mr David Connah, Mrs Patricia Starling, Mrs Valerie Alcock, Mr David Alcock, Mr & Mrs R & M Hufton, Ms Julie Craft, Mrs Madeline Allsop, Mr Dick Bend, Mrs Margaret Bend, Mrs Pauline Hodson, Mr Peter Ward, Mrs Elizabeth Ward, Mr Roger Dean, Mr George Cordy, Mr Russell Lathall, Mrs Patricia Shaw, Ms Kathryn Shaw, Mr John Bolger, Mr Richard Shaw, Mrs Kirsty Cohen, Mr & Mrs M & M Lowe, Miss Angela Smith, Mrs Haydee Lafferty, Mr David Simpson, Mr Adam Heathcote.

## **Policy SP2: Strategy for Growth**

### Responses received relating to Policy

#### Support:

- Natural England support the policy and supporting text.
- EA support the policy for the water, management and reducing flood risk elements.
- Policy needs to refer to issue of avoidance of mineral sterilisation (NPPF Para 143) and prior extraction.
- English Heritage supports policy in terms of high quality design.
- National Trust support policy.
- Highways Agency is satisfied that the policy has pledged to reduce need to travel by car- but wants reference to dealing with the residual traffic demand generated by development proposals and need to reference the potential impact on M1 and the need for infrastructure improvements
- Further reference to enhanced infrastructure needed before development such as schools, shops and other local facilities, especially as need new GP within the Annesley area.
- For sustainable economic growth and reduce out commuting.

- Suggest that the design and quality criteria are in a separate policy.
- Support for overall housing figures as close to the RSS requirement.
- Support Sutton being focus of growth.
- Support for promotion of main urban areas as locations for growth and reuse of PDL within urban areas should be afforded a higher priority.
- Support strategy's focus on economic development and job creation.
- Support the policy in terms of promotion of social and cultural facilities.
- Mansfield DC supports the employment and economic regeneration approach of the policy.
- Nottinghamshire County Council raised concerns over Buildings at Risk in Ashfield with particular concern expressed about the condition of Annesley Hall.
- The Policy should cross reference to the additional detail in the Local Transport Plan.

Object:

- Object to presumption that house building creates jobs.
- Object to land in green belt being allocated for housing as this would not fulfil the SP2 objectives.
- Need a comprehensive review of green belt boundaries as per the NPPF.
- Policy ought to support the SUEs-able to deal with traffic issues and are close to public transport, are close to town centres and employment, and would allow for infrastructure provision rather than piecemeal development
- SP2 should include the overall dwelling requirement figure.
- Jobs should come before houses, existing brown field sites vacant land and derelict houses should be used first with no use of green belt land, proposals will only add to traffic congestion.
- Strategy is not consistent with NPPF time horizon and thus does not meet housing requirements.
- No reference to economic benefits of house building.
- No recognition within SP2 of the need to build upon the significant investment made in the MARR-should open up development sites along the MARR and will even constrain businesses and homes being developed along MARR.
- The Environment Agency's recommend that an objective be included within the Local Plan to 'Protect and enhance the wider environment' giving particular attention to dealing with controlled waters and land contamination.
- ACCESS raised that the A611 through Annesley is one of the country's most congested roads with a number of sites within a 2km corridor of the A611 already having planning permission or yet to be fully occupied. Substantial concerns were raised regarding the transport infrastructure as:
  - The Ashfield Transport Study, Nov 2010 concentrated on 3 major 1000 dwelling developments around Ashfield and failed to investigate the road capacity and junction capacity through Annesley Woodhouse stopping at the A611/B6139 Coxmoor Junction;
  - Newark and Sherwood Council study on the traffic impact of the

proposed mixed use Lindhurst development is out of date as a result of the proposed developments of HG1Sv (Rushley Farm - Residential development) and HG1MUa (South of West Notts College Mixed Use);

- Developments within Gedling Borough Council namely Top Wighay (1000 dwellings) and Papplewick North (600 dwellings) as well as Ashfield District Council mixed development site at Rolls Royce Hucknall site (900 dwellings) will also further impact on the A611.

Consequently, the transport evidence is "unsound".

#### Responses received relating to Policy supporting text

##### Support:

- Support for housing assessment approach based on uplift from employment led projections.
- Text should emphasis commitment to developing sustainable diverse and resilient economy by providing for indigenous economic growth and providing flexible portfolio of land.
- Para 3.28 refer to Building for life 12 and reference the basis on which a design review would be recommended.
- Para 3.29 on green infrastructure supported by EA and Wildlife Trust- although some GI may not necessarily best be multifunctional-some may best be served by having a single aim.
- Support for the main paragraphs from residents largely in Annesley Woodhouse but it is considered:
  - in relation to paragraph 3.21 that Annesley Woodhouse/ Nuncargate/Kirkby Woodhouse form a separate village identity as does (New) Annesley (Colliery Village) and ought to be treated similarly. They are distinct from the main centres and should be allowed to develop and create their own identities rather than coalescing into the larger towns. For the purposes of any illustration the Council should ensure that: clarity in the terms used for: Annesley, New Annesley, Annesley Woodhouse - does this include Nuncargate and Kirkby Woodhouse? Nuncargate; Kirkby Woodhouse.
  - In relation to paragraph 3.21 it is noted that a health centre has not been provided at Annesley Colliery site as promised. A commitments should be obtained from the developer and infrastructure provider in relation to providing a GP unit in relation to the proposed developments along Derby Road (HG1 Kcl & HG1 Ke) for the construction of a GP unit in the Annesley Area.

##### Object:

- Object to time period of plan and the implication for housing numbers-the plan period should be 2011-26.
- Notts CC comment that time period is sufficient but would benefit from being longer and overall housing requirement is acceptable.

**Response:**

- Reason for the timescale of the Plan is set out in paragraph 1.9 of the Local Plan Preferred Approach and will be addressed in more detail in a technical note to accompany the Local Plan Publication Draft in the spring of 2013.
- The housing/employment requirement for the 10 year plan is set out in the Local Plan and explained more fully in the Housing Technical Paper (Sept 2012) and the Local Economy Summary Paper (August 2012).
- Sites allocated for housing were all assessed as part of the Sustainability Appraisal, including sites which were green belt and are now proposed for housing. The Sustainability appraisal is based on a consistent approach which has been independently assessed as part of a peer review. A revised SA will be published at the next stage of the Plan which will take account of comments made about the SA.
- The Housing Strategy Technical Paper will set out the reasoned justification for the choice of housing sites in the Local plan Preferred Approach, including not allocating Sustainable Urban extensions.
- It is acknowledged that some of the proposed development sites will result in a loss of countryside/Green Belt. However, the Council's analysis identified that there are insufficient brownfield sites (including derelict sites) to meet the housing requirements and therefore homes will need to be built on Greenfield sites. The Council has to make difficult decisions in balance the needs for housing against the environment.
- There is no need to include dwelling capacity figures in Policy SP2 as they will be included in policy HG1.
- It is recognised that traffic is a substantial issue for a number of larger sites. A Transport Assessment was undertaken in 2010 based on the requirements of an increase in by 11,200 dwellings. Additional work is currently being undertaken to examine the impact of the housing and employment land allocations proposed and measures necessary to mitigate the effects of the growth. A transport Study will be published in due course.
- An integrated part of planning for sustainable development is taking into account the physical, economic, social and environmental infrastructure necessary to enable the development to progress. The Council has undertaken a Infrastructure Capacity Study and has had meeting with infrastructure providers such as the Education Authority and PCT. The Council is currently working on an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which looks to identify: what infrastructure is required, how it will be provided, where/when is infrastructure needed and when can any constraints be overcome.
- An amendment to the Plan related to the EA response is included within the Portrait chapter of the Plan.
- Development along the MARR is reflected in the criteria based aspects of the Area Policy for Sutton-in-Ashfield and Kirkby-in-Ashfield.
- The Plan already references at Para 3:16 to a sustainable and diverse economy.

**Changes to the Local Plan:**

- Include dwelling capacity numbers for each site in the HG1 Policy.
- Add additional bullet point to the Policy to refer to need to ensure no sterilisation of minerals.
- Policy SP2 (4) to be amended to add additional wording to the Policy to take opportunities to protect and enhance the water environment.”
- Add bullet point to Para 3.16 to refer to providing for indigenous economic growth and providing flexible portfolio of land.
- Amend paragraph 3.22 to include words “As large parts of Ashfield is on a principal aquifer this includes giving particularly emphasis to protecting ground water from contamination and enhancing the water environment.”
- Add to Para 3.24 the need to manage traffic management arrangements and residual traffic impacts from development.
- Add to Para 3.29 to recognise that some GI may not necessarily best be multifunctional-some may best be served by having a single aim.
- Review wording to provide a consistent approach to settlements with clarity in relation to the terms used for: Annesley, New Annesley, Annesley Woodhouse.
- Changes to the text will be taken forward to emphasise that the Local Plan and the Local Transport Plan complement each other and the respective councils are working together on highway issues.

Number of Comments		Number of Respondents	
95		82	
Objection to Policy	Support the Policy	Comment on the Policy	
14	17	64	

**List of Respondents**

Environment Agency, OPUN, Nottingham Wildlife Trust, Natural England  
 The Coal Authority, English Heritage, National Trust, Highways Agency,  
 Taylor Wimpey, Derbyshire Environmental Services, Nottinghamshire County  
 Council, Gedling Borough Council, Pegasus Planning Group Ltd, David  
 Wilson Homes, BDW, Phoenix Planning UK Ltd, The Cooperative Group  
 Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners, The Tyler-Parkes Partnership, NJL  
 Consulting LLP, Marrons, URS Infrastructure and Environment UK Ltd, H.  
 Nicholl, Dr D Cross, Mr J Shaw, Mr and Mrs Stewert and Anne Stewert,

Mr L Dacunha, S Hull, Mr M Bee, D Rose, Mr S Barkes, Mr and Mrs Norris, S Kiddy, Annesley Community Committed to Ensuring Sustainable Settlements (ACCESS), Mr Robert Collier, Mrs Julia Collier, Mr Peter Olko, Mrs Joan Olko, Miss Deberah Olko, Mr William Cooper, Ms Ann Cooper, Mr & Mrs M & P Dear, Mrs Margaret Lathall, Mr John Shaw, Mrs Micaela Stanley, Mrs Anne Chalkley, Mr Stewart Chalkley, Mr Stephen Jacksdale, Mrs Alison Jackson, Mrs Pauline Cumberland, Mr Donald Bailey, Mr Mark Raynor, Mr Philip Wood, Mrs Margaret Johnson, Mrs Thompson, Mr John Lowe, Miss Becky Chaukley, Mr David Connah, Mrs Patricia Starling, Mrs Valerie Alcock, Mr David Alcock, Mr & Mrs R & M Hufton, Ms Julie Craft, Mrs Madeline Allsop, Mr Dick Bend, Mrs Margaret Bend, Mrs Pauline Hodson, Mr Peter Ward, Mrs Elizabeth Ward, Mr Roger Dean, Mr Russell Lathall, Mrs Patricia Shaw, Ms Kathryn Shaw, Mr John Bolger, Mr Richard Shaw, Mrs Kirsty Cohen, Mr & Mrs M & M Lowe, Miss Angela Smith, Mrs Haydee Lafferty, Mr David Simpson, Mr Adam Heathcote, Mrs Edna Pearson & Mr & Mrs A & D Rhodes.

### **Policy SP3: Settlement and Town Centre Hierarchies**

#### Responses received relating to Policy

##### Support

- The National Trust supports this policy.
- Support for the policy with regard to Sutton in Ashfield being a primary location for growth;
- Support for the policy with regard to the role of Sutton in Ashfield as a sub regional centre. This is consistent with the East Midlands Regional Plan which identifies the Mansfield-Ashfield area as a sub regional centre. As such, the site at Lowmoor Road is considered to provide a sustainable development solution to help meet future housing needs in the area.
- The policy identifies Sutton in Ashfield and Kirkby in Ashfield as major areas for change. It also acknowledges the sustainability of Sutton in Ashfield and Kirkby in Ashfield, which is consistent with the Regional Plan. As such, land to the east of Lowmoor Road is well located to provide a sustainable development solution to help meet future housing requirements
- Support for the strategy of growth within the main towns in Ashfield;
- Support for the identification of Underwood as an area for smaller scale growth provided that there are key facilities to support this;
- Support with regard to Annesley Woodhouse being in the main urban area and settlement hierarchy. Land to the south of Annesley Woodhouse, on Forest Road, is currently in the main urban area and it should remain in

the main urban area.

- Support for the policy with regard to Sutton in Ashfield, Hucknall and Kirkby in Ashfield offering the best locations for growth. In particular to the north of the District there are better opportunities for growth in the adjoining countryside i.e. avoiding Green belt release. This would also help to reduce carbon footprint of the communities living in Ashfield;
- Support for the classification of Hucknall as a 'Major District Centre' which recognises that this is a sustainable location for growth;

#### Object

- Mansfield District Council has raised an objection to Sutton in Ashfield being defined as a 'Sub Regional Centre'. Sutton in Ashfield town centre is considered to play a secondary role to Mansfield (Sutton is ranked 499 in the 2008 Management Horizons Europe index of town centres whereas Mansfield is ranked at 128). The important role of Mansfield town centre within the area should be recognised alongside the supportive role played by Sutton-in-Ashfield town centre
- An objection was raised to this policy due to sites adjacent to the MARR not being included in the hierarchy.
- Concern was raised regarding the role of Kirkby in Ashfield as a 'District Centre'. One respondent considered that the size of the town centre is considered similar to Hucknall town centre and its role should be the same.
- The policy recognises that the conservation areas of Bagthorpe and Teversal are further reasons/restrictions to growth, but there is no reference to the conservation area of Kirkby (and in particular to the restriction on expansion to the south resulting from the need to protect the setting of the conservation area), nor is there any reference to New Annesley conservation area.
- With regard to Rushley Farm and the site to the south of West Notts College – an explanation regarding the special relationship between Ashfield and Mansfield should be incorporated into this Policy.

#### Comment

- There was a mixed response regarding the policies consistency with the East Midlands Regional Plan – some felt that the policy was in conformity with the regional plan whilst others didn't.
- There should be more emphasis on the development of previously developed sites in the main urban area within the policy;

#### Responses received relating to Policy supporting text

- Paragraph 3.35 states that there is a railway station in Sutton in Ashfield yet it is some distance outside the town;
- Support for the statement 'there are fewer restrictions on growth in Sutton in Ashfield as it is not surrounded by Green Belt';  
Objection regarding paragraph 3.38 – it states that Annesley Woodhouse has scored well in the Accessible Settlements Study yet it cannot accommodate large scale growth due to Green Belt constraints. The site

on Forest Road could accommodate development and it is being proposed to be put back into Green Belt.

**Response:**

- Although Sutton in Ashfield is ranked lower in terms of the 2008 Management Horizons Europe index of town centres, the recently revoked East Midlands Regional Plan identified the Mansfield-Ashfield area as a 'sub regional' centre for growth. Sutton in Ashfield is the largest town centre in Ashfield and, as such, its role within the District and the surrounding area should reflect the importance of the centre in terms of the provision of retail goods and services. Furthermore, the Ashfield Retail Study 2011 update recommends that Sutton in Ashfield is defined as a 'sub regional centre' to reflect the status of the town. The study identified that Sutton is an extremely important retail centre which caters for the majority of the catchments population's comparison needs. As such, local planning policies need to reflect the importance of the centre to ensure that it remains a focus for significant additional retail and town centre development.
- It is not considered necessary to include the MARR within the settlement hierarchy as it is not a settlement.
- Kirkby in Ashfield town centre functions as a district centre, as is evident from the Ashfield Retail Study Update (2011). As such, it is not considered appropriate to change the role or definition of the town centre.
- It is noted that the policy does not make reference to the role Mansfield has within the hierarchy of centres. The Policy will be amended to reflect the fact that Mansfield and Ashfield form the function of a sub-regional centre for growth (as previously set out in the recently revoked East Midlands Regional Plan).

**Changes to the Local Plan:**

- Make reference to the Districts relationship with Mansfield. Insert: "Areas in the District adjacent to the Sub Regional Centre of Mansfield" in the Main Urban Areas section of the hierarchy. Supporting text will also be added to explain Mansfield's role.



<b>Number of Comments</b>		<b>Number of Respondents</b>	
18		13	
<b>Objection to Policy</b>	<b>Support the Policy</b>		<b>Comment on the Policy</b>
7	9		2

**List of Respondents**  
 Mr. R. Routledge, Mansfield District Council, Mr. J. Deakin, David Wilson Homes BDW, Ms. J. Walters, Barton Wilmore Planning, Mr. A. Hubbard, National Trust, Mr. D. Pope, Nathaniel Litchfield and Partners, Mr. D. Rixson, Vincent and Gorbing, Ms. S. Gill, Nottinghamshire County Council, Mr. G. Longley, Pegasus Planning on behalf of Hallam Land Management, Ms. J. Gardner, Marrons, Mr. J. Booth, Phoenix Planning (UK) Ltd, Ms. H. Winkler, The Tyler-Parkes Partnership, Mr. M. Eagland, Peacock and Smith on behalf of Wm Morrison plc, Mr. A. Gore, Pegasus Planning on behalf of Clowes Development

## Strategic Area Based Policies Hucknall

### Policy SPH1: Green Infrastructure in and around Hucknall

#### Responses received relating to Policy

- Natural England support this policy.

#### Responses received relating to Policy supporting text

- Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust recommend a small change to the text at paragraph 4.5, page 50. Acknowledges the multifunctional aspect of 'green infrastructure' but advise no where does it acknowledge that the infrastructure overlaps with the historic environment and, for instance along the Leen Valley, contains designated heritage of international significance.
- It is unfortunate that paragraphs 4.1.13 to 4.1.16 from the Core Strategy Preferred Options document have been removed, as they provided important detail regarding the historic character and development of the Hucknall area. Continue to maintain that a policy and/or strategy incorporating historic environmental issues should be developed for the Hucknall area, and recommend that the paragraphs from the Core Strategy Preferred Options document are reinstated.
- Nottinghamshire County Council acknowledge the multifunctional aspect of green infrastructure but advises no where does it acknowledge that the infrastructure overlaps with the historic environment, for instance along the Leen Valley.

#### Response:

- It is not considered necessary to include the supporting from The Core Strategy Preferred Options 2010 to the main text of the policy as this information is included in the 'Portrait of the District' in the first chapter of the Local Plan.

#### Changes to the Local Plan:

- Recommend changes to paragraph 4.5, page 50 as follows: It is important that Green Infrastructure assets are 'multi functional', where appropriate, a bridleway, for example, may encourage physical activity but also provide a route into the countryside, a Local Nature Reserve may provide accessible biodiversity and also allow local residents to learn about nature, allotments may encourage healthy lifestyles and also reduce food miles.
- Changes to text to include Nottinghamshire County Council comments with regards to infrastructure overlapping the historic environment.

<b>Number of Comments</b>		<b>Number of Respondents</b>	
4		4	
<b>Objection to Policy</b>	<b>Support the Policy</b>		<b>Comment on the Policy</b>
1	0		3

**List of Respondents**

Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust, English Heritage, Natural England, Nottinghamshire County Council

**Policy SPH2: Hucknall Housing Growth**

**Comments received relating to Policy**

- English Heritage request that reference be made to preservation and enhancement of the 4 listed hangars at Rolls Royce both within the policy and any emerging development brief
- Section 2 of the policy states that the protection and enhancement of areas of biological importance will be required to achieve sustainable development at Rolls Royce. Given that a large proportion of the allocation is designated as a SINC it is unclear how this can be achieved. Significant compensatory habitat works may be required, which could be delivered through an approach such as Biodiversity Offsetting.

- Natural England and Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust support the green infrastructure requirement and the protection and enhancement of areas of biological importance as essential components of achieving sustainable communities
- Concern expressed over the short plan period/lack of long term planning and the effect this could have on the duty to co-operate and the contribution that Hucknall makes to the City's Greater Nottingham's future housing needs.
- Plan period should extend to 15 years – the plan therefore has an under provision of housing land. In considering an inadequate time frame, the Plan cannot be considered to be positively prepared and is in danger of not meeting the housing need of the area, thus being unsound.
- Reference should be made to the close relationship with the wider Nottingham HMA and the need for close alignment with the Greater Nottingham Authorities.
- Dwelling capacity for each site should be included in order to enable proper assessment of the overall housing supply for Hucknall.
- Information contained within the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) does not appear to be available.
- The basis for the housing target is considered reasonable, justified and supported by DCC.
- The level of future growth, reflecting that of the regional plan is welcomed in that it accords with the approach taken in the Nottingham Aligned Core Strategies. Also supported by Notts CC.
- Support for the proposed phasing of Broomhill Farm site in terms of preventing the risk of overdevelopment and subsequent unsustainable outcomes. Policy should set a review period for when the latest state of demand/need will be assessed against completions.
- Object to the development of the Rolls Royce site with regard to loss of green space, habitats and closure of the flying club
- Objection to erosion of green belt
- Objection to increase in traffic, particularly capacity of Watnall Road. Reference should be made to improvement of by-pass to Moorbridge.
- Suggest a new tramline to Rolls Royce from Cinderhill Blenheim estate.
- Tram network cannot cope with the existing number of users
- Lack of facilities for young people will lead to an increase in crime
- Hucknall has had more than its share of development and new housing and there should not be any more for at least 10 years
- Information should be provided on the district wide housing situation – not just the 3 sub areas.
- Housing targets should be expressed as a minimum (as per para 47 NPPF) and development should not be resisted 'in principle' once the supply of deliverable sites is achieved. Policy wording should be amended to reflect this.
- Reference to the SHLAA in the policy is unsound and would, in effect, allocate land identified within the SHLAA for development. The SHLAA forms an evidence base and carries no weight as a development plan document to allocate or approve land for housing.

- It is likely that the Council will need to adjust its overall policy requirements for Rolls Royce due to viability and the deliverability of the business park
- Part 3 relating to the phased delivery of the Broomhill Farm site should be deleted as it is unreasonable, impractical and unjustified and offends the Wednesbury principle.
- It is unclear how the housing requirement has been arrived at. A rate lower than the regional plan must be fully justified.
- Hucknall's housing requirement should reflect the findings of the Edge Analytics report (CLG projection and the figure based on long term migration trends). It should be far greater and help to meet the unmet needs in the Greater Nottingham HMA.

Comments received relating to Policy supporting text

- Para 4.13 relating to the phased delivery of the Broomhill Farm site should be deleted.
- Para 4.11 - To refer to allocations as being identified on the proposals Map and in policy HG1 is confusing. They should both be the same and only reference to HG1 is required

**Response:**

- Reference to the 4 hangars at Rolls Royce is a specific detail that is already covered by policy EV11 and would be identified and addressed at planning application stage. It is considered unnecessary to be included in policy SPH2, but will be included in a new introductory paragraph specific to the Hucknall area. Inclusion of this information will also be incorporated into in any future development brief for the site.
- Implications for the SINC at Rolls Royce - The entire southern part of the site has been highlighted as having some wildlife significance, however, several smaller areas within the site have been identified as magnesian limestone (Calcareous) grassland and of greater conservation importance for the county, also being nationally scarce. Any development scheme put forward will need to take account of these areas, and other grassland areas of value at the site, and design the development to avoid or mitigate sensitive areas accordingly. Significant compensatory habitat works may be required and will be addressed at planning application stage. Additional wording will be included in the supporting text to this effect.
- The justification for the timescale of the Plan is set out in paragraph 1.9 of the Local Plan Preferred Approach and will be addressed in more detailed in a technical note to accompany the Local Plan Publication Draft in the spring of 2013. Para. 157 of the NPPF refers to a 15 year time horizon as 'preferable', however, in the interests of actively promoting the localism agenda and maintaining a 5 year land supply, a decision has been taken to plan for a shorter period in the first instance, whilst looking to an early

review to plan for longer term. It is acknowledged that due to timescale and likely adoption date, this may result in a plan with a remaining period of 9 years. The plan period will be amended to 2024 to address this issue.

- The housing requirement for the 10 year plan is set out in the Local Plan and explained more fully in the Housing Technical Paper (Sept 2012)
- Acknowledged that there is currently no reference to the close relationship of Hucknall with Nottingham City. Hucknall does form part of the Nottingham Core Housing Market area and is to a large extent functionally part of Greater Nottingham. This will be addressed in an introductory section at the next stage in the Local Plan process.
- There is no need to include dwelling capacity figures in Policy SP2 as they will be included in policy HG1
- Phasing of development at Broomhill Farm - The Council do not intend to change the approach taken to this site and it will only be brought forward if/when required in order to satisfy the 5 year supply of housing land in Hucknall. Discussions have been held with the landowner regarding the importance of bringing forward the strategic site at Rolls Royce with its regeneration/employment benefits in a timely manner.
- The SHLAA is available to view on the Council's website.
- The Preferred Approach document does not propose Green Belt allocations in the Hucknall area, therefore no Green Belt erosion is anticipated in this area.
- It is acknowledged that some of the proposed development sites will result in a loss of countryside/green belt. However, the Council's analysis identified that there are insufficient brownfield site (including derelict sites) to meet the housing requirements and therefore homes will need to be built on Greenfield sites. The Council has to make difficult decisions in balance the needs for housing against the environment. The Rolls Royce site is a mixed use allocation which will also bring forward 27ha of land for employment uses and potentially lever in further advanced engineering investment and resultant job creation as part of the overall development.
- Whilst it is acknowledged that the Flying Club is an important facility, the loss of such must be weighed against the benefits of a strategic development opportunity with the potential to provide significant levels of housing for local needs and increased employment opportunities.
- It is recognised that traffic is a substantial issue for a number of larger sites. A Transport Assessment was undertaken in 2010 based on the requirements of an increase in by 11,200 dwellings. Additional work is currently being undertaken to examine the impact of the housing and employment land allocations proposed and measures necessary to mitigate the effects of the growth. A transport Study will be published in due course and any specific reference to improvements be included in the emerging Infrastructure Delivery Plan
- Any extension to the tram network will come under the remit of Notts County Council. There will be continuing dialogue with the County Council throughout the Local Plan process and the question of any scope to extend the existing network will be raised. However, there is no current funding for an infrastructure project of this type and scale, or for the foreseeable future.

- It is considered unnecessary to provide information regarding the housing situation at a District level. The area specific policies reflect the disparate housing market sub-areas and are therefore locally specific, not based purely on administration boundaries. The overall situation is however set out in the annual Housing Land Monitoring Report for Ashfield.
- Paragraph 47 of the NPPF does not refer to housing targets being expressed as a minimum, merely that the plan meets the full objectively assessed needs for housing. The housing targets set out in the Preferred Approach document have been arrived at following a detailed assessment of need for the District. The Plan seeks to provide for these needs through the allocation of sites which are deemed to be realistically available and deliverable whilst conforming with the Core Planning Principles as set out in paragraph 17 of the NPPF. In particular, the NPPF, whilst having a presumption in favour of sustainable development, also requires LPAs to take account of the different roles and character of different areas, promoting the main urban areas, protecting green belt and recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside. Unconstrained growth would be inappropriate and could damage the character of an area. Clearly, a number of windfall sites are expected to be forthcoming over the plan period and will receive approval where they are consistent with other policies in the Local Plan.
- An integrated part of planning for sustainable development is taking into account the physical, economic, social and environmental infrastructure necessary to enable the development to progress. The Council has undertaken an Infrastructure Capacity Study and has had meetings with infrastructure providers such as the Education Authority and PCT. The Council is currently working on an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which looks to identify: what infrastructure is required, how it will be provided, where/when is infrastructure needed and when can any constraints be overcome. Policy SD4 addresses these issues.
- Acknowledged that wording relating to SHLAA in policy is misleading. This refers to sites which haven't been allocated specifically due to the size/yield being below the threshold for allocations, but nevertheless are available, suitable and accord with policy, with potential to contribute to overall supply. An assumption has been made that these may come forward within the plan period and have potential to contribute to overall supply. Needs to be re-worded for clarity
- The requirements for the Rolls Royce development are based on needs to achieve a sustainable development – detailed viability issues will need to be addressed at planning application stage
- The Hucknall housing target as proposed is already in excess of the CLG projection and long term migration trend scenarios as set out in the Edge Analytics report. It is considered unnecessary and inappropriate to increase this further, particularly taking into account the impact of additional allocations in Gedling Borough.
- Reference to sites being shown on the proposals map and in HG1 is not considered to be an issue, as they are one and the same. However, may be clearer to re-word to read 'as identified in policy HG1 And indicated on the Proposals Map'

**Changes to the Local Plan:**

- Change plan period to 2024 to enable a full 10 year provision post adoption.
- The justification for the Plan period of 10 years will be incorporated into a technical paper.
- Include reference to heritage assets (Rolls Royce listed hangars) in a new introductory paragraph specific to the Hucknall area, and in any future development/site brief for the Rolls Royce site.
- Add new introductory section specific to each Strategic Area and include relationship with greater Nottingham etc.
- Include dwelling capacity numbers for each site in the HG1 policy
- Add supporting text with regard to Rolls Royce strategic site as follows:-  
‘The entire southern part of the site has been highlighted as having some wildlife significance, however, several smaller areas within the site have been identified as magnesian limestone (Calcareous) grassland and of greater conservation importance for Nottinghamshire. Any development proposal put forward will need to take account of these areas, and other grassland areas of value, and design the development to avoid or mitigate sensitive areas accordingly. Significant compensatory habitat works may be required and will be addressed at planning application stage.’
- Remove the reference to HG1 and SHLAA sites in policy.

Number of Comments		Number of Respondents	
<b>30</b>		<b>19</b>	
Objection to Policy	Support the Policy	Comment on the Policy	
<b>16</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>10</b>	

**List of Respondents**

Mr David Rixon, Vincent & Gorbings; Tom Gilbert-Woodridge, English heritage; Natural England; Ms A Gibson, Gedling BC; Ian Goldstraw, Derbyshire environmental Services; Matt Gregory, Nottingham City Council; Andrew Lowe, Nottinghamshire wildlife Trust; Martin Bee; Mr Colin Hutson; Jean Toseland; Paula Newcombe; Mr & Mrs Paul Taylor; John Deakin, David Wilson Homes; Andrew Gore, Pegasus Planning Group; Gareth Jones, URS; Aaron Smith, Caldecotte consultants; B Holmes, Oxalis Planning; Sally Gill, Notts CC



## Policy SPH3: Economy and Jobs in Hucknall

### Comments received relating to Policy

#### Support

- English Heritage welcomes the reference to the historic environment but considers that amendments are required to the wording of Criteria 5 e) proposing that the word 'substantial harm' from the National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 133 should be utilised.
- Gedling Borough Council supports that the proposed employment allocations, including Rolls Royce, are consistent with the Greater Nottingham Aligned Core Strategies Policy 4. The comments identify that Hucknall, as a Sub Regional Centre, has a key role both in growing and diversifying the local economy as part of the Greater Nottingham area.
- Rolls Royce is identified as provided an opportunity to meet housing and employment needs for Hucknall.

#### Object

- Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust considers that to make the most effective use of land for development a rigorous review of existing vacant property should be undertaken and a strategy for the beneficial use of the properties developed. The Trust support the specific comments made in the Policy on the need to protect ecological assets and it should be noted that some of the named sites, particularly, the former airfield at Watnall (adjacent to Rolls Royce) is designated as a SINC. There is a need in Criteria 5 to define 'substantial overriding economic reasons' and describe how these would be assessed.
- The ex-Dowty site on Watnall Road is unused and effectively derelict for a number of years. Consideration should be given to a future productive use of the site.

### Comments received relating to Policy supporting text

None

### Response:

- A number of employment land studies have assessed employment sites within Hucknall including the Greater Nottingham Employment Land Review and the Ashfield and Mansfield Districts Joint Property Strategy. The policies in the Local Plan Preferred Approach reflect that a number of employment sites in these studies may be lost to other uses over the Plan period. However, there is a difficult balance to be had between allocating housing sites and effectively closing down existing business with the loss of associated jobs.

- The Dowty site has been subject to a planning appeal whether the inspector refused permission for residential use on the site.

**Changes to the Local Plan:**

- Criteria 5 e) is amended to reflect use of “substantial harm” rather than substantial impact. The agricultural element being amend to reflect that the Council takes into account the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land.

Number of Comments		Number of Respondents	
5		5	
Objection to Policy	Support the Policy	Comment on the Policy	
2	3	-	

**List of Respondents**

Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge for English Heritage; Ms A Gibson for Gedling Borough Council; Andrew Lowe for Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust; Mr John Tedstone and Gareth Jones BSc(Hons) DipTP for URS Infrastructure & Environment UK Ltd.

## Policy SPH4: Hucknall Town Centre

### Comments received relating to Policy

#### Support

- Support for the policy and document from The Theatre's Trust.
- Concern was raised about the increase in traffic in the town centre;
- Pedestrianisation of the high street would severely restrict the Royal Mail's ability to undertake its statutory function, as restricting vehicular access to and from the Hucknall Post Office would increase delivery times. Two alternative options have been suggested: 1. High Street is only pedestrianised between the access road to the Hucknall PO and Watnall Road; or 2. Automatic rising and lowering bollards are installed at each end of the pedestrianised stretch of High Street.

#### Comments

- Concern was raised regarding the lack of convenience shopping facilities to the north of the town centre. People with limited mobility living to the north of Hucknall town centre find it difficult to access convenience stores.
- References to the historic environment were welcomed by English Heritage but it was recommended that this should be expanded further.
- The number of boundaries in the town centre are confusing (town centre; primary shopping area; primary frontage) – this seems to limit the areas which are considered suitable for town centre development.
- Paragraph 4.19 states that Hucknall has a rich heritage, but the policy does not mention the many buildings of architectural interest (designated and undesignated). The policy misses the opportunity to indicate that it will preserve buildings that contribute to the heritage and local distinctiveness.

### Comments received relating to Policy supporting text

- Concern was raised about the increase in traffic congestion in the town centre.

### **Response:**

- Policy SH4 supports convenience retail development to the North of Hucknall Town Centre, particularly at the Piggins Croft site. The pedestrianisation scheme on Hucknall High Street will also improve access for people with limited mobility.
- With regard to the historic environment, the Policy will be reviewed and amended to reinforce the importance of heritage assets and the cultural and social benefits this brings to Hucknall.

- The town centre boundary, primary shopping area, primary frontage and secondary frontage boundaries will be reviewed and amended where necessary.
- As the Highway Authority, Nottinghamshire County Council is the lead partner in the development of Hucknall town centre road improvement scheme. The County Council has undertaken extensive public consultation on the scheme. It is understood that delivery vehicles will be permitted to enter the pedestrianised area before 10am and after 4pm and certain vehicles will be exempt from the scheme e.g. security vehicles serving banks etc. The County Council has indicated that discussions are continuing to take place with businesses on Hucknall High Street regarding access arrangements.
- The Policy will be amended to emphasise the role of buildings of historical and architectural importance in Hucknall.

**Changes to the Local Plan:**

- More emphasis will be given to the importance of Hucknall town centre’s historic environment within the Policy and the supporting text.
- Slight amendment to the town centre boundary adjacent to the new inner relief road. The town centre boundary now aligns with the new road.

Number of Comments		Number of Respondents	
7		6	
Objection to Policy	Support the Policy	Comment on the Policy	
1	1	5	

**List of Respondents**

Ms L West; Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge, English Heritage; Mr R Routledge, Mansfield District Council; Mr Ken Creed; Mr Paul Foreshaw, BNP Paribas Real Estate; Rose Freeman, The Theatre's Trust;

## Strategic Area Based Policies Kirkby-in-Ashfield & Sutton-in-Ashfield Hucknall

### Policy SPKS1: Green Infrastructure In and Around Kirkby-in-Ashfield and Sutton-in-Ashfield

#### Responses received relating to Policy

##### Support

- Support from residents largely in Annesley Woodhouse for the positive stance taken in paragraph 5.1 to the natural environment but a more proactive approach should be taken to ancient woodlands and their identification.
- Natural England support this policy.

##### Object:

- The Local Plan states in Policy SP3 that Annesley Woodhouse is within the urban area of Kirkby in Ashfield however on the strategic area diagram for the Kirkby in Ashfield area, the diagram does not identify Annesley Woodhouse.
- Three major proposals are envisaged in the North East corner of Ashfield District:- a very large area taken for sand quarrying around Two Oaks Farm; HG1Sv which intends to take 30 hectares of farmland for residential dwellings around Rushley Farm and immediately adjacent, 1700 homes plus business, schools and Health Centre in the Lindhurst project. A large impact on the local amenity Thieves Wood.
- Overall the approach and intention set out is welcomed. It is however argued that there has been a significant change during 2012 in relation to the green infrastructure links and related provision for the public, including Ashfield residents. This is as a result of the opening of significant new visitor facilities at Hardwick in the stableyard area rather than in the Hall. As a consequence of the provisions now available, the significance of the parkland and built assets at Hardwick and the wider connections available it is requested that the policy is expanded to include link S9 of the Green Infrastructure and Bio-diversity Strategy.
- Rejuvenate the towns rather than taking the easy route by giving permission to build on green field sites.

#### Responses received relating to Policy supporting text

- It is unfortunate that paragraphs 4.2.13 to 4.2.17 from the Core Strategy Preferred Options document have been removed, as they provided important details regarding the historic character and development of this part of the district. Continue to maintain that a policy and/or strategy incorporating historic environmental issues should be developed for this part of the district, and recommend that the paragraphs from the Core Strategy Preferred Options document are reinstated.
- Ensuring that new residential development is located in close proximity to

existing green infrastructure is a logical outcome of the statement made in paragraphs 5.3 – 5.4. The outcome should be made more specific in the explanatory text. It is inferred but not explicitly so and this has important implications for where the District Council needs to accommodate development.

- Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust have concerns about the inference that the aim is to always achieve Multifunctional GI assets, as described in our response to para 3.29.

Other

- Residents largely in Annesley Woodhouse raised that the area maps do not include the Woodhouse ward and that Annesley Woodhouse, New Annesley are villages and should be included in a strategic area in their own right.

**Response:**

- There are no proposals to create a separate strategic area for Annesley Woodhouse, and New Annesley.
- It is not considered necessary to add supporting text paragraphs 4.2.13 to 4.2.16 from the Core Strategy Preferred Options 2010 to the main text of the policy as this is sufficiently covered in the 'Portrait of Ashfield' in the first chapter of the Local Plan.
- Habitat Regulations scoping report has been completed. It considers the impact and effect of any proposed development and policy on the relevant sites. The Council has liaised with Natural England throughout the production of the HRA scoping report and will continue to consult with them as necessary.

**Changes to the Local Plan:**

- Recommend addition to policy to include Silverhill to Hardwick (S9 of the Green Infrastructure and Bio-diversity Strategy) (to be included after Pleasley Trail linking to The Lawn).
- Recommend the addition of supporting text paragraphs 4.2.13 to 4.2.16 from the Core Strategy Preferred Options 2010 to the main text of the policy as this is sufficiently covered in the 'Portrait of Ashfield' in the first chapter of the Local Plan.
- Changes the plan to include Annesley Woodhouse area.

<b>Number of Comments</b>		<b>Number of Respondents</b>	
<b>59</b>		<b>56</b>	
<b>Objection to Policy</b>	<b>Support the Policy</b>		<b>Comment on the Policy</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>		<b>53</b>

**List of Respondents**

Mr and Mrs Chalkey, D. Rose, John Deakin, David Wilson Homes, BDW, Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust, Barton Wilmore Planning, National Trust, English Heritage, Natural England, Mrs P Sapey, Nottinghamshire County Council, Mr Robert Collier, Mrs Julia Collier, Mr Peter Olko, Mrs Joan Olko, Miss Deberah Olko, Mr William Cooper, Mr & Mrs M & P Dear, Mrs Margaret Lathall, Mr John Shaw, Mrs Micaela Stanley, Mrs Anne Chalkley, Mr Stewart Chalkley, Mr Stephen Jacksdale, Mrs Alison Jackson, Mrs Pauline Cumberland, Mr Donald Bailey, Mr Mark Raynor, Mr Philip Wood, Mrs Margaret Johnson, Mrs Thompson, Mr John Lowe, Miss Becky Chaukley, Mr David Connah, Mrs Patricia Starling, Mrs Valerie Alcock, Mr David Alcock, Mr & Mrs R & M Hufton, Ms Julie Craft, Mrs Madeline Allsop, Mr Dick Bend, Mrs Margaret Bend, Mrs Pauline Hodson, Mr Peter Ward, Mrs Elizabeth Ward, Mr Roger Dean, Mr George Cordy, Mr Russell Lathall, Mrs Patricia Shaw, Ms Kathryn Shaw, Mr John Bolger, Mr Richard Shaw, Mrs Kirsty Cohen, Mr & Mrs M & M Lowe, Miss Angela Smith, Mrs Haydee Lafferty, Mr David Simpson, Mr Adam Heathcote

Comments on the Woodhouse map and for a separate strategic area for Annesley Woodhouse and New Annesley from Mr Robert Collier, Mrs Julia Collier, Mr Peter Olko, Mrs Joan Olko, Miss Deberah Olko, Mr William Cooper, Ms Ann Cooper, Mr & Mrs M & P Dear, Mrs Margaret Lathall, Mr John Shaw, Mrs Micaela Stanley, Mrs Anne Chalkley, Mr Stewart Chalkley, Mr Stephen Jacksdale, Mrs Alison Jackson, Mrs Pauline Cumberland, Mr Donald Bailey, Mr Mark Raynor, Mr Philip Wood, Mrs Margaret Johnson, Mrs Thompson, Mr John Lowe, Miss Becky Chaukley, Mr David Connah, Mrs Patricia Starling, Mrs Valerie Alcock, Mr David Alcock, Mr & Mrs R & M Hufton, Ms Julie Craft, Mrs Madeline Allsop, Mr Dick Bend, Mrs Margaret Bend, Mrs Pauline Hodson, Mr Peter Ward, Mrs Elizabeth Ward, Mr Roger Dean, Mrs Patricia Shaw, Ms Kathryn Shaw, Mr John Bolger, Mr Richard Shaw, Mr & Mrs M & M Lowe, Miss Angela Smith.

## Policy SPKS2: Kirkby-in-Ashfield and Sutton-in-Ashfield Housing Growth

### Comments received relating to Policy

- The plan period should extend at least to 2026, and preferably 2028.
- Gedling BC do not consider that the proposed level of growth and the large allocations at the eastern edge of Kirkby will have any significant cross boundary issues.
- The preferred housing target appears to be reasonable and justified and is supported by Derbyshire CC. Support also from Notts CC for the level of growth which is comparable with the requirements as set out in the Regional Plan.
- From a housing market point of view, there are unlikely to be strong cross boundary implications for housing provision requirements in Bolsover
- Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust consider that the policy should state that the release of housing land for development should be staged to meet real demand, given that growth estimates are often extremely unreliable beyond 3-5 years.
- Question the housing requirements over the next 10 years – what proportion of this is for immigrants?
- Mass house building in Ashfield will result in only people from Nottingham being able to purchase/rent houses
- Plan period should extend at least to 2029 (15 years from adoption), therefore dwelling requirement is underprovided. The most sustainable and least constrained settlement is considered to be Sutton which should be the primary focus for this additional housing requirement.
- The housing requirement should not appear as a fixed requirement. Para 47 of the NPPF makes clear that housing requirements are a minimum, not a maximum. There are no provisions in the NPPF to advocate resisting development in principle once the supply of deliverable sites is achieved. Policy should be amended to read ‘at least 4121 new homes will be provided....’
- The reference to sites ‘deemed as suitable and deliverable in the SHLAA’ as defining land that will deliver housing supply is unsound. The reference would in effect allocate land identified in the SHLAA for development.
- To refer to allocations as being defined on both the proposals map and in policy HG1 is confusing and only the latter is required.
- The oversupply of employment land should be used to provide for the housing requirement (in particular Coxmoor road)
- Due to their places in the Settlement Hierarchy, it is suggested that the wording of the policy should be reversed to read Sutton and Kirkby Housing Growth
- The lack of any formal Green Belt review represents a significant flaw in the Council’s Evidence Base and its approach to the plan and sustainability appraisal will cast doubt over the soundness of the final plan at EIP.



- The proposed housing target has not been positively prepared; not been justified; nor is it consistent with national policy. The technical paper dismisses the use of CLG household projections with no substantive justification – the projections would imply a need of 5063 (942 more than proposed) and should be used in preference.
- The housing technical paper fails to justify why a 20% flexibility allowance should not be applied. Para 6.5 asserts that the District does not have a record of persistent under delivery, but this is not consistent with the Housing Land Monitoring report.
- Add text to the policy to clearly state that progress against the housing target will be regularly monitored and further housing allocations will be brought forward where necessary.
- The evidence for setting the housing target is based on incorrect premises and out of date data.
- The policy's reliance on SHLAA sites is unsound as there is no indication that these sites are viable. CLG guidance states 'the assessment is an important evidence source to inform plan making, but does not in itself determine whether a site should be allocated for development.' It is wrong for the local plan to rely heavily on SHLAA sites that may not be deliverable.
- Concern over additional traffic and impacts on education, doctors and dentists.

Comments received relating to Policy supporting text

None.

**Response:**

- The justification for the timescale of the Plan is set out in paragraph 1.9 of the Local Plan Preferred Approach and will be addressed in more detailed in a technical note to accompany the Local Plan Publication Draft in the spring of 2013. Para. 157 of the NPPF refers to a 15 year time horizon as 'preferable', however, in the interests of actively promoting the localism agenda and maintaining a 5 year land supply, a decision has been taken to plan for a shorter period in the first instance, whilst looking to an early review to plan for longer term. It is acknowledged that due to timescale and likely adoption date, this may result in a plan with a remaining period of 9 years. The plan period will be amended to 2024 to address this issue.
- In respect of considering staged release of housing sites to meet real demand, due to unreliable growth estimates beyond 3-5 years, it should be noted that the NPPF requires planning for housing sites over the longer term (a minimum of 10 years, preferably 15). Although projections can only ever be estimates, the level of need identified in the Local Plan Preferred Approach has been objectively assessed and is considered to be 'sound'. The Government's current policy puts emphasis on significantly boosting the supply of housing. Policy SPKS2 seeks to address need whilst preventing

unconstrained growth which may damage the character of the area. It is considered that the market will respond to demand and that developers will not build houses they cannot sell.

- The housing requirement for the 10 year plan is set out in the Local Plan and explained more fully in the Housing Technical Paper (Sept 2012)
- The affordability of housing in Ashfield is currently favourable in comparison to other local authority areas, however, Policy HG3 sets out requirements for affordable housing on new developments based on viability. It is considered that additional growth would not increase the cost of housing, although constraining it can have this effect with regard to supply and demand.
- Kirkby and Sutton main urban areas both present sustainable locations for development, however, it is acknowledged that Kirkby does have some Green Belt constraints. It should also be noted that the core planning principles set out in NPPF para. 17 require LPAs to recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside and the preferred areas of growth take account of this too. It is considered that to plan for disproportionate growth and focus the majority of future development towards Sutton would jeopardise the vision for regeneration and economic growth in Kirkby.
- Paragraph 47 of the NPPF does not refer to housing targets being expressed as a minimum, merely that the plan meets the full objectively assessed needs for housing. The housing targets set out in the Preferred Approach document have been arrived at following a detailed assessment of need for the District. The Plan seeks to provide for these needs through the allocation of sites which are deemed to be realistically available and deliverable whilst conforming with the Core Planning Principles as set out in paragraph 17 of the NPPF. In particular, the NPPF, whilst having a presumption in favour of sustainable development, also requires LPAs to take account of the different roles and character of different areas, promoting the main urban areas, protecting green belt and recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside. Unconstrained growth would be inappropriate and could damage the character of an area. Clearly, a number of windfall sites are expected to be forthcoming over the plan period and will receive approval where they are consistent with other policies in the Local Plan.
- The policy does not rely heavily on SHLAA sites, but on allocated sites which have been deemed to be deliverable and the most sustainable. It is acknowledged that wording relating to SHLAA in policy is misleading. This refers to sites which haven't been allocated specifically due to the size/yield being below the threshold for allocations, but nevertheless are available, suitable and accord with existing policy. and with potential to contribute to overall supply. An assumption has been made that these may come forward within the plan period and have potential to contribute to overall supply. Needs to be re-worded for clarity
- Reference to sites being shown on the proposals map and in HG1 is not considered to be an issue, as they are one and the same. However, may be clearer to re-word to read 'as identified in policy HG1 And indicated on the Proposals Map'

- Over supply of employment land should be used for housing – Employment land studies have been undertaken to identify the employment land required in relation to the employment proposed. We are working with Mansfield District Council in relation to employment to ensure that land is not allocated unnecessary for employment purposes.
- Lack of formal green belt review – A detailed survey of all Green Belt boundaries has been undertaken to inform the minor changes proposed in the Preferred Approach document. A strategic review for the Nottingham Outer Housing Market Area (this does not include Hucknall area) will be published at the next stage of the Local Plan process.
- A justification for not applying a 20% buffer for the first 5 years of housing supply will be included in a revised Housing Technical Paper.
- Unnecessary to add text to the policy to state that progress against the housing target will be regularly monitored and further housing allocations will be brought forward where necessary. The housing land monitoring report is produced on an annual basis and sets out the situation with regard to housing supply and delivery against requirements.
- It is recognised that traffic is a substantial issue for a number of larger sites. A Transport Assessment was undertaken in 2010 based on the requirements of an increase in by 11,200 dwellings. Additional work is currently being undertaken to examine the impact of the housing and employment land allocations proposed and measures necessary to mitigate the effects of the growth. A transport Study will be published in due course.
- An integrated part of planning for sustainable development is taking into account the physical, economic, social and environmental infrastructure necessary to enable the development to progress. The Council has undertaken an Infrastructure Capacity Study and has had meetings with infrastructure providers such as the Education Authority and PCT. The Council is currently working on an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which looks to identify: what infrastructure is required, how it will be provided, where/when is infrastructure needed and when can any constraints be overcome. Policy SD4 addresses these issues.

#### **Changes to the Local Plan:**

- Add introductory section specific to each Strategic Area to give more background information.
- Include dwelling capacity numbers for each site in the HG1 policy.
- Delete reference to HG1 and SHLAA sites from policy.
- Include justification for not applying a 20% buffer for the first 5 years of housing supply in a revised Housing Technical Paper.

<b>Number of Comments</b>		<b>Number of Respondents</b>	
<b>36</b>		<b>25</b>	
<b>Objection to Policy</b>	<b>Support the Policy</b>		<b>Comment on the Policy</b>
<b>25</b>	<b>2</b>		<b>9</b>

**List of Respondents**

Robert Barsby; Russ Aram; Lynn Henstock; Margaret Brunt; Beverley Howard; Keith Oliver, Taylor Wimpey UK; Ms A Gibson, gedling BC; Ian Goldstraw, Derbyshire Environmental Services; Andrew Lowe, Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust; Helen Boddice; Dr David cross; Mr & Mrs Adam Brown; Felicity Pether; Mr S Barkes; John Deakin, David Wilson Homes; Guy Longley, Pegasus Planning Group; Aaron Smith, Caldecotte consultants; Jennifer Walters, Barton Wilmore Planning; Ms Jane Gardner, Marrons; Mr N Baseley, Ian Baseley Associates; Mr M Eagland, Peacock & Smith; Mr Dennis Pope, Nathaniel Litchfield and Partners; Ms Sarah Kiddy; Matthew Stafford, the Co-operative Group; Christine Kidger, Kirkby & District Conservation Society; Sally Gill, Notts CC

**Policy SPKS3: Economy and Jobs in Kirkby-in-Ashfield and Sutton-in-Ashfield**

**Comments received relating to Policy**

**Support**

- English Heritage welcomes the reference to the historic environment but considers that amends are required to:
  - Give protection to the setting of historic assets such as Hardwick Hall;
  - Improve the wording of the policy including the wording of Criteria 5 e) proposing that the word 'substantial harm' from the National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 133 should be utilised.

- Support for the overall Policy approach from the National Trust but it is considered that the precise wording of Section 4b of the Policy should reflect the wider settings of heritage assets such as Hardwick Hall. Proposes changes to Section 4b to include "b) Protecting the historic parks and gardens of Hardwick Hall (those areas within Ashfield), Annesley Hall, and Skegby Hall, and their wider settings."
- Natural England is supportive of the approach that the policy takes to the development of tourism which specifically safeguards key landscape and heritage assets.
- Mansfield District Council identifies that the employment and economic regeneration approaches aligns with the Mansfield and Ashfield Joint Economic Strategy.
- Support for the Council proactively support for sustainable economic growth and for additional sites along the Mansfield Ashfield Regeneration Route. However, it is considered that the Council should define an aspirational target for employment land on the basis that:
  - (1) other sites potentially may not come forward over the plan period, and
  - (2) a choice of employment land gives flexibility to the market in any event.
- Support for the identification of locally significant business areas, as set out at 1(c). But noted that this does not include the site at Coxmoor Road, Sutton in Ashfield.
- Support for any new allocations or the reviewing of existing allocations of land for economic development will be across the Mansfield Ashfield economic area and strategic sites to be along the Mansfield Ashfield Regeneration. However, the view was expressed that the Council should review existing allocations compared to potential new allocations put forward by landowners, developers and other interested parties.

#### Object

- Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust considers that to make the most effective use of land for development a rigorous review of existing vacant property should be undertaken and a strategy for the beneficial use of the properties developed. The Trust support the specific comments made in the Policy on the need to protect ecological assets. However, there is a need in Criteria 5A to define 'substantial overriding economic reasons' and describe how these would be assessed.
- The allocation PJ2Se should be extended to the east up to Cauldwell Wood. Concerned expressed that Policy SPKS3 may not offer the best prospect of delivering additional jobs and regeneration or build upon the significant investment in the Mansfield Ashfield Regeneration Route.
- Objection to the development of housing to the south of the MARR.
- The poor condition of Outram Street needs to be addressed is business is to be attracted to Sutton-in-Ashfield.
- Object to the Local Plan Preferred Approach as the approach is not consistent with National Policy, the East Midlands Regional Plan, 2009 and Government statements and initiatives in relation to growth. While

welcoming the policy proactively supporting sustainable economic development there is an objection to restricting land for economic development to 58 ha where this figure has led to a prescriptive approach and fails to objectively review all potential employment land allocations. Support for any additional allocations to be along the Mansfield Ashfield Regeneration Route.

Comments received relating to Policy supporting text

None.

**Response:**

- The background evidence to the Local Plan includes a number of economic and employment land studies. The findings from these studies are brought together in the 'Local Economy Summary Paper' September 2012 which sets out a detailed explanation of the approach adopted by the Council. The Policy in the Local Plan Preferred Approach gives effect to "Ambitions A Plan for Growth" the Ashfield and Mansfield Joint Economic Masterplan, and Experian's Selected Sectors Growth Scenario. These takes forward a scenario that will result in the highest identified demand requirement for employment land in the District with the Policy identifying a requirement for 58 hectares of land in Kirkby-in-Ashfield and Sutton-in-Ashfield. Nevertheless, the Policy also provides for flexibility in setting of a criteria approach for additional sites to come forward along the Mansfield Ashfield Regeneration Route if changes in demand reflect such a need over the Plan period.
- A number of additional sites have been proposed and are considered in the separate Local Economy Summary Paper Supplementary Paper. The conclusion, from the Supplementary Paper is that most of the existing employment sites have been partly development. They are considered suitable to meet the potential demand requirement over the Plan period and will allow for a choice of different uses. In addition, the Policy incorporates a criteria base approach to bring forward additional employment sites if required in the Plan period. Therefore, it is considered that the Council has taken a positive approach to employment demand within the District which will deliver jobs and opportunities in Ashfield. Consequently, no changes to the Policy are recommended in relation to these aspects.

**Changes to Local Plan:**

- Criteria 4 b) to include after Protecting the historic parks and gardens 'and their settings'.
- Criteria 5 e) is amended to reflect use of "substantial harm" rather than substantial impact. The agricultural element being amend to reflect that the

Council takes into account the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land.

<b>Number of Comments</b>		<b>Number of Respondents</b>	
<b>10</b>		<b>10</b>	
<b>Objection to Policy</b>	<b>Support the Policy</b>		<b>Comment on the Policy</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>		<b>1</b>

**List of Respondents**

D.Rose; Alan Hubbard for the National Trust; Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge for English Heritage; Natural England; Mr R Routledge for Mansfield District Council; Andrew Lowe for Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust; Mrs Angela Morris; Dennis Pope, Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners for Anthony Salata; Ms Jane Gardner, Marrons; Helen Winkler, The Tyler-Parkes Partnership.

**Policy SPKS4: Kirkby-in-Ashfield and Sutton-in-Ashfield Town Centres**

Comments received relating to Policy

Support

- Support for Policy SKS4 from residents largely in Annesley Woodhouse but with comments:
  - The sentence in Paragraph 5.24 should be extended to include the Promenade retail shopping complex along, typically Forest Road at Annesley Woodhouse, and similar village promenade shops, which provide a much valued service and local employment.
  - Any multi-store developments, especially the change of use from defunct public house to an express store, within a 2 km radius of

these out of town promenade shops be prevented so that its core function to the local residents remains intact and not threatened by the buying power of multi-nationals.

#### Object

- The proposal for the inclusion of Rushley Farm, located on the edge of Ashfield, District, would serve to counter the aim of this policy (which are to promote the vitality and viability of the town centres of Sutton in Ashfield and Kirkby in Ashfield). Both centres would lose commercial and business footfall to neighbouring Mansfield.
- The inclusion of the Asda supermarket in Sutton in Ashfield town centre within the Primary Shopping Area (PSA) should be assessed against the NPPF definition of a PSA. The NPPF definition of a PSA is as follows: “PSAs are defined areas where retail development is concentrated (generally comprising the primary and those secondary frontages which are adjoining and closely relating to the primary shopping frontage)”.
- Include in the PSA: the north side of Station Street from Ellis Street to Kirkby Motors.
- Remove Morrison’s car park from the PSA.
- Amend the town centre boundary to include the land at Lane End and the railway station car park. Transport infrastructure should form part of the function of a town centre and there are opportunities on Lane End for social, leisure or economic development.
- Include a new paragraph to explain social, leisure and transport links in relation to Kirkby town centre.
- Mansfield District Council has raised concerns regarding the extent of the town centre boundaries in Sutton in Ashfield and Kirkby in Ashfield. They have suggested that the areas outlined in blue (currently defined as PSA) should be defined as ‘town centre’. The blue washed out area defined as the ‘town centre’ is considered to be confusing and it seems to restrict the area where town centre uses are considered acceptable.
- There is no mention of Kirkby Cross Conservation Area in the Policy.

#### Comment

- The increase in comparison floorspace quoted in the text for Sutton in Ashfield could not be accommodated within the town centre unless Sutton Centre School was redeveloped.
- On page 86 there is an artist’s impression of a new cultural quarter in Sutton in Ashfield. There are no details of this within the text.
- Royal Mail has indicated that they would like more flexibility in the Policy to allow for a change of use for the Royal Mail delivery offices in Sutton in Ashfield and Kirkby in Ashfield (on Brook Street and Precinct Road). Both are considered suitable by Royal Mail for a change of use to residential or mixed use retail/residential development.
- Identify the area adjacent to Morrisons (currently the Royal Mail delivery office) as an area for residential development (approx. 0.09Ha).
- Within the Primary shopping area, where the policy states residential use



will be appropriate above shops, it is suggested that this is changed to 'on upper floors of buildings'.

- Section 4 of Policy SPKS4 should include The 'King Street, Langton Road and Brook Street area' as an area of opportunity for redevelopment – suggested by Royal Mail – they have submitted for consideration which is approx. 0.1Ha. The town centre Masterplan highlights opportunities for improvements to this area. This would provide an opportunity to create a landmark mixed use building at the gateway of the town centre. A mix of retail and residential uses would help the Council to improve the town centre and meet local housing needs.
- It is considered that residential uses within the town centres would increase footfall, thereby enhancing the vitality and viability of the centres.

#### Comments received relating to Policy supporting text

- Query regarding the need for a new 2750 sqm food store – the policy states that there is an over-representation of convenience goods retailing. If Sutton is to survive, the store should be located within the town centre boundary. The Homebase site is not a suitable location as it is too far out of the centre.
- There is no reference to heritage or local distinctiveness. Kirkby has a designated conservation area and arguably Sutton Market Place is worthy of conservation area designation.
- Paragraphs 5.30 and 5.38 fail to reinforce local distinctiveness as a driver to underpin quality of design.
- Paragraph 5.35 fails to note the quality of Sutton Market Place as a desirable environment for markets and independent shopping.

#### Response:

- Annesley Woodhouse shopping parade is included in Policy SP3 which sets out the hierarchy of centres. It is not considered necessary to duplicate this within Policy SPKS4.
- The changes of use from public houses to 'express stores' falls within national applied 'Permitted Development' rights. It is therefore not possible to include a clause within the policy which would prevent a change of use from a public house to a retail unit. Proposals which seek to demolish a public house and replace it with a convenience store would need to demonstrate that there are no other suitable premises within a town centre or local centre; applicants would need to undertake a sequential test in this regard.
- The majority of the proposed housing allocations are located in and adjacent to the main urban areas of Sutton in Ashfield, Kirkby in Ashfield and Hucknall. Consequently, the proposed housing allocation at Rushley Farm is not considered a threat to the viability and vitality of the town centres in Ashfield.

- Ellis Street to Kirkby Motors on Station Road is included in the PSA for Kirkby in Ashfield therefore no change is required.
- Morrison's car park will be removed from the PSA boundary;
- It is not considered appropriate to include Lane End and the Railway Station car park within the town centre boundary as it may affect the vitality of the centre (the town centre should be the first choice for the location of retail and leisure type development).
- The supporting text will be strengthened with regard to social, leisure and transport links in Kirkby in Ashfield.
- It is not considered necessary to amend the PSA or town centre boundaries as the two boundaries have different functions. This will be clarified within the text.
- There is an over-representation of certain types of convenience retailing and this should have been clarified within the text. The results of the Ashfield Retail Study 2011 show that there is a need to improve main convenience retailing in Sutton in Ashfield due to the overtrading of the Asda store in the town centre. The reference to over and under representation of businesses will be removed from the text as this misleading and the types of business which operate within the centre change over time.
- The inclusion of the Asda supermarket within the PSA is considered to be consistent with the NPPF definition of a PSA.
- It is noted that the diagram on page 86 (Artists impression of a new cultural quarter) is not clearly explained within the policy. The diagram, which has been taken from the Sutton town centre Masterplan, has now been removed from the document as it is anticipated that the Masterplan will be updated in the near future.
- The Ashfield Retail Study Update 2011 sets out the requirement for additional convenience retail floorspace. The Policy has taken into consideration the recommendations of the study.
- The Policy provides flexibility for uses appropriate to a town centre location. As such, it is not considered necessary to amend the policy.
- The Royal Mail depot sites are located on the edge of the town centres and are quite small (both are under 0.1 hectare). As such, it is not considered that there would be any significant restrictions on either site coming forward for redevelopment. The sites are not considered large enough to identify as 'areas of development opportunity'.
- Kirkby Cross Conservation Area is approximately 750 metres from the edge of Kirkby town centre boundary. As such, it is not considered relevant or appropriate to mention the Conservation Area in this Policy.
- There are currently no plans to designate Sutton Market Place as a conservation area. The Council will review this in due course following the adoption of the Local Plan. The Policy will be amended to acknowledge the fact that the Market Place is a local heritage asset and any future development should seek to preserve or enhance local character.
- Paragraph 5.35 will be strengthened with regard to the role of Sutton Market Place.
- Paragraphs 5.30 and 5.38 will be strengthened with regard to stressing the importance of local distinctiveness.

**Changes to Local Plan:**

- Remove the sentence (paragraph 5.33): ‘Overall there is an over-representation of convenience retailing, building societies and travel agents and an under representation of restaurants, cafes and bars’.
- Policy map amendment – amend the primary shopping frontage line at Morrison’s supermarket.
- Paragraph 5.34 – Emphasise the importance of Sutton Market Place with regard to it being a local heritage asset.
- Paragraph 5.35 - strengthened with regard to the role of Sutton Market Place as an area for independent retailers.
- Paragraphs 5.30 and 5.38 - strengthened with regard to stressing the importance of local distinctiveness.
- Remove the Cultural and Business Quarter illustration and reference from the supporting text.
- The supporting text will be strengthened with regard to social, leisure and transport links in Kirkby in Ashfield.

<b>Number of Comments</b>		<b>Number of Respondents</b>	
<b>58</b>		<b>54</b>	
<b>Objection to Policy</b>	<b>Support the Policy</b>	<b>Comment on the Policy</b>	
<b>6</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>6</b>	

**List of Respondents**

Mr Robert Collier, Mrs Julia Collier, Mr Peter Olko, Mrs Joan Olko, Miss Deberah Olko, Mr William Cooper, Ms Ann Cooper, Mr & Mrs M & P Dear, Mrs Margaret Lathall, Mr John Shaw, Mrs Micaela Stanley, Mrs Anne Chalkley, Mr Stewart Chalkley, Mr Stephen Jacksdale, Mrs Alison Jackson, Mrs Pauline Cumberland, Mr Donald Bailey, Mr Mark Raynor, Mr Philip Wood, Mrs Margaret Johnson, Mrs Thompson, Mr John Lowe, Miss Becky Chaukley, Mr David Connah, Mrs Patricia Starling, Mrs Valerie Alcock, Mr David Alcock, Mr & Mrs R & M Hufton, Ms Julie Craft, Mrs Madeline Allsop, Mr Dick Bend, Mrs Margaret Bend, Mrs Pauline Hodson, Mr Peter Ward, Mrs Elizabeth Ward, Mr Roger Dean, Mr George Cordy, Mr Russell Lathall, Mrs Patricia Shaw, Ms Kathryn Shaw, Mr John Bolger, Mr Richard Shaw, Mr & Mrs M & M Lowe, Miss Angela Smith, Mrs Haydee Lafferty Mr Adam Heathcote; David Rose, Christine Wakelin; Rose Freeman on behalf of the Theatres Trust; Mr. R. Routledge, Mansfield District Council; .Mr P. Foreshaw, BNP Paribas Real

Estate; Mr. M. Eagland, Peacock and Smith; Mr John Kerry, Kirkby and District Conservation Society; Ms. S. Gill, Nottinghamshire County Council.

## Strategic Area Based Policies – Selston, Jacksdale and Underwood

### Policy SPV1: Green Infrastructure in and around Selston, Jacksdale and Underwood

#### Responses received relating to Policy

##### Support

- Natural England strongly supports the approach which this policy takes in encouraging new and improved green infrastructure links around Selston, Jacksdale and Underwood and follows the recommendations set out in the District Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity Strategy.
- Keepmoat supports the proposal to secure new and improved green infrastructure particularly the protection of the local nature reserve off Winter Closes and the wooded area extending down towards Cordy Lane. The importance of protecting and creating new green infrastructure is recognised and supported.
- Selston Parish Council support the proposals to secure new and improved Green Infrastructure around Selston, Jacksdale and Underwood which are to include links between Jacksdale and Ironville. The Preferred Approach Proposal Map identifies the location of sites of Nature Conservation Value to be safeguarded under the provisions of Policy EV4. These designated areas include a small finger of land extending north eastwards from Lea Lane on the southern side of Selston, and a longer finger extending north eastwards from Lower Bagthorpe. Public footpaths run through this area and it is a popular walking area for local residents. These designations do not overlap however and the Parish Council would like consideration for further Green Infrastructure corridor being designated to incorporate, expand and enhance the currently designated areas, namely Selston (Lea Lane to Lower Bagthorpe).

##### Object

- I understand that we do have to have some additional building in Selston as this has been imposed by central government and but my objections are about building on such a large scale in a rural area. Fully support building on brown field sites and some in-fill around the village, but totally object to large scale building of the nature proposed on Green Belt land. Other concerns are regarding the lack of suitable access for the area and lack of services. Whilst I can live with small areas of building, I am fundamentally opposed to building on the scale proposed in the Selston area.
- This raises concerns as described above about the apparent requirement for all GI to be multifunctional, when in reality more may be achieved across a network where some sites can be multifunctional, but others are better to be uni-functional. It also needs to be made clear that different GI assets cannot be traded, as they are not usually interchangeable, and

some are irreplaceable.

Responses received relating to Policy supporting text

- It is unfortunate that paragraphs 4.3.11 to 4.3.15 from the Core Strategy Preferred Options document have been removed, as they provided important detail regarding the historic character and development of this part of the district. We continue to maintain that a policy and/or strategy incorporating historic environment issues should be developed for this part of the district, and recommend that the paragraphs from the Core Strategy Preferred Options document are reinstated.
- An illustrative masterplan has been submitted which extended the proposed housing allocation HG1Vg, Winter Closes. It is stated Green Infrastructure within the extended site area there are substantial opportunities to provide and improve green infrastructure. The allocation of compensation land against the loss of these SINC sites is key to progressing the proposal, where it is also considered likely that the application would need to provide a habitat management plan to demonstrate how these newly created areas would be managed for a period of no less than 10 years.

**Response:**

- Habitat Regulations Scoping report will be completed before the next stage of the Plan and will consider the impact and effect of any proposed development and policy on the relevant sites.
- Housing needs technical note will set out the reasoning for the housing numbers.
- Lea Lane, Selston to Lower Bagthorpe is already connected by link G11 as identified within the Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity Strategy.

**Changes to the Local Plan:**

- Recommend the addition of supporting text paragraphs 4.3.11 to 4.3.14 from The Core Strategy Preferred Options 2010 to the main text of the policy. To be included in chapter 2, Ashfield Areas.
- Consideration of Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust comments and potential changes to wording of paragraph 6.5.

<b>Number of Comments</b>		<b>Number of Respondents</b>	
<b>8</b>		<b>7</b>	
<b>Objection to Policy</b>	<b>Support the Policy</b>		<b>Comment on the Policy</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>		<b>3</b>

**List of Respondents**

Mr and Mrs P & S Brand, Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust, English Heritage, Natural England, Phoenix Planning (UK) Ltd, Selston Parish Council, Nottinghamshire County Council.

**Policy SPV2: Selston, Jacksdale and Underwood Housing Growth**

Comments received relating to Policy

- General support from Derbyshire CC Environmental Services in terms of the preferred housing target. Higher growth could significantly compromise the main green belt purpose in this location. There are unlikely to be any significant cross boundary implications for Amber Valley and Bolsover Districts due to the modest scale of provision.
- Support from Notts CC for the level of growth which is comparable with the requirements as set out in the Regional Plan.
- The Housing Technical Paper states that the delivery of the preferred targets will rely on an early return to good housing market conditions. Available evidence suggests this is unlikely in the short term (next 5 years), consequently the target may be hard to achieve and adds weight to the case that a higher target would be unlikely to be deliverable.
- General support for more homes in Selston, particularly affordable family homes.

- Support for level of housing, but too much has been proposed in one place (HG1Va) without putting in improvements and provisions that are needed now.
- Accept the need for affordable housing, but too much is being proposed for this area – services need improving first.
- General concern expressed over existing services, including school places and transport (in particular school busses to allow student access to 6<sup>th</sup> form education. Query as to whether any thought has been given to this as it is not evident.
- No proposal for commercial development. Existing provision is limited and most residents therefore go to Alfreton to shop.
- Concern over fluvial water which is already a serious problem for residents of Church Lane.
- The plan period should be extended to align with adjoining local authorities/RSS period and additional level of new dwellings be calculated on a pro rata basis. Other alternative suggestion is to extend to 2029 to give 15 years supply.
- The housing requirement should not appear as a fixed requirement. Para 47 of the NPPF makes clear that housing requirements are a minimum, not a maximum. There are no provisions in the NPPF to advocate resisting development in principle once the supply of deliverable sites is achieved. However, it is agreed that the relative accessibility of the area plays a determining role in assessing the amount of housing which would be sustainable in accordance with SP1, SP2 and SP3. Therefore, additional safeguards should be included within the policy to clarify that the quantity of housing will be tied to reflect local demand. Policy should be amended to read ‘at least 689 new homes will be provided...2023 to reflect local demand.’
- The reference to sites ‘deemed as suitable and deliverable in the SHLAA’ as defining land that will deliver housing supply is unsound. The reference would in effect allocate land identified in the SHLAA for development.
- To refer to allocations as being defined on both the proposals map and in policy HG1 is confusing and only the latter is required.
- The policy should reinforce the primacy of the Named Settlement Boundaries and directing development to sustainable sites within them, therefore relating back to SP2. Amend policy to read ‘Housing development within Selston, Jacksdale and Underwood Strategic area will be directed to the allocations as identified in policy HG1 and to sustainable development sites within the Named Settlement Boundaries’
- Selston Parish Council cautiously support the proposed level of housing growth on the basis that it is necessary to maintain the current levels of employment within the Parish and improve local educational and retail facilities. However, the Parish Council identified that they do have some key issues in respect of the larger sites identified in Policy HG1, which reflects concerns raised by local residents at the Parish Council organised consultation events. There is a local desire to see HG1Va reduced in scale and with a retail frontage to Alfreton Road; a reconfiguration of HG1Vg to accommodate a replacement Primary School site, employment allocation, and a new access to Cordy Lane; modifications to HG1Vc/Vd to



incorporate a site for a replacement Primary School.

Comments received relating to Policy supporting text

N/A

**Response:**

- An integrated part of planning for sustainable development is taking into account the physical, economic, social and environmental infrastructure necessary to enable the development to progress. The Council has undertaken an Infrastructure Capacity Study and has had meetings with infrastructure providers such as the Education Authority and PCT. The Council is currently working on an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which looks to identify: what infrastructure is required, how it will be provided, where/when is infrastructure needed and when can any constraints be overcome. Policy SD4 addresses these issues.
- The availability of sustainable, deliverable housing sites to meet the required need is limited in this area. It is considered that site HG1Va presents a sustainable location for growth in the villages and has the potential capacity to deliver community benefits, e.g., education, a small amount of commercial/retail use in accordance with policy SP3 (additional text to support SP3 will be included for clarity and cross referred in policy HG1Va). The approximate number of houses to be delivered on this site has been reduced since the Preferred Approach consultation as a result of investigations surrounding old mining activities. This has been reported to the Local Plan Steering Group and to Selston Parish Council.
- There are no plans to extend the Winter closes site allocation at this current time for several reasons- strong objections from the neighbouring authority will cause major obstacles for cross boundary planning and the 'Duty to Co-operate'; much of the land is contaminated; SINC status of the land. Selston Parish Council are committed to undertaking a Neighbourhood Plan and any future development opportunities in the area will be brought forward as a result, working alongside an early review of the Ashfield Local Plan.
- Policy HG3 sets the level of affordable housing requirement. This does not directly reflect need, but is limited due to financial viability for the delivery of sites and is therefore considered to be a minimum.
- No proposal for commercial development - see above
- Policy CC3 sets out the Council's approach to flood risk and requires that development will not be permitted if it would be at an unacceptable risk of flooding, or create an unacceptable risk of flooding elsewhere.
- The justification for the timescale of the Plan is set out in paragraph 1.9 of the Local Plan Preferred Approach and will be addressed in more detailed in a technical note to accompany the Local Plan Publication Draft in the spring of 2013. Para. 157 of the NPPF refers to a 15 year time horizon as

'preferable', however, in the interests of actively promoting the localism agenda and maintaining a 5 year land supply, a decision has been taken to plan for a shorter period in the first instance, whilst looking to an early review to plan for longer term. It is acknowledged that due to timescale and likely adoption date, this may result in a plan with a remaining period of 9 years. The Plan period will be amended to 2024 to address this issue.

- Paragraph 47 of the NPPF does not refer to housing targets being expressed as a minimum, merely that the plan meets the full objectively assessed needs for housing. The housing targets set out in the Preferred Approach document have been arrived at following a detailed assessment of need for the District. The Plan seeks to provide for these needs through the allocation of sites which are deemed to be realistically available and deliverable whilst conforming with the Core Planning Principles as set out in paragraph 17 of the NPPF. In particular, the NPPF, whilst having a presumption in favour of sustainable development, also requires LPAs to take account of the different roles and character of different areas, promoting the main urban areas, protecting green belt and recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside. Unconstrained growth would be inappropriate and could damage the character of an area. Clearly, a number of windfall sites are expected to be forthcoming over the plan period and will receive approval where they are consistent with other policies in the Local Plan. Due to the role of the villages additional safeguards could be included within the policy to clarify that the quantity of housing will be tied to reflect local demand. However, due to the location of the villages within the Green belt, growth will be constrained by policy EV1.
- The policy does not rely heavily on SHLAA sites, but on allocated sites which have been deemed to be deliverable and the most sustainable. It is acknowledged that wording relating to SHLAA in policy is misleading. This refers to sites which haven't been allocated specifically due to the size/yield being below the threshold for allocations, but nevertheless are available, suitable and accord with existing policy. and with potential to contribute to overall supply. An assumption has been made that these may come forward within the plan period and have potential to contribute to overall supply. Needs to be re-worded for clarity.
- Reference to sites being shown on the proposals map and in HG1 is not considered to be an issue, as they are one and the same. However, may be clearer to re-word to read 'as identified in policy HG1 And indicated on the Proposals Map'
- The hierarchy of the 'Named Settlements' is set out in Policy SP3 – Settlement and Town Centre Hierarchies.
- The Council will be formulating a development brief for the site at Alfreton Road, Selston. The development brief will set out the requirements for the site in terms of service provision and may include retail services if necessary.

**Changes to the Local Plan:**

- Add introductory section for each specific Strategic Area to give more background information.
- Delete reference to HG1 and SHLAA sites in policy.
- Additional supporting text to SP3 to refer to local shopping facilities and also potential for retail provision/education/employment in HG1Va supporting text.

Number of Comments		Number of Respondents	
13		10	
Objection to Policy	Support the Policy	Comment on the Policy	
7	6	0	

**List of Respondents**

Sally Gill, Notts CC; Ian Goldstraw, Derbyshire Environmental Services; Jen Lowe; Mr N Baseley, Ian Baseley Assocs; John Deakin, David Wilson Homes; John Booth, Phoenix Planning (UK) Ltd; Mr Aaron Smith, Caldecotte consultants; Ms S ball, Selston Parish Council. Mrs Mary Rutter; Robert Swain.

**Policy SPV3: The Economy and Jobs in Selston, Jacksdale and Underwood**

**Comments received relating to Policy**

**Support**

- Selston Parish Council supports the provisions of Policy SPV3. This approach is considered to be realistic given the rural setting of the Parish and its infrastructure. However, there are concerned that there are no

allocations made within Policy PJ2. The Parish Council considers that a specific site allocation should be made and the text to SPV3 & PJ3 revised to read: To facilitate economic development the Council will make new site specific provision at Underwood and give weight to retaining employment sites in the local area where they are not detrimental to their rural location.

- The Parish Council have raised concerns over local issues which they consider would be substantially exacerbated if the proposed housing allocation HG1 Vg were to be taken forward in its present form and extent. These include safety issues in relation to the school. In view of these issues, the Parish Council is in principle supportive of proposals put forward by promoters who propose extending the Winter Closes development allocation to the southwest. The Parish Council propose that any additional housing allocated in Underwood, necessary to facilitate the improvements to the existing employment, schooling and access arrangements, should be balanced by a reduction in the major housing allocation at Selston, HG1 Va where the Parish Council perceive that there are less tangible community benefits from this particular development proposal.
- Support for the Policy for economic growth within the rural settlements and particularly the expansion or intensification of business activities which are not detrimental to the rural area. The proposer identifies that an illustrative masterplan has been submitted which extended the proposed housing allocation HG1Vg, Winter Closes. It is stated that this will create a mixed use development including the part redevelopment on an existing employment site, facilitating new and more intensive business activities and bringing forward significant visual improvements to the site and the surrounding area. This proposal will also lead to the removal of inappropriate HGV movements through the centre of the village.
- A concern was raised regarding the three employment units on Winter Closes including a HGV haulage yard, a concrete works and a vehicular dismantling and scrap yard. These existing uses are all heavy 'dirty' uses which have a detrimental impact upon the open character of the Green Belt and create issues with regards to the movement of HGV vehicles through the village. If business are relocated this would allow the existing employment site will be redeveloped for employment purposes incorporating B1 office and light industrial uses.

**Response:**

- Support for the Policy is acknowledged. The Policy, together with Policy PJ3, gives significant weight to protecting existing employment area from development for other purposes. As part of the masterplanning of the larger housing allocations in the rural area the Council will explore whether a small site for economic development could be included as part of any of the site. It is acknowledge that the Local Plan does not specifically allocate land for employment purposes within in the rural areas but this reflects a

number of factors:

- a) The nature of jobs is changing. With modern technology, there is an increasing trend for people to work or run businesses from their homes rather than operating from offices and units.
- b) There evidence would indicate that the only units brought forward in the rural areas have been by the public sector. Units have been brought forward at Cordy Lane, Underwood, Annesley Farm, Annesley and Pye Hill Road. The development of these units was undertaken by the local council with assistance from grants funding. Given the current financial climate it is unlikely that the public sector will bring forward units in the foreseeable future.
- c) The rural settlements are not isolated to the same extent as parts of Derbyshire or Lincolnshire as there are in relatively close proximity to the urban settlements such as Kirkby-in-Ashfield where units are available.
- d) Policies with the Local Plan support the reuse of rural buildings or well design new buildings of a suitable scale to the locality which potential forms a supply of units if there is a demand.
- e) No evidence of a demand for or the viability of units within, the rural areas has been demonstrated in the employment land studies or form from any other source.
- f) Allocation of employment land is likely to require a site in the Green Belt. Once taken out of the Green Belt if there is no demand for the site it becomes vulnerable to alternative uses such as housing development as the National Planning Policy Framework emphasises that planning policies should avoid the long term protection of site allocated for employment uses where there is no reasonable prospect of the site being used for that purpose.

**Changes to the Local Plan:**

- No changes are proposed to the Local Plan arising out of the consultation responses.

<b>Number of Comments</b>		<b>Number of Respondents</b>	
<b>3</b>		<b>2</b>	
<b>Objection to Policy</b>	<b>Support the Policy</b>		<b>Comment on the Policy</b>
-	<b>2</b>		<b>1</b>

**List of Respondents**

John Booth, Phoenix Planning (UK) Ltd , John Booth, Phoenix Planning (UK) Ltd for Keepmoat Ltd and Ms S Ball for Selston Parish Council.

## Adapting to Climate Change

### Policy CC1: Energy Use, Regeneration and Low Carbon Energy Generation

#### Responses received relating to Policy

##### **Support:**

- Support for the Policy from the National Trust.
- Natural England supports the Policy to ensure no significant effects on the surrounding landscape, designated nature conservation areas or biodiversity considerations. Also support inclusion of potential impact on adjoining SSSIs.
- Support for the Policy on Energy Use, Renewables and Low Carbon - project viability is key to progressing these requirements.

##### **Object**

- English Heritage objects to reference to energy efficiency measures as part of refurbishment which could include listed buildings and buildings in conservation areas-need to ensure that proposals protect the special interest of these heritage assets.
- Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust object as further detail is required in this Policy for clarity. They also considered that amendment was required to Para 3d to include species protected under national and international law, including those that occur outside protected areas.

##### **Comments:**

- English Heritage welcomes reference to the historic environment in paragraph 3(a), although the term 'heritage assets' would be more consistent with national policy than 'historical features/areas'. The paragraph only refers to 'significant adverse effects', which is not defined or consistent with the concept of 'harm' in the NPPF. Weighing up harm versus public benefits is also now an established approach in national policy.
- English Heritage suggest wording in Criterion (c) amended within paragraph 3.
- National Farmers Union is not sure that conservation areas are areas of national importance in paragraph 3c.
- National Farmers Union proposed a presumption in favour of renewables unless there are severe constraints.

#### Responses received relating to Policy supporting text

##### **Support**

- Natural England welcomes the inclusion of the Urban Heat Island Effect in paragraph 7.4. as urban green space can have a significant cooling effect, contributing towards climate change adaptation. Even modest increases in

tree canopy cover can significantly reduce the urban heat island effect via evapotranspiration and shading. Green roofs have been shown to have a dramatic effect on maximum surface temperatures, and provide a unique opportunity to retrofit green infrastructure into dense urban areas where space is at a premium.

- Farmers Union support wording in para 7.1.

**Response:**

- Policy is considered already sufficiently favourable to renewables.
- Other changes suggested by responders will be included in revisions to the Plan.

**Changes to the Local Plan:**

- Amend Para 3a of policy to replace “historical features/areas” with “heritage assets”.
- Amend Para 3 to identify significant harm in the wording of the Policy in relation to historic assets and biodiversity.
- Add an additional paragraph 3e “Species protected under national and international law, including those that occur outside protected areas”
- Amend the Policy Para 3 “In and adjoining areas of national importance amend to include to “natural and heritage assets of national importance”.
- While noting support for the reference in the text to the Urban Heat Island Effect, this not specifically identified in the Policy and consequently has not been taken forward.

Number of Comments		Number of Respondents	
7		6	
Objection to Policy	Support the Policy	Comment on the Policy	
2	4	1	



### List of Respondents

English Heritage, Natural England, Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust, National Farmers Union, URS infrastructure and Environment UK Ltd.

## **Policy CC2: Water Resource Management**

### Comments received relating to Policy

#### Support

- Support for the Policy from the Environment Agency in particular for the reference to the Water Framework Directive (WFD) and the importance of separating foul and surface water discharge systems. The Environment Agency in its response to Policy SD6 identified that the Local Plan presents an opportunity to create, protect, maintain, restore and enhance watercourses through development.
- Natural England generally supports the Policy.
- Development must incorporate all practicable water conservation measures subject to ensuring no adverse impact on the water environment and biodiversity. All new build properties should have smart meter installed whereby the owner will be able to monitor and conserve their supplies.
- Efficiency should relate not only to water but also to electricity and gas.

#### Object

- Concerns were expressed in specific cases regarding surface water run off from the proposed new road at Rolls Royce and the associated industrial uses potential polluting a local spring.
- Objection to Water Efficient in relation to residential development being required to meet Code Level 3 of the Code for Sustainable Homes. The Policy should set out a requirement to meet national targets in the Code for Sustainable Homes as lower levels should not be specified where viability will be critical.

### Comments received relating to Policy supporting text

- The Environment Agency proposed an amendment to paragraph 7.21, which identifies that major aquifers are now known as 'principal aquifer'.

**Response:**

- Issues regarding surface water run off will be addressed as part of any planning application. For sites of one hectare or more a site specific flood risk assessment will be required, which will include considering the risks from surface water flooding.
- The evidence from the Council’s Watercycle Study is that it is important to reduce the use of water resources in the District and therefore water saving measures should be implemented. The Department of Communities and Local Government “Cost of building to the Code for Sustainable Homes. Updated cost review” August 2011 identified that to achieve Code Level Three/Four for water would cost £150 for a terraced property and £200 for a four bedroom semi detached house. Therefore, given the importance of saving water together with the limited impact in terms of viability no change is recommended to the Policy.
- The Council encourages efficient in relation to all natural resources, but the Policy relates to water resources and not to gas and electrical services.

**Changes to the Local Plan:**

- Add to the Policy on Water Quality 3 d) “Opportunities will be taken to restore and enhance watercourses, including small water courses such as ditches, to improve water quality and to extending the connectivity and biological complexity of watercourses and their wider environment.”
- Amend paragraph 7.21 to state ‘principal’ aquifers.

Number of Comments		Number of Respondents	
8		8	
Objection to Policy	Support the Policy	Comment on the Policy	
3	5	-	

**List of Respondents**

Jean Toseland, Sally Wyatt for Reach Out Residents, Mr Keith Oliver for Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd, Natural England; Joan Olko, Mrs Thompson, Angela Smith and Andrew Pitts for the Environment Agency.

## Policy CC3: Flood Risk

### Comments received relating to Policy

#### Support

- Support for the Policy from the Environment Agency (EA). The EA made the following comments:
  1. a) Question the need for the addition of 'in relation to watercourses'..
  1. c) explains that no new development will be permitted if it creates an unacceptable risk of flooding elsewhere. The EA consider that this should read that new development should not increase flood risk elsewhere in accordance with paragraph 103 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).
  2. b) The EA We considered schemes in Hucknall and any developments within the catchment of the River Leen should be designed to reduce flows to Greenfield rate of run-off.
  2. g) Policy CC3 which makes reference to the 'maintenance and long term management' of SUDS schemes is welcomed.
- Natural England expressed support for sustainable urban drainage incorporating amenity and biodiversity benefits. Natural England also stressed that wherever possible these areas should be connected into the green infrastructure network.

#### Object

- Proposals for development on the housing allocations at Rushley Farm and Beck Lane would be at variance with this Policy due to the surface water discharges from these sites.
- English Heritage raised concerns regarding the impact of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDS) on heritage assets, requesting that the Policy is amended accordingly.
- A substantial number of responses were received from respondents living in Annesley Woodhouse setting out the same comments:
  - Proposed an addition to paragraph 7.27 to reflect that the topography of the Ashfield in association with imperious soils results in springs in various localities, which may not always flow throughout the year.
  - Paragraph 1f of the Policy should be amended to incorporate additional wording “and this does not increase the downstream flow from the site to what it was prior to development.”

Comments received relating to Policy supporting text  
None.

**Response:**

- Policy CC3 is intended to minimise the risk of flooding in the District from new development. The Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment has not identified a flood risk in relation to Rushley Farm and Beck Lane. On the Rushley Farm no issues are identified on the Environment Agency's surface water flooding maps. Policy CC3 requires that sustainable drainage systems will be utilised on developments (SuDS) unless it is not feasible or viable. SUDS is utilised to prevent surface water flooding and to store surface water on site to prevent flood elsewhere. The use of SUDS has been emphasised by the provisions of the Flood and Water Management Act 2010. Under the Act there will be a requirement when the relevant sections come into force for:
  - a) House builders and developers to incorporate sustainable drainage systems into new developments.
  - b) The County Council to approve surface water drainage proposals and adopt those systems (subject to conditions).

If issues are identified with proposed SUDS systems that cannot be resolved, the development proposal is unlikely to get either planning permission or permission for the SUDS system.

- The Local Plan stresses that planning applications will be assessed against all planning policies with the Local Plan and that all policies are interdependent. Therefore, issues regarding heritage asset would be covered by Policy EV11: The Historic Environment.
- It is not consider that additional wording is required to Criteria 1 f) of the Policy as this is already taken account of in the SUDS element of the Policy Criteria 2 b).

**Changes to the Local Plan:**

- Recommend that an amendment is made to Policy CC3 to reflect the Environment Agency's comments as follows:
  1. a) delete 'in relation to watercourses'.
  1. c) amend the Policy to delete "no new development will be permitted if it creates an unacceptable risk of flooding elsewhere". Add new sub point "increases flood risk elsewhere".
  2. b) Include after Hucknall "and any developments within the catchment of the River Leen"

- Consider amending the Policy so that new development, which incorporates and/or borders watercourses, leaves an appropriate “easement” from the watercourse to allow for a green corridor for both biodiversity, amenity and flood risk management purposes.
- Recommend amendment to the wording of the text to paragraph 7.27 to add “where appropriate, evidence should be sought from local sources regarding past flooding and the location of springs. Removal of springs may cause drying out of clay layers and subsequent shrinkage, slippage and reduction in load bearing capabilities in development areas.”

Number of Comments		Number of Respondents	
<b>53</b>		<b>53</b>	
Objection to Policy	Support the Policy	Comment on the Policy	
<b>47</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>-</b>	

**List of Respondents**

David Rose, Mr & Mrs Stewart and Anne, Mr Andrew Pitts for the Environment Agency, Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge for English Heritage, Natural England, Hugh Nicoll, Mr Robert Collier, Mrs Julia Collier, Mr Peter Olko, Mrs Joan Olko, Miss Deberah Olko, Mr William, Cooper, Ms Ann Cooper, Mr & Mrs M & P Dear, Mrs Margaret Lathall, Mrs Micaela Stanley, Mrs Anne Chalkley, Mr Stewart Chalkley, Mr Stephen Jacksdale, Mrs Alison Jackson, Mrs Pauline Cumberland, Mr Donald Bailey, Mr Mark Raynor, Mr Philip Wood, Mrs Margaret Johnson, Mrs Thompson, Mr John Lowe, Miss Becky Chaukley, Mr David Connah, Mrs Patricia Starling, Mrs Valerie Alcock, Mr David Alcock, Mr & Mrs R & M Hufton, Ms Julie Craft, Mrs Madeline Allsop, Mr Dick Bend, Mrs Margaret Bend, Mrs Pauline Hodson, Mr Peter Ward, Mrs Elizabeth Ward, Mr Roger Dean, Mr George Cordy, Mr Russell Lathall, Mrs Patricia Shaw, Ms Kathryn Shaw, Mr John Bolger, Mr Richard Shaw, Mrs Kirsty Cohen, Mr & Mrs M & M Lowe, Miss Angela Smith, Mrs Haydee Lafferty, Mr David Simpson, Mr Adam Heathcote.

## Protecting and Enhancing the Environment

### Policy EV1: Green Belt and Countryside

#### Responses received relating to Policy

##### Support

- National Farmers' Union support criteria a) and b) of policy EV1 on the rural economy and the Green Belt.
- English Heritage support criteria f) and paragraph 8.23 regarding infill development in Bagthorpe.
- Support for policy EV1 from residents largely in Annesley Woodhouse and also support for site AN10 – Forest Road, Annesley Woodhouse in the Green Belt Technical Paper (Sept 2012) being returned to Green Belt land. But ask that you note that this site provides a Green Wedge to separate the Sherwood Business Park from the Southern aspect of Annesley Woodhouse residential properties. The following description of this boundary change is “The Green Belt boundary will be amended to closely follow the boundaries of the rear gardens of properties 25a & 27 Forest Road and 33 to 67 Forest Road, and the redundant allotments, which border the rear gardens 17-26 Little Oak Avenue, and the garage line behind 25-26 Little Oak Avenue, to include the site in the Green Belt”
- Support for paragraphs 8.9, 8.10 and 8.24 on the rural economy and the Green Belt.
- Network Rail support Policy EV1 – in particular the mention of railway installations within rural locations. This is consistent with advice in the NPPF in allowing essential local transport infrastructure in the countryside.
- Selston Parish Council support Policy EV1 in terms of its protection of the Green Belt and Countryside from inappropriate development. They acknowledge that Green Belt release to accommodate new housing to maintain the economic and social sustainability of the rural areas is necessary and cautiously accept that the overall scale of release is necessary. The Council further assert that addressing the specific employment school provision and related access issues in Underwood in respect of landholdings off Winter Closes constitute very special circumstances justifying an additional /alternative area of release. In order to balance this position, the Parish Council seeks reduction in the scale of the large Green Belt housing release at Selston, which is also strongly supported by its residents.
- Support for Winter Closes sites. It is considered that it will have a negligible impact upon the open character of the wider Green Belt.

##### Object

- It is not appropriate to apply the same policies to Countryside as those which apply to Green Belt. This does not accord with advice in the NPPF. Green Belts should have a higher status. Developments which are inappropriate in the Green Belt may sometimes be appropriate in the countryside (e.g. Traveller sites).

- Concerned that this policy applies the Green Belt test (very special circumstances) to the defined Countryside. The NPPF provides extensive guidance on the importance of Green Belts and includes the very special circumstances test; it does not set out a very special circumstance test for development in the countryside. The two designations are very different and therefore it is inappropriate to have a policy test which covers both designations.
- Separate policies should be in place to outline the protection given to the Green Belt and non Green Belt areas in the countryside.
- Object to the premise that the countryside should fall within the same policy as Green Belt. It is vital that a suitably worded countryside policy is introduced to the plan which will allow appropriate development in appropriate circumstances whilst protecting the intrinsic value of the countryside.
- Objects to EV1 in that it covers land that can and should be developed for residential purposes.
- Proposed allocation at Rushley Farm (HG1Sv) would be at variance with this Policy. The Rushley Farm site, the sand extraction quarry and the Lindhurst Farm development exemplifies that this statement is not adhered to.
- The Plan Period need to be extended to at least 2026 and, preferably to 2028. Coupled with this is the need to safeguard land beyond the plan period. Therefore, the Green belt boundaries should be reviewed so that they endure for the much longer term, in line with paragraph 85 of NPPF.
- Objects to the land rear of 8 Beauvale Road being included as Green Belt. The land is unsuitable for farming due to lack of soil surface on old foundations footprint. Suitable for a small development.
- Objection to the Green Belt review to the rear of 220 Nottingham Road, Hucknall. The Green Belt boundary runs through the middle of gardens, with no defining boundary. The Green Belt boundary should be the hedgerow to the rear of our gardens, this being a more defensible boundary.
- Objection to the release of Green belt land for benefit of housing developers.
- Objection to Policy EV1 only in respect of the manner in which the Green Belt is currently defined to include land at Nottingham Road / Hucknall Bypass (not an object to the wording of the policy). The site would bring benefits to both Bulwell and Hucknall and would enable the Green belt boundary to be removed to the clearly more distinct long term defensible line of Nottingham Road and predominantly the Hucknall by-pass. The site would not prejudice the retention of the strategic gap between settlements.
- Objection to the Council's decision to designate land south of Forest Road, Annesley Woodhouse as Green Belt. The land does not have a function of preventing coalescence; it bears no relationship to Nottingham or Derby. The Green Belt Technical Paper is flawed. The basis of the technical paper was to identify anomalies and to assess whether there has been any changes which constitutes exceptional circumstances - this does not relate to our clients land which was removed as part of the 2002 Local

Plan. The Local Plan and SHLAA identify that there are insufficient urban area sites. The Council has failed to identify areas of safeguarded land between the urban area and the Green Belt to meet longer term needs, stretching beyond the plan period. This is a notable absence where the plan period will be just 9 years from the date of adoption in 2014. The decision to move the boundary to the rear of properties on Forest Road is not justified and is in stark contrast to other areas now removed from the Green belt for proposed residential development.

- Objection to Policy EV1, only in respect of site HG1Va – Alfreton Road, Selston and is not an objection to the wording of the policy. Seek the identification as a housing allocation of a small site adjacent to 149 Stoney Lane, Selston. Housing site (HG1Va) directly causes the coalescence of Selston and Selston Green and therefore has no regard to Strategic Objective SO11. There is no evidence of a separate Green Belt exercise being undertaken for site selection.
- Objection to the Green Belt Review procedure. Site K27, Beacon Farm adjoins the settlement on two sides and has very robust, defensible boundaries – Derby Road and Balls Lane. Inexplicably, site HG1Kd lies wholly within the Green Belt and has been recommended for removal from the Green Belt. HG1Kd is 100% agricultural land with no areas of PDL and has no defensible boundaries.
- The Proposals Map needs to be amended to include Site V14 (SHLAA) as a logical ‘rounding off’ of the named settlement of Jacksdale to provide a more long-term defensible boundary following the line of the Bagthorpe Brook. The wording of Policy EV1 should be amended to include the additional category of development now contained within the NPPF as that comprising ‘appropriate development’ in the Green Belt (para 89) to ensure that it is fully consistent with national policy.
- Object to the proposed inclusion of land to the rear of 27 to 67 Forest Road, Annesley Woodhouse in the Green Belt. The boundary has been long established and there have been no material changes to the land which now justify its inclusion within the Green Belt. Ashfield have not taken a sufficiently robust assessment of the site to justify its inclusion.
- Object to Site S93 in the SHLAA being identified as countryside. We believe there are sufficient grounds for the development of this land for residential purposes.
- Green Belt sites have been allocated without a review of the Green Belt having taken place, raising serious concerns about the soundness of the plan. One of the core planning principles given in the NPPF is protecting Green Belts. The Council's Green Belt Review (September 2012) is clear in its acknowledgement that it does not consider circumstances where the Green Belt may need to be adjusted to accommodate development. In addition, there is no evidence or explanation given in the Preferred Approach or the Sustainability Appraisal of how the Council has given proper weight to the essential characteristics of the Green Belt or how the release of Green Belt land proposed by this policy demonstrates exceptional circumstances. It is unclear, therefore, whether the Green Belt sites that have been selected in the Local Plan represent the most appropriate strategy and meet with the requirements regarding Green Belt



set out in the NPPF.

- Objection to the Policy to the extent that approximately 10.1 ha of land should be allocated for economic development purposes and for providing sports facilities for a local football club at Hamilton Road, Sutton in Ashfield.
- From residents largely in Annesley Woodhouse the following comments:
  - Criteria EV f and the supporting text paragraph does not include the villages of Annesley Colliery and New Annesley (Conservation Area)
  - Identifies that Policy reference number and text paragraph references do not correspond.
  - Annesley Woodhouse is separate and distinct from Kirkby-in-Ashfield and should be accorded village status.

#### Comment

- Natural England would like the policy to consider any opportunities that could be taken for the green belt to link into green infrastructure and ecological networks both within the urban areas and with the open countryside.
- The preferred approach to Green Belt policy is generally supported. However, policy EV1 or policy SP2 could be more specific in setting out the District Council's commitment to maintain both the principle of the Nottingham – Derby Green Belt and the importance of the need to it. The 2006 review of the Nottingham – Derby Green Belt concluded that the area north of Nottingham in Ashfield was strategically of high importance in meeting the 5 main Green belt purposes.

#### Comments received relating to Policy supporting text

- ACCESS made comments with regard to para. 8.1 which states that:  
“Ashfield’s rural environment is divided into two parts etc  
f) Limited infill development within:
    - i. The Green Belt villages of Bagthorpe, New Westwood, Jubilee and New Selston, so long as there is no adverse affect on the character of the village.
- 1: Jubilee is not mentioned in previous paragraphs of Green Belt Villages and also excludes the village of Annesley Colliery/New Annesley (Conservation Area)  
Para 8.21 states: “EV1 (g. i): It is not always desirable to preclude the implementation of certain infill proposals within villages in the Green Belt. The only villages ‘washed over’ by Green Belt are Bagthorpe, including Lower Bagthorpe, Middlebrook and New Bagthorpe, New Westwood, Jubilee and New Selston.
- 2 - these washed over villages are not in accord to those quoted within Para f) i.
- 3 - Again we make the same comment relating to Annesley Village (Conservation Area) not being included.
- 4 - As local residents of Annesley Woodhouse we believe that this village is separate and distinct from Kirkby and should be accorded village status in its own right.

**Response:**

- Both the Green Belt and Countryside are considered to be important assets to the District, however, it is accepted that it is not appropriate to apply the same policies to Countryside as those which apply to Green Belt. This does not accord with advice in the NPPF. Green Belts should have a higher status and therefore it is proposed to have a separate Green Belt and Countryside Policy in the Local Plan.
- It is not considered necessary at this time to review Green Belt Boundaries beyond the plan period.
- It is considered that Policy EV1 is consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework in respect to the term 'appropriate development'.
- The Green Belt areas proposed for release have been assessed as being deliverable and are considered to be sustainably located. Restricting growth to non-Green Belt countryside would lead to an uneven distribution of growth and the loss of opportunity in respect of Kirkby town centre regeneration and maintaining the vitality of the villages.
- A detailed survey of all Green Belt boundaries has been undertaken to inform the minor changes proposed in the Preferred Approach document. A strategic review for the Nottingham Outer Housing Market Area (i.e., excluding Hucknall) will be published at the next stage of the Local Plan process.
- A significant proportion of the alternative housing sites put forward in response to the public consultation have already been assessed through the SHLAA and Sustainability Appraisal (SA), and also considered by the Council Members. These were dismissed in favour of sites which met the identified housing need and have been assessed as more sustainably located and deliverable in the shorter term. Those sites which are new to the process will be assessed through the SHLAA and SA as part of the Local Plan process. However, this action is only possible where the landowner has indicated that the site is available for housing development.
- The NPPF requires Council's to provide sufficient housing land to meet the objectively assessed needs of the local community. The Council has set out the requirement in the Housing technical paper and has adopted a strategic approach to the allocation of land for housing. There is insufficient brown field and infill land to meet the housing requirement and therefore the plan sets out the allocation of land for housing on sites that are adjacent to existing urban areas. In this regard the Rushley Farm site (HG1Sv) is adjacent to the urban area of Mansfield and will be integrated into the urban area through the development of the proposed adjoining Lindhurst development.
- Additional work has been undertaken with regard to the alternative sites proposed for economic development. However, following this work the Council does not intend to allocate any additional land for economic development purposes. The Local Plan reflects the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework by meeting anticipated needs over the Plan period. It also incorporates flexibility through a criteria approach for additional sites to come forward if changes in demand reflect such a need over the Plan period. Taken together this provides a high degree of choice

for potential economic development uses. Consequently, it is considered that the Council has taken a positive approach to the demand for economic development within the District, which will deliver jobs and opportunities in Ashfield.

- The purpose of Green Belt and Countryside Policy is to indicate the types of development which are appropriate in these areas and not to identify sites for housing, economic or other purposes.
- It is not the purpose of Green Belt Policy EV1 to deal with green infrastructure. Policy EV4 of the Local Plan deals with green infrastructure.
- Paragraph 8.2 refers to the principle of the Nottingham and Derby Green Belt and specifically states that 'maintenance of the Green Belt ensures that Hucknall and Nottingham in particular, which lie very close together, remain physically separate.' It is considered that no additional wording is required in this respect.
- No changes are proposed to Policy EV1 f) as the Policy relate to villages washed-over by the Green Belt. Annesley Colliery and New Annesley are not within the Green Belt and there are no proposals to wash-over these villages.
- Criteria f) i. and paragraph 8.21 both name the Green Belt villages of Bagthorpe, New Westwood, Jubilee and New Selston. Paragraph 8.21 also names Lower Bagthorpe, Middlebrook and Lower Bagthorpe. These three areas form part of the village of Bagthorpe, however it is accepted that this may be confusing and therefore it is proposed to amend paragraph 8.21 so that this is made clear.
- It is acknowledged that Annesley Woodhouse is district from Kirkby In Ashfield. However, in terms of planning the area still forms part of the Main Urban Area and no changes are proposed.
- It is acknowledged that some of the Policy references and paragraph references do not match up - this will be corrected in the Publication Draft document.

### **Changes to the Local Plan:**

- Separate Policy EV1 and supporting text – Green Belt and Countryside: one policy related to the Green Belt and the other related to Countryside.
- Ensure that the references in supporting text correspond with the criteria/numbers in both the Green belt and Countryside Policies.
- Delete paragraphs 8.1, 8.3, 8.9 and 8.22.
- Include a reference in the supporting text to special circumstances – 'the exceptional quality or innovative nature of design of the dwelling'.
- Amend paragraph 8.21 to read:  
    'The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that limited infilling in villages is not inappropriate development in the Green Belt, provided it preserves the openness of the Green Belt. It is not always desirable to preclude the implementation of certain infill proposals within villages in the Green Belt. The only villages 'washed over' by Green Belt are Bagthorpe, including Lower Bagthorpe, Middlebrook and New Bagthorpe, New Westwood, Jubilee and New Selston. Other smaller

hamlets and outlying isolated settlements or extensions of other settlements within the Green Belt are not regarded as villages for the purpose of policy EV1 6).’

- Amend 2<sup>nd</sup> sentence of paragraph 8.21 to read: ‘The only villages washed over by Green Belt are Bagthorpre (including Lower Bagthorpe, Middlebrook and New Bagthorpe), New Westwood.....’
- Add new paragraph after paragraph 8.21 to refer to built up frontages: ‘The District Council defines limited infill development as the completion of an otherwise substantially built up frontage by the filling of a small gap normally capable of taking one or two dwellings only. A substantial built up frontage is defined as an otherwise continuous and largely uninterrupted built frontage of several dwellings visible within the street scene.’
- Delete 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> sentence from paragraph 8.23.

Number of Comments		Number of Respondents	
<b>150</b>		<b>148</b>	
Objection to Policy	Support the Policy	Comment on the Policy	
<b>21</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>52</b>	

**List of Respondents**

Mr & Mrs A Rhodes; Mr R & J Collier; Mr & Mrs Stewart and Anne; W & A Cooper; Mr Peter, Joan & Deborah Olko; Moira & Robert Hufton; J & P Shaw; P Gibbons; N Sinnel; Mrs M Stanley; P Street; M White; Richard Shaw; Kathryn Shaw; R & A Smith; M & M Lowe; P & S Scrimshaw; P & C Wood; John Clarke; J Thompson; Mrs P Starling; D & M Bend; D & S Bailey; John & Margaret Bolger; Mrs A Allsop; R & A Lathall; Mr P Hodson; Kirsty Cohen; C & S Bailey; J Crafts; David Alcock; Sharon & Mark Raynor; AP & S Petchell; Peter Stanley; Mr T Lee; Becky Challday; R Lancashire; Alison & Ryan Scrimshaw; V Hayes; Benn Rice; T Rice; Mrs M Waterhouse; PB & M Canlin; N & S Buckle; M Guy; G & J Roe; P & J Copson; Paula & Michael Dear; H Headworth; Lisa Brown; E E Pearson; Dave Wood; D Connah; W & E Cooper; A Garner; Edmund Hopkins; M & S Dymond; Sophie Lawes; Adam Heathcote; K Brennan; Nicola Boxton; Emma Fawcett; Mr J C Lowe; Mr S P & A Jackson; Mrs P Cumberland; Mr and Mrs Stewart and Anne; Ms Joyce Mole; M E Jackson; Ms Jean Bowyer; Mr Shlomo Downen; Mr P Tame; David Rose; A R Yarwood (Derbyshire Gypsy Liason Group); Nick Grace; Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge (English Heritage); Natural England; Mr Keith Oliver (Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd); Mr Ian Goldstraw (Derbyshire Environmental Services); Mrs C Kemp; Mr Malcolm Turner; Adrian Pitchford; Mr R Fletcher (Ian Baseley Associates); Jennifer

Walters ( Barton Willmore Planning); Helen Winkler (Tyler-Parkes Partnership); Rob Hughes (Ian Baseley Associates); John Collins (John D Collins & Associates); Mr N Baseley (Ian Baseley Associates); Nick Grace (Gracemachin Planning); Mr Dennis Poe (Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners); Mr Rodger Freeston (Savills); Mr Aaron Smith (Caldecotte Consultants); John Booth (Phoenix Planning); Ms S Ball (Selston Parish Council); Mrs M Lake (Network Rail), P.Stone, Signet Planning for Peveril Homes; Guy Longley (Pegasus Planning Group).

ACCESS: Mr Robert Collier, Mrs Julia Collier, Mr Peter Olko, Mrs Joan Olko, Miss Deberah Olko, Mr William Cooper, Ms Ann Cooper, Mr & Mrs M & P Dear, Mrs Margaret Lathall, Mr John Shaw, Mrs Micaela Stanley, Mrs Anne Chalkley, Mr Stewart Chalkley, Mr Stephen Jacksdale, Mrs Alison Jackson, Mrs Pauline Cumberland, Mr Donald Bailey, Mr Mark Raynor, Mr Philip Wood, Mrs Margaret Johnson, Mrs Thompson, Mr John Lowe, Miss Becky Chaukley, Mr David Connah, Mrs Patricia Starling, Mrs Valerie Alcock, Mr David Alcock, Mr & Mrs R & M Hufton, Ms Julie Craft, Mrs Madeline Allsop, Mr Dick Bend, Mrs Margaret Bend, Mrs Pauline Hodson, Mr Peter Ward, Mrs Elizabeth Ward, Mr Roger Dean, Mr George Cordy, Mr Russell Lathall, Mrs Patricia Shaw, Ms Kathryn Shaw, Mr John Bolger, Mr Richard Shaw, Mrs Kirsty Cohen, Mr & Mrs M & M Lowe, Miss Angela Smith, Mrs Haydee Lafferty, Mr David Simpson, Mr Adam Heathcote, Mrs Edna Pearson & Mr & Mrs A & D Rhodes.

## Policy EV2: Re-Use or Adaptation of Buildings in the Green Belt and Countryside

### Responses received relating to Policy

#### Support

- English Heritage supports the policy and welcomes criteria (b) and (g), and paragraph 8.33 regarding the historic environment impact of reusing or adapting rural buildings.
- General support for the Policy from residents largely in Annesley Woodhouse but raising that the period in Policy EV2 f) and paragraph 8.32 should be changed to 15 years rather than 10 to prevent the potential change of use of farm buildings within an owners lifetime.

#### Object

- It is not appropriate to apply the same policies to the Countryside as to those which apply to the Green Belt. Green Belts must inevitably have a higher status. Applying policy in this way negates the purpose of Green Belts. Uses of buildings which are inappropriate in the Green Belt may sometimes be acceptable in the countryside.
- Paragraph 55 of the NPPF makes clear that the residential use of redundant or disused buildings in rural areas is a 'special circumstance' to allow further dwellings where it would 'lead to an enhancement to the immediate setting'. The previous non-residential re-use first approach of national policy predecessors has been removed. Therefore, Policy EV2 and paragraph 8.26 should be amended to ensure they are compliant with the NPPF by supporting the reuse of buildings for residential.
- Policy EV2 g) the recognition that these buildings may have 'historic or architectural value' is appropriate. The statement that the proposed scheme will 'preserve and enhance' the building requires expert historic building conservation input to deliver. Issues such as appropriate materials and detailing are a key component of preservation and enhancement – without which these claims will be unfounded/undelivered.

### Responses received relating to Policy supporting text

- 8.33 acknowledges some of the key issues for historic/listed farm buildings but the use of appropriate materials and craft skills (both to preserve significance and enhance local traditions and distinctiveness) is missed.

**Response:**

- It is considered that the 10 year timeframe referred to in EV2 f) is appropriate.
- The Green Belt and Countryside are considered to be important assets to the District. Whilst it is proposed to separate Policy EV1 – Green Belt and Countryside into two separate policies, it is not considered necessary to do this for Policy EV2.
- Whilst it is acknowledged that paragraph 55 of the NPPF refers to the re-use of redundant or disused buildings in rural areas for housing would be considered as a 'special circumstance' would this would 'lead to an enhancement to the immediate setting". However, it is not considered necessary to repeat national guidance. Paragraph 8.26 is setting out the Council's preferred approach to the re-use of buildings. This is in line with the Council's vision for economic growth for the District.
- Policy SD1: Design Considerations for Development states that 'development form should demonstrate that account has been taken of local materials, architectural style and detailing' amongst other criteria.

**Changes to the Local Plan:**

No changes are proposed arising from the responses.

Number of Comments		Number of Respondents	
44		44	
Objection to Policy	Support the Policy	Comment on the Policy	
3	41	0	

**List of Respondents**

English Heritage, Nottinghamshire County Council, A R Yarwood, Derbyshire Gypsy Liaison Group, Mr A Smith, Caldecotte Consultants, Mr Robert Collier, Mrs Julia Collier, Mr Peter Olko, Mrs Joan Olko, Miss Deberah Olko, Mr William Cooper, Ms Ann Cooper, Mr & Mrs M & P Dear, Mrs Margaret

Lathall, Mr John Shaw, Mrs Micaela Stanley, Mrs Anne Chalkley, Mr Stewart Chalkley, Mr Stephen Jacksdale, Mrs Alison Jackson, Mrs Pauline Cumberland, Mr Mark Raynor, Mr Philip Wood, Mrs Margaret Johnson, Mrs Thompson, Mr John Lowe, Miss Becky Chaukley, Mr David Connah, Mrs Patricia Starling, Mrs Valerie Alcock, Mr David Alcock, Mr & Mrs R & M Hufton, Ms Julie Craft, Mrs Madeline Allsop, Mr Dick Bend, Mrs Margaret Bend, Mrs Pauline Hodson, Mr Peter Ward, Mrs Elizabeth Ward, Mrs Patricia Shaw, Ms Kathryn Shaw, Mr John Bolger, Mr Richard Shaw, Mr & Mrs M & M Lowe, Miss Angela Smith.

### **Policy EV3: Protection and Enhancement of Landscape Character**

#### Responses received relating to Policy

##### Support

- National Trust support this policy.
- Natural England support this policy.
- English Heritage welcome reference to the historic environment, but wishes a reference in criteria (g) to the setting and views from 'listed buildings and scheduled ancient monuments' as well as those already stated.
- Support for Policy EV3 from residents largely in Annesley Woodhouse but with comments on the private allotments on land to the south of Forest Road:
  - The Proposal Map does not show the private allotments on the land to the south of Forest Road;
  - Appendix 6 on page 316 should be amended to reflect the protection of these allotments allotment;
  - The allotments should be brought back into use.

##### Object

- Paragraph 2 means that all proposals need to have this work done, this is excessive and the requirements should only apply to major development proposals.
- This policy is too onerous, instead of the words 'protect and conserve' the words 'avoid any significant adverse impact on...' Item 4 is even more onerous and is unnecessary and contradicts item 2 as it requires enhancement in all circumstances.



Responses received relating to supporting text

- English Heritage recommends that in paragraph 3, reference should be made to 'public benefits' and not simply 'benefits' in order to be consistent with national policy.

**Response:**

- The aim of the Policy is to protect and enhance the character of the landscape it does not specifically relate to allotments.
- The Landscape Character Assessment for Ashfield covers all countryside areas which lies outside the Main Urban Area and Named Settlements. Development proposals in the Green Belt or Countryside must firstly be in acceptable in accordance with Policy EV1 – Green Belt and Countryside (note that it is proposed to have separate Green Belt and Countryside Policies in line with National guidance). Under Policy EV3, should a proposal be acceptable in principle based upon Policy EV1, then the actual form of the development will need to have regard to the particular landscape characteristics of importance to that locality, as identified in the Landscape Character Assessment. This is explained in paragraph 8.41 of the Preferred Approach Local Plan. It is not considered that that the Policy is excessive or onerous.
- It is acknowledges that paragraph 3 should refer to 'public benefits' and not simply 'benefits' in order to be consistent with national policy.

**Changes to the Local Plan:**

- Amend criterion (g) of Policy EV3 to read 'the setting of, and views to and from, Listed Buildings, Scheduled Monuments, Conservation Areas, and Historic Parks and Gardens'.
- Amend paragraph 3 of Policy EV3, to read 'public benefits' and not just 'benefits'.

<b>Number of Comments</b>		<b>Number of Respondents</b>	
<b>45</b>		<b>45</b>	
<b>Objection to Policy</b>	<b>Support the Policy</b>		<b>Comment on the Policy</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>43</b>		<b>0</b>

**List of Respondents**

Mr A Marshal, Greasley Parish Council, National Trust, English Heritage, Natural England, National Farmers Union, A R Yarwood, Derbyshire Gypsy Liaison Group, Mr Robert Collier, Mrs Julia Collier, Mr Peter Olko, Mrs Joan Olko, Miss Deberah Olko, Mr William Cooper, Ms Ann Cooper, Mr & Mrs M & P Dear, Mrs Margaret Lathall, Mr John Shaw, Mrs Micaela Stanley, Mrs Anne Chalkley, Mr Stewart Chalkley, Mr Stephen Jacksdale, Mrs Alison Jackson, Mrs Pauline Cumberland, Mr Mark Raynor, Mr Philip Wood, Mrs Margaret Johnson, Mrs Thompson, Mr John Lowe, Miss Becky Chaukley, Mr David Connah, Mrs Patricia Starling, Mrs Valerie Alcock, Mr David Alcock, Mr & Mrs R & M Hufton, Ms Julie Craft, Mrs Madeline Allsop, Mr Dick Bend, Mrs Margaret Bend, Mrs Pauline Hodson, Mr Peter Ward, Mrs Elizabeth Ward, Mrs Patricia Shaw, Ms Kathryn Shaw, Mr John Bolger, Mr Richard Shaw, Mr & Mrs M & M Lowe, Miss Angela Smith.

**Policy EV4: Green Infrastructure, Biodiversity and Geological Conservation**

Responses received relating to Policy

- The Environment Agency's response to Policy SD6 identifies that the revised approach to planning guidance emphasises is for Local Authorities to include key issues within the Local Development Plan. These key issues can then be used to influence and guide decisions on a site specific basis at application stage. The Environment Agency recommend

that an objective be included within the Local Plan to 'Protect and enhance the wider environment' giving particular attention to dealing with controlled waters and land contamination.

- Natural England support this policy.
- Page 322 Appendix 11 should also mention Special Areas of Conservation (SAC) when listing the nature conservation sites to be taken into consideration.
- Welcome the proposal put forward to improve the sub-regional Green Infrastructure links between our two districts.
- Special Biological and Geological sites, Thieves Wood and Coxmoor Golf course are both listed as important locations of biodiversity. These are too close to the proposal of HG1Sv.
- It is noted that this policy has specifically addressed the deficiency identified in former proposed policy CP4 which only sought biodiversity improvements in respect of major developments.
- Unfortunate that reference to the historic environment has been reduced in this draft policy compared to Policy CP4 in the Core Strategy Preferred Options.
- The policy offers the same level of protection to internationally designated sites as it does to locally designated sites. Change is required to ensure compliance with paragraph 113 of the NPPF.
- Reference needs to be made to the preservation, restoration and re-creation of priority habitats and the protection and recovery of priority species as listed in the UK Biodiversity Action Plan, and as required by NPPF paragraph 117.
- Ecological networks, wildlife corridors and stepping stones are considered to be adequately through the section of the policy that deals with Green Infrastructure, although it might be helpful to explicitly highlight these in section 1 of the policy.
- The policy should refer to avoiding harm to geological conservation interests, which it currently does not.
- Section 5, reference to priority species and habitats should be added in addition to protected species.
- Consider SINC status of land at Castle Hill, Kirkby EV11AC north of fishing ponds, area of great biodiversity contained within a conservation area.
- Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust support the policy, but advise some amendments to the policy text.
- ACCESS supports the Policy but:
  - Considers that inadequate distinction is made between differing classes of nature conservation sites.
  - In the opinion of ACCESS an independent survey by EMEC showed that sufficient species were present to warrant the Hay and Wildflower meadow to the rear of Forest Road to be considered a SINC site.
  - There is conflict between the Green Infrastructure document, and the Local Plan in the name of EV5/97. ACCESS consider it should be amended to "Forest Road Nature Area",.

- Stressed the changes set out below to the Little Oak Plantation.
- Support from Annesley & Felley Parish Council for the findings of the ACCESS group in relation to their ecology studies with particular reference to Little Oak plantation and the need for the maintenance of the green corridor which runs behind the houses adjacent to Forest Road and is within the Parish Boundaries.
- Support for Policy EV4 from residents largely in Annesley Woodhouse and also reflect ACCESS comments regarding:
  - Little Oak Plantation has been granted Local Wildlife Status (SINC) and this should be entered into the Appendix 3 list and the definition of this be changed on the Proposals Map.
  - Little Oak Plantation has been identified as an Ancient Woodland and this should be reflected in Appendix 5 and the Proposals Map.
  - The Proposals Map and Local Plan 2010-2023, fail to include and show the allotments within Annesley Colliery Village & Forest Road
- Paragraph 8.54 states that “The protection and enhancement of ... locally designated areas such as ... Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) ... is vital.” In addition, paragraphs 4.4, 5.4 and 6.4 states that “to ensure that existing areas maintain or enhance Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity it is important to protect existing assets...”. However, the proposals map appears to contradict this approach, with at least five SINC’s included within proposed housing or employment land allocations (four wholly, and one partially).

Responses received relating to Policy supporting text

None

**Response:**

- Reference to the historic environment will be considered as part of the review of the EV4 policy.
- The Council will consider whether the Policy needs amending to reflect differing classes of nature conservation sites.
- The change in the status of the Little Oak Plantation was identified in a footnote to Appendix 3 and Appendix 5. It is anticipated that they will be designated by the next consultation stage in which case they will be included in included in the relevant Appendix.
- The site at Forest Road was surveyed by the Nottinghamshire Biological and Geological Record Centre as part of the Forest Road planning applications and no recommendations were made for the site to be identified as a SINC.
- The Environment Agency’s recommended changes have been made to policy SD6.

- The allocation of new SINC sites will not be considered at this stage.
- SINC sites identified on employment or housing land allocations would be considered as part of any future planning application and assessed against Policy EV4: Green Infrastructure, Biodiversity and Geological Conservation.

### **Changes to the Local Plan**

- The Appendix is amended in relation to EV5/97 to "Forest Road Nature Area, Annesley Woodhouse."
- Changes to the Policy to reflect The Environment Agency recommend that an objective be included within the Local Plan to 'Protect and enhance the wider environment' giving particular attention to dealing with controlled waters and land contamination. (Comments on Policy SD6)
- Recommend change to text to distinguish between the hierarchy of designated nature conservation sites that exist. Also, reference will be made to the preservation, restoration and re-creation of priority habitats and the protection and recovery of priority species as listed.
- Recommend amendment to policy EV4 to reflect Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust comments.
- Recommend change to supporting text page 322, Appendix 11 (point 2) to include Special Areas of Conservation (SAC) within text.
- Recommend changes to policy in line with Nottinghamshire County Council comments.

<b>Number of Comments</b>		<b>Number of Respondents</b>	
<b>59</b>		<b>58</b>	
<b>Objection to Policy</b>	<b>Support the Policy</b>	<b>Comment on the Policy</b>	
<b>3</b>	<b>56</b>	-	

### **List of Respondents**

Bolsover District Council, Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust, D.Rose, National Trust, English Heritage, Natural England, Nottinghamshire County Council Annesley & Felley Parish Council, Kirkby & District Conservation Society Annesley Community Committed to Ensuring Sustainable Settlements (ACCESS), Mr Robert Collier, Mrs Julia Collier, Mr Peter Olko, Mrs Joan Olko, Miss Deberah Olko, Mr William Cooper, Ms Ann Cooper, Mr & Mrs M & P Dear, Mrs Margaret Lathall, Mr John Shaw, Mrs Micaela Stanley, Mrs Anne Chalkley, Mr Stewart Chalkley, Mr Stephen Jacksdale, Mrs Alison Jackson, Mrs Pauline Cumberland, Mr Donald Bailey, Mr Mark Raynor, Mr Philip Wood, Mrs Margaret Johnson, Mrs Thompson, Mr John Lowe, Miss Becky Chaukley, Mr David Connah, Mrs Patricia Starling, Mrs Valerie Alcock, Mr David Alcock, Mr & Mrs R & M Hufton, Ms Julie Craft, Mrs Madeline Allsop, Mr Dick Bend, Mrs Margaret Bend, Mrs Pauline Hodson, Mr Peter Ward, Mrs Elizabeth Ward, Mr Roger Dean, Mr George Cordy, Mr Russell Lathall, Mrs Patricia Shaw, Ms Kathryn Shaw, Mr John Bolger, Mr Richard Shaw, Mrs Kirsty Cohen, Mr & Mrs M & M Lowe, Miss Angela Smith, Mrs Haydee Lafferty, Mr David Simpson, Mr Adam Heathcote

## **Policy EV5: Protection of Green Spaces and Recreational Facilities**

### **Responses received relating to Policy**

#### **Support**

- National Trust's concern with this Policy relates to one detailed piece of wording - overall the Policy is supported. The concern relates to part 2c of the Policy which seeks to resist the loss of Other Open Areas that benefit the settings of important buildings or scheduled monuments. The concern is that this is a partial response to protecting the historic environment and by exclusion would leave assets such as Historic Parks and Gardens and important open spaces/views associated with Conservation Areas vulnerable to the adverse impacts of ill-considered development on Other Open Areas. It is suggested that this matter is most readily remedied by a reference to 'heritage assets' the definition of which adequately covers the various key elements of the historic environment, including locally important, as well as nationally designated, assets.
- The National Planning Policy Framework requires each Local Planning Authority should produce a Local Plan for its area. Local Plans should address the spatial implications of economic, social and environmental

change. In this regards Sport England supports this policy in principle.

- Support for Policy EV5 from residents largely in Annesley Woodhouse but with comments:
  - The communities wish to retain and bring back into use Annesley Miners Welfare Sports field. The Council is requested to purchase this area and bring into use as there is a lack of adult sports facilities in the area or alternatively, serve a section 215 notice to prevent neglect.
  - These playing fields are located in Annesley and not Kirkby as shown in Appendix 4, page 311.

#### Object

- Sport England advise that paragraph 73 of the NPPF advises that planning policies should be based on robust and up to date assessments of the needs for open space, sports and recreation facilities and opportunities for new provision, and that Sport England consider both the Green Space Strategy and Playing Pitch Strategy (2008) to be out of date. The evidence base in this regard could be considered as 'not robust' nor to be up to date and would not, therefore, be in accordance with paragraph 73 or 158 of the NPPF.
- Sport England is particularly concerned with regard to the wording of paragraph 8.73 which advises that 'In the case of school playing fields, development required for educational purposes will be permitted particularly as this is restricted by other legislation relating to the disposal of school playing fields.' Sport England advises that both as a statutory consultee and under the provision of the NPPF, the development of school playing fields for school projects is not automatically acceptable. The loss of school playing fields is a particularly contentious issue not just to other development but also for education related purposes, Sport England would raise a statutory objection to any loss of playing field unless one of the exceptions to our policy is met.
- We only have one decent park in Hucknall for children and young people to play.
- These submissions are directed at the allocation EV5/20 ' Hucknall Town Football Club Ground. It is submitted that the allocation is not justified in the context of the allocation HG1Hh ' which properly acknowledges that the site has outlined planning permission for mixed residential and employment development. **CHANGES SHOULD BE MADE** Remove allocation EV5/20 from Hucknall Town Football Club Site.
- This representation deals specifically with the promotion of TCG's site at Unwin Road, Sutton in Ashfield for allocation as a residential development. The site allocation EV5/200 should be removed from protection as a recreational facility and reallocated as a housing development. This site is in an area with a surplus of football pitches and its loss would not result in the local residents being unable to access recreational facilities. The site directly adjacent to the Unwin Road site is also used as a football pitch and would remain accessible to residents.
- Objection to the inclusion of land at the Former Annesley Miners Welfare in relation to the inclusion of the former playing pitches which were

associated with the former public house. The removal of the site from under the provisions of this policy is sought because there is no justifiable basis for it to continue to apply to this site.

- English Heritage welcome the reference to resisting the loss or fragmentation of green spaces not identified on the Proposals Map which contribute to the character and significance of places and heritage assets (criteria 3(a) to 3(c)). However, it is not clear why such criteria do not apply to green spaces identified on the Proposals Map, given that these are spaces that have been explicitly identified. The criteria (a) to (e) under paragraph 2 could lead to the loss or partial loss of green spaces that contribute to the character and significance of places and heritage assets. The criteria shown under paragraph 3 should also apply.

Responses received relating to Policy supporting text

None.

**Response:**

- It is noted that the playing pitches fell into neglect once the former Annesley Miners Arms closed down. The pitches are listed within the Playing Pitch Strategy 2008 and it would be the requirement of a developer to prove there is no longer the need for these facilities to be protected.
- It is acknowledged that Annesley Miners Welfare Sports field is located in Annesley and not Kirkby as shown in Appendix 4.
- Although outline planning permission has been granted for Hucknall Town Football Club, no development has commenced and the facilities are still in use.
- It is acknowledged that the current Ashfield Playing Pitch Strategy (2008) need to be updated and as such the Council is currently working on updating this document in order to ensure that appropriate facilities are protected and the needs for new or updated facilities are understood. Until such time the 2008 Playing Pitch strategy will remain the current evidence base for the Council.
- The Council currently considers that site EV5/200: Pretty Polly Sports Ground should be protected as a recreational facility. In the event that an application for housing was submitted on the site it would need to be assessed against the criteria of Policy EV5.
- Criteria 2 e) of Policy EV5 aims to protect school playing fields from development, the exception to this will be where the school genuinely requires space for educational purposes. It is proposed to amend the word 'required' to 'essential' to further strengthen this criteria. Paragraph 8.73 of the supporting text, will also be amended to this effect.
- It is accepted that the criteria listed under paragraph 3 of Policy EV5 should equally apply to green spaces and recreation facilities identified on the Proposals Map and as such the policy and supporting text will be amended accordingly.



**Changes to the Local Plan:**

- Amend criteria 2 e) of Policy EV5 to read ‘In the case of school playing fields the development is essential for educational purposes.’
- Amend criteria 3 of Policy EV5 to read: ‘The Council will resist the loss or fragmentation of green space and recreation facilities identified on the policies map and listed in Appendix 4, and other green space not identified on the policy map which:’
- Amend criteria 3 c) of Policy EV5 to read ‘Provide the setting for heritage assets’.
- Amend EV5/99 in Appendix 4 (pg 311) to read ‘Annesley’ rather than ‘Kirkby’.
- Amend EV5/97 in Appendix 4 (pg 311) to read ‘Forest Road, Annesley Woodhouse’ rather than ‘Forest Road Kodak Site, Annesley’
- Amend paragraph 8.72 to read: ‘The Council will resist the loss or fragmentation of green space and recreation facilities identified on the Policies Map and listed in Appendix 4, and other green space not identified on the Policies Map which contribute to the distinctive form, character and setting of a settlement or an area.’
- Amend paragraph 8.73 to read ‘In the case of school playing fields, development essential for educational purposes will be permitted where it can be demonstrated that sufficient suitable outdoor space remains on the site.’
- Add new paragraph after 8.73 to read, ‘Where the educational use of the site ceases, proposals for the development of its playing fields will only be considered favourably where it can clearly be demonstrated to meet the criteria set out in Policy EV5.’

Number of Comments		Number of Respondents	
<b>54</b>		<b>52</b>	
Objection to Policy	Support the Policy	Comment on the Policy	
<b>9</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>0</b>	

### **List of Respondents**

Sport England, National Trust, English Heritage, Natural England, Framptons, Ian Basely Associates, The Co-operative Group, Mr Robert Collier, Mrs Julia Collier, Mr Peter Olko, Mrs Joan Olko, Miss Deberah Olko, Mr William Cooper, Ms Ann Cooper, Mr & Mrs M & P Dear, Mrs Margaret Lathall, Mr John Shaw, Mrs Micaela Stanley, Mrs Anne Chalkley, Mr Stewart Chalkley, Mr Stephen Jacksdale, Mrs Alison Jackson, Mrs Pauline Cumberland, Mr Mark Raynor, Mr Philip Wood, Mrs Margaret Johnson, Mrs Thompson, Mr John Lowe, Miss Becky Chalkley, Mr David Connah, Mrs Patricia Starling, Mrs Valerie Alcock, Mr David Alcock, Mr & Mrs R & M Hufton, Ms Julie Craft, Mrs Madeline Allsop, Mr Dick Bend, Mrs Margaret Bend, Mrs Pauline Hodson, Mr Russell Lathall, Mrs Patricia Shaw, Ms Kathryn Shaw, Mr John Bolger, Mr Richard Shaw, Mrs Kirsty Cohen, Mr & Mrs M & M Lowe, Miss Angela Smith, Mrs Haydee Lafferty, Mr David Simpson, Mr Adam Heathcote, Mrs Edna Pearson & Mr & Mrs A & D Rhodes.

## **Policy EV6: Protection of Open Areas**

### **Responses received relating to Policy**

#### **Support**

- The land between Mill Lane and Alfreton Road is currently protected by this policy. The area is an important green corridor in an urban area. These areas are becoming fewer, particularly in the Alfreton Road area which has already had a major estate built on its farmland.
- Agree that alternative options are not appropriate where areas of undeveloped open space are concerned. As such land allocated under EV6Sa and EV6Sb should be maintained as shown on the September preferred approach plan.
- National Trust overall supports the policy, but is concerned with part 2c of the Policy which seeks to resist the loss of Other Open Areas that benefit the settings of important buildings or scheduled monuments. The concern is that this is a partial response to protecting the historic environment and by exclusion would leave assets such as Historic Parks and Gardens and important open spaces/views associated with Conservation Areas vulnerable to the adverse impacts of ill-considered development on Other Open Areas. It is suggested that this matter is most readily remedied by a reference to 'heritage assets' the definition of which adequately covers the various key elements of the historic environment, including locally

important, as well as nationally designated, assets.

- Natural England supports the policy.
- English Heritage welcome the reference to resisting the loss or fragmentation of open areas not identified on the proposals map which contribute to the character and significance of places and heritage assets (criteria 2 a to 2c).
- Supports the site identified on proposals map as EV6Sb – Rookery Lane.

**Object**

- Concerned about the loss of Green Belt land and wildlife at Derby Road site.
- Concerns raised regarding how much land is being lost through the granting of planning permission.
- Reference EV6Sb, believes this land acts as described in 8.75 and should be adopted as proposed in the Preferred Approach plan September 2012.
- Objection to policy EV6Sb and requests that the designation be deleted from the land and the land form part of the broader housing allocation known as site HGSi.
- Requests EV6Sc is removed and allowed to be built on due to existing anti social behaviour problems.
- EV6Hc This policy has not been 'positively prepared' and is not justified in its restriction to 'associated recreational uses which maintain the character of the area, in particular its openness. The allocation to the land at Aerial Way fails to recognise the fact that this site has the benefit of planning permission for the relocation of Hucknall Town Football Club. Changes that should be made: Re word Policy EV6 to read 'Any development proposals on Open Areas should have regard to the existing character and function of the open area, and the requirement for recreational facilities to meet development needs'.
- Request for land at former Miners Welfare sports ground, Stoneyford Road, Stanton Hill (EV6C) to be removed has an open area. The associated representation seeks the allocation of the site for housing under policy HG1.

**Response:**

- It is agreed that part 2c of Policy EV6 should refer to 'heritage assets' and not just 'important buildings or scheduled ancient monuments'.
- With regards to the loss of Green Belt land - The NPPF requires Council's to provide sufficient housing land to meet the objectively assessed needs of the local community. The Council has set out the requirement in the Housing Technical Paper and has adopted a strategic approach to the allocation of land for housing. There is insufficient brown field and infill land to meet the housing requirement and therefore the plan sets out the allocation of land for housing on sites that are adjacent to existing urban areas.

- EV6 Sb – Rookery Lane. This site is not required to form part of the broader housing allocation known as site HG1Si. The site has already been assessed through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) and Sustainability Appraisal (SA), and also considered by the Council Members. The site was dismissed in favour of other sustainable sites which met the identified housing need. However, there are two small areas of EV6 Sb that are proposed to be removed from the Policies Map as they are not considered to perform the function as an important open area (see attached plan) .
- EV6 Sc – Cochrane Terrace, Skegby. This site is not listed in the Policy. The site will be removed from the Policies Map as it is already protected by Countryside Policy (EV1).
- EV6 Hc – Aerial Way, Hucknall. This site has the benefit of planning permission for the relocation of Hucknall Town Football Club, therefore the site will be deleted from Policy EV6 and re-allocated under Policy EV5 – Protection of Green Space and Recreation Facilities. Policy EV5 allows for the provision of appropriate recreation facilities that are of a scale appropriate with the size of the space.

**Changes to the Local Plan:**

- Amend Policy EV6 2 c) to read: “Provide the setting for heritage assets”
- EV6 Sb – Rookery Lane. Delete the two isolated areas (north-west of HG1Si and South of HG1Si) from the Policies Map as they are not considered to perform the function as an important open area.
- EV6 Sc – Cochrane Terrace, Skegby. Delete this site from the Proposal Map as it is already protected by Countryside Policy (EV1).
- EV6 Hc – Aerial Way, Hucknall. Delete this site from Policy EV6 and re-allocated under Policy EV5 – Protection of Green Space and Recreation Facilities.

Number of Comments		Number of Respondents	
<b>25</b>		<b>17</b>	
Objection to Policy	Support the Policy	Comment on the Policy	
<b>24</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	

**List of Respondents**

Miss J Vardy, P and A Hemstock, C Wakelin, Ms C White, Alan Hubbard, National Trust, English Heritage, Natural England, Signet Planning, Long Reign Allotment Gardens, Mrs C Vale, Ms E Caswell, Mr and Mrs Wiggins Framptons, RPS Newark, Peacock and Smith, Emma Fawcett

**Policy EV7: Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows**

Responses received relating to Policy

Support

- National Trust support this policy.
- Natural England support this policy.
- Annesley and Felley Parish Council wishes to support and endorse the findings of the ACCESS group in relation their ecology studies with particular reference to Little Oak plantation and the need for the maintenance of the green corridor which runs behind the houses adjacent to Forest Road and is within the Parish Boundaries. As a Parish Council it is vital to ensure the local ecology within its boundaries is fully recognised and protected for future generations and to provide opportunities for Parishioners to access these areas.
- Support for Policy EV7 from residents largely in Annesley Woodhouse but with comments that the Little Oak Plantation has been identified as an Ancient Woodland and this should be reflected in Appendix 5 and the Proposals Map.

Object

- We note that the Local Plan references within the Appendices that the Little Oak Plantation is to be considered as Ancient Woodland until it is formerly designated as such, by Natural England. We object to this reference and remind the Council that the Plantation was until very recently managed by the Forestry Commission as a commercial plantation and that it is unreasonable now that the woodland is within our Client's ownership, to impose this restriction.

**Responses:**

- At the time of the Local Plan and Policies Map going to print, Natural England had not designated Little Oak Plantation as ancient woodland. It has therefore not been include in Appendix 5 of the Local Plan or on the Policies Map. Should confirmation be received prior to submission of the Local Plan to the Secretary of State in November 2013 - Appendix 5 and the Policies Map will be amended accordingly.

**Changes to the Local Plan:**

- No changes proposed to the Local Plan arising out of the consultation responses.

Number of Comments		Number of Respondents	
52		52	
Objection to Policy	Support the Policy	Comment on the Policy	
1	51	0	

**List of Respondents**

Barton Wilmore Planning, National Trust, Natural England, Annesley and Felley Parish Council, Mr Robert Collier, Mrs Julia Collier, Mr Peter Olko, Mrs Joan Olko, Miss Deberah Olko, Mr William Cooper, Ms Ann Cooper, Mr & Mrs M & P Dear, Mrs Margaret Lathall, Mr John Shaw, Mrs Micaela Stanley, Mrs Anne Chalkley, Mr Stewart Chalkley, Mr Stephen Jacksdale, Mrs Alison Jackson, Mrs Pauline Cumberland, Mr Donald Bailey, Mr Mark Raynor, Mr Philip Wood, Mrs Margaret Johnson, Mrs Thompson, Mr John Lowe, Miss Becky Chaukley, Mr David Connah, Mrs Patricia Starling, Mrs Valerie Alcock, Mr David Alcock, Mr & Mrs R & M Hufton, Ms Julie Craft, Mrs Madeline Allsop, Mr Dick Bend, Mrs Margaret Bend, Mrs Pauline Hodson, Mr Peter Ward, Mrs Elizabeth Ward, Mr Roger Dean, Mr George Cordy, Mr Russell Lathall, Mrs Patricia Shaw, Ms Kathryn Shaw, Mr John Bolger, Mr Richard Shaw, Mrs Kirsty Cohen, Mr & Mrs M & M Lowe, Miss Angela Smith, Mrs Haydee Lafferty, Mr David Simpson, Mr Adam Heathcote.

## Policy EV8: Provision and Protection of Allotments

### Comments received relating to Policy

#### Support

- The Policy should include protection for the Annesley and Felley Parish Council Allotments behind Byron Road and the two sets of allotments present on the land between Byron Road and Moseley Road.
- General support for the Policy but with an emphasis on the Council taking active steps to maintain and improve existing sites.
- ACCESS supported the emphasis placed on allotments contributing towards quality of life but has a number of specific concerns relating to the Allotment Strategy not being updated. Appendix B does not identify the size and number of allotments, the allotments in the ownership of Annesley and Felley Parish Council are not identified, the loss of the allotments on Diamond Avenue and that the private allotments off Forest Road are not identified on the Proposals Map. ACCESS proposed that the provision of allotments should be included in all Section 106 obligations at a fixed rate.
- Support for Policy EV8 from residents largely in Annesley Woodhouse but with comments:
  - The Proposals Map and Local Plan, Appendix 6, page 316, fail to include and show the allotments within Annesley Colliery Village;
  - Should not use the word blight in paragraph 8.91.

#### Object

- Objections were received to private allotments being included in the Policy. From the evidence referenced in the Policy, there is an unmet demand for allotments and therefore in that context it is very unlikely that an applicant would be able to satisfy point 2b of the Policy. In this context, the Policy is unreasonable and unworkable.
- The private allotments off Forest Road, Annesley Woodhouse are not identified on the Proposals Map and these allotments are a valued recreational resource and green space.

### Comments received relating to Policy supporting text

- The use of the word blight in paragraph 8.91 is ambiguous when used in context relating to allotments.

### Response:

- The up-dating of any strategies documents and monitoring of information is dependent on the resources and time available. The priorities have not permitted the Allotment Strategy to be updated. Similarly, in relation to

Appendix 6: allotments. The Appendix taken in conjunction with the Proposals Map provides protection for allotment sites. There are no proposals to identify specific allotment sizes and numbers.

- There were a large number of vacancies on the Diamond Avenue and the Church Site allotments in the early part of 2000. Consequently, a substantial part of the Diamond Avenue Allotment area was allocated for housing as part of the Ashfield Local Plan Review, 2002. Planning permission has subsequently been granted for the development of the site for housing. There are no proposals to bring forward additional allotments other than on the existing Church Site Allotment site if there is an increasing demand for allotments in this area.
- The National Planning Policy Framework place a significant emphasis on the viability of the Local Plan and individual sites. Therefore, the Council has no proposals to require allotments to be brought forward on all housing site. Section 106 obligations will be assessed in relation to specific needs arising from a development and the viability of those obligations.
- The private allotments at Forest Road have not been use for allotments for a number of years. The site of the allotments forms part of a wider area which the Local Plan Preferred Approach proposed should be included within the Green Belt. As the Green Belt gives substantial protection to the land in question it is not proposed to amend the Proposals Map or Appendix to include the land formerly used for allotments.

### **Changes to the Local Plan:**

- The Policy Map and Appendix should be amended to include Annesley & Felley Parish Council's allotments.
- The Policy Map should be amended to identify the correct area of the Wesley Street Allotments including the area off Forest Road.
- Amend paragraph 8.91 to delete the reference to blight and incorporates that 'The approach of non-maintenance and running down of allotments will not provide evidence of a lack of demand for allotments in the locality. '

<b>Number of Comments</b>		<b>Number of Respondents</b>	
<b>57</b>		<b>57</b>	
<b>Objection to Policy</b>	<b>Support the Policy</b>	<b>Comment on the Policy</b>	
<b>2</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>1</b>	



**List of Respondents**

Mr John Barlow for Annesley & Felley Parish Council; Mr & Mrs Stewart and Anne; Mr & Mrs Norris; Mrs P Lewis for KDAG; Mr Peter, Joan & Deborah Olko; Mr & Mrs Peacock; P & S Scrimshaw; Mrs J Green; P & C Wood; P & E Ward; John Clarke; Mrs J Hallam; Mr H McDonald; Rajinder Bains; J Thompson; Jennifer Walters for Barton Willmore Planning; Annesley Community Committed to Ensuring Sustainable Settlements (ACCESS) Mr Robert Collier, Mrs Julia Collier, Mr Peter Olko, Mrs Joan Olko, Miss Deberah Olko, Mr William Cooper, Ms Ann Cooper, Mr & Mrs M & P Dear, Mrs Margaret Lathall, Mr John Shaw, Mrs Micaela Stanley, Mrs Anne Chalkley, Mr Stewart Chalkley, Mr Stephen Jacksdale, Mrs Alison Jackson, Mrs Pauline Cumberland, Mr Mark Raynor, Mr Philip Wood, Mrs Margaret Johnson, Mr John Lowe, Miss Becky Chaukley, Mr David Connah, Mrs Patricia Starling, Mrs Valerie Alcock, Mr David Alcock, Mr & Mrs R & M Hufton, Ms Julie Craft, Mrs Madeline Allsop, Mr Dick Bend, Mrs Margaret Bend, Mrs Pauline Hodson, Mr Peter Ward, Mrs Elizabeth Ward, Mrs Patricia Shaw, Ms Kathryn Shaw, Mr John Bolger, Mr Richard Shaw, Mr & Mrs M & M Lowe, Miss Angela Smith Mr.A.Burton

**Policy EV9 – Recreational Equine Development**

Comments relating to Policy

No comments were received.

Comments received relating to Policy supporting text

No comments were received.

**Response:**

-.

**Changes to the Local Plan:**

-

<b>Number of Comments</b>		<b>Number of Respondents</b>	
0		0	
<b>Objection to Policy</b>	<b>Support the Policy</b>		<b>Comment on the Policy</b>
-	-		-

<p><b><u>List of Respondents</u></b></p> <p>-</p>
---------------------------------------------------

### **Policy EV10: Agricultural Land Quality**

<p><u>Comments relating to Policy</u></p> <p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Natural England expressed supports for the Policy.</li> </ul> <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposals for development on housing allocations at Rushley Farm and Beck Lane would be at variance with this Policy.</li> </ul> <p><u>Comments received relating to Policy supporting text</u></p> <p>None.</p>
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**Response:**

- The objections relate to specific housing allocations on land regarded as fallings with the best and most versatile land.

**Changes to the Local Plan:**

- Changes to the Policy are proposed to reflect the wording in the National Planning Policy Framework to take account the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile land rather than expressing it as significant weight.

<b>Number of Comments</b>		<b>Number of Respondents</b>	
<b>3</b>		<b>3</b>	
<b>Objection to Policy</b>	<b>Support the Policy</b>		<b>Comment on the Policy</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>		<b>-</b>

**List of Respondents**

David Rose, Natural England & Hugh Nicoll.

## Policy EV11: The Historic Environment

### Comments received relating to Policy

#### Support

- ACCESS supports the decision to make the historic environment a material consideration but has concerned that no database exists of non-designated historical assets. The Local Plan should specify that a list of non-designated heritage assets will be published in a separate document by time of submission of the Local Plan to the Secretary of State.
- Support for the Policy from residents, substantially from Annesley Woodhouse, but proposing changes to the text of paragraph 8.118 to give a date of 2014 for the local selection criteria for historic assets of local importance to be introduced. The comments also sets out the status would be as a material consideration.
- Bolsover District Council welcomes the recognition of the importance of Hardwick Hall as a historic building and its setting, and the need to protect such assets in the policies within the consultation document.
- National Trust supports the policy.
- English Heritage supports the policy. It is not clear whether development management policies are considered to be "strategic", but it will be important to clarify, particularly for any emerging Neighbourhood Plans (see Paragraph 184 of the NPPF). Paragraph 126 of the NPPF requires Local Plans to set out a positive strategy for the historic environment, taking into account a number of factors. Further thought should be given as to whether the Ashfield Local Plan contains such a strategy, as well as relevant strategic policies. In terms of Policy EV11 and its supporting text, we have a few comments. Reference to 'adverse impacts' in paragraphs 2 and 5 would be better referred to as 'harm' to be consistent with national policy. Furthermore, there will need to be recognition that harm can be justified by (outweighing) public benefits to be consistent with the NPPF. The second sentence of Paragraph 8.107 states that advice and guidance should be sought from English Heritage on the scale and nature of information required to assess the impact of any development proposal. This is the role of the District Council rather than English Heritage, and this sentence should be amended accordingly. We only get involved in certain development proposals depending on the heritage asset and the proposal itself, but even in such cases, the advice on information requirements ultimately rests with the Council. We welcome the Council's proposal to identify assets of local importance (which could form part of the historic environment strategy required by the NPPF), but it would be helpful to clarify when such a scheme would be introduced and what status such identified assets would have in the planning process.
- NCC support policy EV11 that relates specifically to the historic environment, however, suggests that it would be appropriate to list the local/ non-designated heritage assets.

Object

- In terms of the County's historic environment a number of concerns are raised, of particular concern is the lack of recognition of the historical nature of Kirkby in Ashfield, Sutton in Ashfield, Jacksdale. Selston and Underwood.

Comments received relating to Policy

- Criteria 2) In addition to 'high quality and sensitive design' it could be appropriate to include 'of appropriate scale, siting and materials'....
- Criteria 4) Concerned about how something is identified as being negative. It is not uncommon for an appraisal or study to mistakenly identify something as having no significance which later on, its importance becomes apparent. If this happened it would make it much harder to protect under this policy. Has 'relevant study' be defined? Should this be 'relevant study adopted by the Council'. We would not accept a developer's study as this could purposefully identify an asset as negative for their own purpose. Is this section necessary.
- Criteria 5) Expand on Heritage Statement to explain that it should describe the 'significance' of the heritage assets affected.
- Criteria 5) states ' A development proposal will not be permitted where it would directly or indirectly have a material adverse impact on a heritage asset'. This is strongly worded, which for Conservation is good. I wonder whether this should form a separate section along the lines of..."A development proposal, including demolition, will not be permitted where it would have a material adverse impact on the significance of a heritage asset or its setting" Perhaps as the start to section 2. This ensures that there is a presumption against demolition of all heritage assets designated or not in the policy. Demolition is not referred to in the policy at all otherwise.
- The reference to Section 106, and mitigation secured by condition does infer that harm to an asset will be acceptable if suitably mitigated through these means.
- The policy does not refer to 'use'. An inappropriate use can be harmful to a heritage asset. A section to say that the proposed use of a heritage asset should be the optimum viable use compatible with the fabric and setting of the building. New uses that adversely affect the fabric or setting of heritage assets shall not be supported unless it can be demonstrated the harm is justified to realise the optimum viable use. This would allow the policy to be better used for Change of Use applications affecting heritage assets.
- Should the policy be used to strengthen the approach to advertising and signage in / on heritage assets? If so a specific reference to advertising may be worthwhile.
- Should the policy refer to improving shop fronts or is there a specific policy about shop fronts and the need to good traditional or good modern designs and materials dependant on location and building?

Comments received relating to Policy supporting text

- While the Parish Council do not oppose the alterations to exclude the new

developments in Annesley Village from the Conservation Area, we would ask for more clarification as to the small section of the new development (HG1Kc) that is both allocated for housing as well as being included in the Conservation Area.

- Request for a variety of different areas within Selston, Jacksdale, Kirkby and Sutton to be on the Local Heritage Asset List and the creation of conservation areas.
- Request to insert in paragraph 8.109 conservation area at Selston, buildings span 200 years with school and chapel, features shops and public house.
- The Council is proposing to introduce a scheme by which historic assets of local importance are identified, using local selection criteria. This status would be a material consideration in assessing planning application affecting such buildings or assets. Suggest that paragraph 8.118 is amended to read ‘the Council will introduce a scheme by which historic assets of local importance are identified, using local selection criteria by 2014.
- Regards to Kirkby Cross conservation area, advise Sherwood House Inn could be converted to form apartments and Wagon and Horses (former public houses) could be converted to form shop. Also refers to former public houses White Hart (Huthwaite) and Robin Hood (Rainworth).
- Site known as Lower Portland, proposed to be designated as a site of industrial archaeological interest and should appear on the appropriate lists.
- Para 8.117 Refers to the NCC Buildings At Risk Register but does not include the published on-line register in the list of Evidence base. The figures for Ashfield are as follows:

**Ashfield B@R Figures**

Grade I Listed Buildings	0	
Grade II* Listed Buildings	0	
Grade II Listed Buildings	9	11.4% at risk rate
Local Interest Buildings	2	
Total number of Listed Buildings in district	79	

**Response:**

- The Council has recently adopted a ‘Criteria for Local Heritage Asset Designation’ together with a ‘Local List’. Sites and buildings nominated for inclusion on the Local List will be assessed in due course against the Criteria for Local Heritage Asset Designation. Both documents will be available at the Main Council Offices or via the Council’s web site - [www.ashfield-dc.gov.uk](http://www.ashfield-dc.gov.uk). It is not considered necessary to include the Local List in the Local Plan as this will be an ever evolving document that is likely to be updated frequently.

- Paragraph 8.118 of the Local Plan confirms that should a building or asset be identified as a locally important historic asset, then this status would be a material consideration in assessing planning applications affecting such buildings or assets.
- It is agreed to delete the term 'adverse impact' from policy EV11 and replace with the term 'harm'.
- It is acknowledged that harm can be justified by (outweighing) public benefits, as outlined in the NPPF, however it is considered unnecessary to repeat the NPPF in the Local Plan.
- It is considered that the lack of recognition of the historical nature of Kirkby in Ashfield, Sutton in Ashfield, Jacksdale, Selston and Underwood should be addressed, but it is suggested that this information should be included in the introduction to each of the Strategic Area Based Policies.
- With regards to Housing Allocation HG1 Kc - This site was previously allocated as employment land in the Ashfield Local Plan Review 2002, but now benefits from the granting of planning permission for residential development. The Council planned to undertake a review of the Conservation Area prior to the Publication Draft Local Plan, however this has not been possible and this will now take place following the adoption of the Local Plan and therefore the Conservation Area boundary will remain unchanged (as shown on the 2002 Adopted Local Plan). The local community and the Parish Council will be consulted once the review has commenced.
- The process of considering an area for Conservation Area status is separate from the adoption of the Local Plan. Should an area be designated as a Conservation Area, Policy EV11 will be applicable.
- Sherwood House Inn is currently the subject of a planning application for conversion/extension to form a convenience store. No plans for Wagon and Horses but could be converted to form a shop under permitted development. Other former public house White Hart could be capable of conversion subject to planning permission. Robin Hood former public house is not within the district of Ashfield.
- It is not considered necessary to include Nottinghamshire County Councils' Buildings at Risk figures in the Local Plan however the Council will publish these figures on their web site for information.
- It is agreed to include the wording 'of appropriate scale, siting and materials' in criteria 2 of Policy EV11.
- It is agreed to amend criteria 4 to refer to studies adopted by the Council.
- In Criteria 5) - it is agreed that there is a need to explain that Heritage Statements should describe the 'significance' of the heritage assets affected. It is also agreed that the wording 'A development proposal will not be permitted where it would directly or indirectly have a material adverse impact on a heritage asset' is strongly worded. The policy will be reworded to refer to reflect this.
- A specific reference to demolition will be included to ensure that there is a presumption against demolition of all heritage assets designated or not in the policy.

- It is considered that the reference to Section 106, and mitigation secured by condition in criteria 5 of Policy EV11 does not infer that harm to an asset will be acceptable.
- It is agreed that Policy EV11 needs to include a criteria for the re-use of heritage assets for new purposes.
- It is recognised that the Council needs to strengthen its approach to advertising and signage in general, and also to improving shop fronts and it is proposed that this will be included in Policy EV11. The Council is also producing a Design SPD and it is envisaged that the need for good traditional or good modern designs and materials are included.
- It is proposed to delete paragraph 8.107 as the information regarding Heritage Statements and Archaeological Evaluations is already covered in paragraph 8.132 of the Local Plan.

### **Changes to the Local Plan:**

- Add the wording 'adopted by the Council' at the end of the 1<sup>st</sup> sentence of criteria 1 of Policy EV11.
- Amend criteria 2 of Policy EV11 to read:  
'Development proposals, including alterations and extensions, should preserve or enhance the significance of designated heritage assets, non-designated heritage assets, and their settings through high quality and sensitive design of appropriate scale, siting and materials. Development, including demolition, that would harm the special historic, architectural or archaeological interest of a heritage asset, directly or indirectly, will not be permitted.'
- Delete criteria's 4 and 5 of Policy EV11.
- Add new two new criteria to read:  
'Support will be given for the re-use of heritage assets for new purposes where they are compatible with their character, architectural integrity and setting. New uses that harm the fabric or setting of heritage assets shall not be supported unless it can be demonstrated the harm is justified to realise the optimum viable use.'  
'Shopfronts of architectural or historical value should be retained and preserved wherever possible. Proposals for new shopfronts should respect the character, scale, proportion and detailing of the host building.'
- Delete paragraph 8.107.
- Amend 1<sup>st</sup> sentence of paragraph 8.112 to read:  
'Where a development proposal involves total or substantial demolition of a building in a conservation area consideration will be given to the significance of the building and the contribution it makes to the significant character and appearance of the area.'



- Delete the words ‘and found to be impractical’ from the 2<sup>nd</sup> sentence of paragraph 8.115.
- Amend 2<sup>nd</sup> sentence of paragraph 8.118 to read:  
‘The Council has introduced a scheme by which historic assets of local importance are identified, using local selection criteria.’
- Amend 1<sup>st</sup> sentence of paragraph 8.119 to read:  
‘A list of non-designated heritage assets is published in a separate document.....’
- Amend last sentence of paragraph 8.120 to read:  
‘The Council will resist the demolition of Buildings of Local Interest where there is no clear and convincing justification.’
- Amend 1<sup>st</sup> sentence of paragraph 8.121 to read:  
‘.....their setting may also contribute to their significance.’
- Add new supporting text after paragraph 8.131 to read:  
**‘Shopfronts**

Shopfronts of architectural or historical value exist across the District in a variety of settings sometimes individually and sometimes as part of group. Where they do not form part of a listed building or lie outside a Conservation Area they will often form an undesignated heritage asset. In recognition of the contribution that they make to form the character of the District, the Council is keen to see them retained and incorporated into new development wherever possible.

New shopfronts can also make a positive contribution to the character of an area and where these are proposed they should be designed to complement the host building. The presence of poorly designed shopfronts in the vicinity will not be accepted as justification for a lesser standard of design. The introduction of well designed shop fronts can often act as a catalyst for the same within a street or area with economic benefits. Detailed assessment of proposals will be made in accordance with a Shopfront and Advertisement Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document.’

- Amend paragraph 8.132 to read:  
**‘Statements of Heritage Significance and Archaeological Evaluations**

In cases where it is necessary for an applicant to submit a Statement of Heritage Significance (as required since 2010 and the NPPF) and/or archaeological evaluation, the scope and degree of detail necessary will vary according to the particular circumstances of each application. The level of detail required should be proportionate to the importance of the heritage asset, the size of the development and the level of its impact on

the heritage asset. As a minimum a Heritage Statement and/or archaeological evaluation should describe the significance of the heritage asset affected and consult the Nottinghamshire Historic Environment Records.

Where an application site includes, or is considered to have the potential to include, heritage assets with archaeological interest, the Council will require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where desk-based research is insufficient to properly assess the interest, a field evaluation.

Heritage Statements and Archaeological Evaluations should contain a level of detail proportionate to the heritage asset's importance. In some cases these will need to be undertaken by an appropriately qualified and skilled individual or organisation preferably accredited by nationally recognized professional institutes or organisation. Other sources of evidence will include conservation area appraisals, documentary evidence, maps and plans, published research and views analysis. Where appropriate, a programme of work will be secured with mitigation measures being secured by condition or through a Section 106 agreement. Applicants are advised to discuss proposals with the Council prior to submitting an application.

Heritage Statements of Significance and other forms of assessment can make a valuable contribution to extending our understanding of Ashfield's character and significance. The Council is committed to ensuring that public benefits will always outweigh harm to the historic environment. The Council is particularly keen to ensure that heritage assets can be sustained and enhanced by enabling viable uses compatible with the fabric and setting of the building. New uses that adversely affect the fabric or setting of heritage assets shall not be supported unless it can be demonstrated the harm is justified to realise the optimum viable use.'

- Add additional text to the introduction of each Strategic Area Based Policies to refer to their historical nature.

Number of Comments		Number of Respondents	
<b>50</b>		<b>50</b>	
Objection to Policy	Support the Policy	Comment on the Policy	
<b>6</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>1</b>	

**List of Respondents**

Annesley Community Committed to Ensuring Sustainable Settlements (ACCESS); Annesley & Felley Parish Council; Greasley Parish Council; Kirkby and District Archaeological Group; Kirkby and District Conservation Society; Mr and Mrs Chalkley; Bolsover District Council; National Trust English Heritage; Nottinghamshire County Council; Simon Britt; Mr S Swift; Mr Robert Collier, Mrs Julia Collier, Mr Peter Olko, Miss Deberah Olko, Mr William Cooper, Ms Ann Cooper, Mr & Mrs M & P Dear, Mrs Margaret Lathall, Mr John Shaw, Mrs Micaela Stanley, Mrs Anne Chalkley, Mr Stewart Chalkley, Mr Stephen Jacksdale, Mrs Alison Jackson, Mrs Pauline Cumberland, Mr Mark Raynor, Mr Philip Wood, Mrs Margaret Johnson, Mrs Thompson, Mr John Lowe, Miss Becky Chaukley, Mr David Connah, Mrs Patricia Starling, Mrs Valerie Alcock, Mr David Alcock, Mr & Mrs R & M Hufton, Ms Julie Craft, Mrs Madeline Allsop, Mr Dick Bend, Mrs Margaret Bend, Mrs Pauline Hodson, Mr Peter Ward, Mrs Elizabeth Ward, Mr Roger Dean, Mrs Patricia Shaw, Ms Kathryn Shaw, Mr John Bolger, Mr Richard Shaw, Mr & Mrs M & M Lowe, Miss Angela Smith.

## Providing Jobs

### Policy PJ1: Business and Economic Development

#### Comments received relating to Policy

##### Support

- There was support for the creation of new employment opportunities and new homes at Rolls Royce.

##### Object

- Concern was expressed regarding the amount of land allocated for economic development as it was stated there are currently many units on business and industrial sites which are empty.
- Pointed out that the Dowty site, Watnall Road, Hucknall is an eye sore and needs action to resolve the poor condition of the site with a viable use.
- Suggested the Council must be more proactive in bringing medium to large companies to the area with incentives such as rent/rate reductions and financial help with factory building.

#### Comments received relating to Policy supporting text

None.

#### **Response:**

- There are a number of vacant employment units around the District but this reflects that the country has been through a severe recession. The Council is planning for the period to 2023 and its policies have to be supported by a substantial evidence base under the requirements of national planning policy. There are a number of studies which have examined the local economy and the potential need for land for economic development. The conclusion the Council has arrived at from these Studies is that, apart from the employment proposal at Rolls Royce, the anticipated demand for employment sites can be met from the sites which have already been allocated for employment and for the most part have seen development or infrastructure provision.
- Housing development provides local employment opportunities. Research undertaken on behalf of The Homes and Communities Agency's suggest that approximately 150 jobs result per 1,000 increase in population. The Ashfield and Mansfield Joint Economic Masterplan identifies a number of actions the Council is taking to support both local businesses and local people. Rents are outside the Council's control as they are set by the market. However, there are schemes in place to give rates assistance to business. Unoccupied business property is exempt from rates for a specific

period, the Business Rates Deferral Scheme provides help in relation to cash flow and the Small Business Rate Relief enables small businesses to apply to reduce the rates payable on the property they occupy.

**Changes to the Local Plan:**

- No changes proposed to the Local Plan arising out of the consultation responses.

<b>Number of Comments</b>		<b>Number of Respondents</b>	
3		3	
<b>Objection to Policy</b>	<b>Support the Policy</b>		<b>Comment on the Policy</b>
2	1		-

**List of Respondents**

Mr S. Barkes, Gareth Jones BSc(Hons) DipTP of URS Infrastructure & Environment UK Ltd, and Sally Wyatt for Reach Out Residents.

## Policy PJ2: Allocations, Locally Significant Business Areas & Protection of Economic Development Sites

### Comments received relating to Policy

#### Support

- There was support for the principles of Policy PJ2 which sets out that the Council will look to sustain and enhance Ashfield's employment capacity to meet the needs of businesses, including small and medium enterprises by supporting employment allocations. However, it was raised that the Council has not identified any employment sites within the rural areas. The provision of a site of Winter Closes could provide the Council with an opportunity of allocating a specific employment site in the rural area.

#### Object

- Proposal for retaining the farm land on Crow Trees Farm (Pinxton Lane). Concern expressed regarding traffic at the junction of Common Road and the A38.
- The Highway Agency welcomes the fact that the East Midlands Northern Sub-Region Employment Land Review (EMNSELR) has been used to inform the Council's decision on which sites to take forward in the Local Plan Preferred Approach. However, it expressed concern that the sites at Pinxton Lane, Fulwood Road North and to the west of Fulwood are not well served by public transport links and these sites do not appear to be consistent with Strategic Objective SO9: Reducing the Need to Travel by Car. Therefore, the allocations will have a negative impact on Junction 28 of the M1. For two sites at Annesley Road in Hucknall and Pinxton Lane in Sutton-in-Ashfield, the close proximity of the sites to junctions of the M1 is specifically highlighted, thus indicating that the car is likely to be favoured means of transport to access these sites. Similarly, whilst the site at Rolls Royce in Hucknall is located 9km south of J27 of the M1, it too has the potential to increase traffic demand at this junction.
- Selston Parish Council raised concerns that Policy PJ2 does not identify any sites for economic development within the rural area. The Parish Council identified that it has been approached by developers who will be making their own representation to Ashfield District Council in respect of landholdings off Winter Closes in Underwood including an employment site. The Parish Council strongly supports the principle of an appropriate employment land allocation in the Parish and the District Council is urged to consider the suitability of this proposal.
- Identified that Policy PJ2 is not 'positively prepared' and as written under category (1) for Locally Significant Areas fails to be consistent with national planning policy. Changes that should be made including delete 'Proposals for alternative to the uses specified above will not be permitted.'
- Objection to the employment allocations as the approach is not consistent

with National Policy, the East Midlands Regional Plan 2009 and Government statements and initiatives in relation to growth. In particular, the approach fails to objectively assess reasonable alternative employment sites undermining the viability of the evidence base.

- Objections to the proposed allocations in the Policy on the grounds that specific sites for economic development are not included in the proposed allocations including:

#### Sutton-in-Ashfield

- Land comprising an approximately 14 ha site bounded by MARR to the south, Prologis Park to the west, the boundary with Mansfield DC to the north and Cauldwell Brook to the east. It is considered that the current designation of this land as Countryside is outdated. Given the recent Penniment Farm decision, which considered MARR to form the boundary between the urban area and the countryside, the site is clearly a sustainable option to meet growth objectives in the District. The submission sets out that this site is the best location on MARR for additional high-quality employment development.
- Land off Hamilton Road, Sutton in Ashfield with an employment estate to the north and Kings Mill Reservoir to the west comprising approximately 10 ha. The submission sets out that approach adopted by the Council fails to meet the requirements of the East Midlands Regional Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework. A large portfolio of sites is required which offers choice and opportunity for economic development and it should include the site in question. (The submission is supported by a report by DTZ on the likely demand for employment land in Ashfield). It is set out that the strategic importance of the land would be such that it would be a significant allocation in the authority's portfolio of employment land and it should be both protected and promoted for employment uses.
- Approximately 6 ha of land located between Hamilton Road and Cauldwell Road. The site is of a more modest size than Prologis Park and Pinxton Lane allocations so that it does not carry the high infrastructure costs, the anticipated higher land values and it is deliverable in the short term. The total site is approximately 10.1 ha and the representation identify that the land owner is working with a local football club to provide changing rooms and 2 senior and a junior pitch for a local football club as part of the proposal.

#### Kirkby-in-Ashfield

- An employment site is proposed as part of a mixed use development to the west of Kirkby-in-Ashfield (Mowlands). The supporting statement identifies that Mowlands can provide a western bypass relieving congestion on Sutton Road. The employment land is identified to the south of Pinxton Lane. The site area has not been identified in the submission but from the map submitted with the representations it is approximately 34 ha.

Hucknall

- The Whyburn site at Hucknall is put forward as a major mixed-use urban extension which can help to meet the needs of the Greater Nottingham Housing Market Area in a sustainable way. The representation stresses that the suitability and sustainability of the site has been recognised by independent consultants appointed by the Greater Nottingham Authorities, including Ashfield. The Appraisal of Sustainable Urban Extensions - Tribal 2008, concluded that the Whyburn site: "is suitable for residential mixed-use development" because: "the strong suitability of mixed-use at this location, its strong performance in landscape and Green Belt terms, potential for bus connectivity with Hucknall Town Centre and the potential for tram extension into the site " It is also stressed that the previous Local Plan Inspector confirmed the inherent merits of Whyburn as an appropriate location for development. The mixed use site is identified as providing the opportunity to accommodate 3,000 jobs. The site should be allocated for development to help meet the housing and employment needs of Ashfield and the unmet needs arising from the Greater Nottingham Housing Market Area. Because of the strategic nature of the site it provides the opportunity to deliver new housing and employment space over a long period of time - potentially helping to meet the objective of the NPPF for Plans to take account of requirements beyond the Plan period.

Underwood

- A mixed use site off including land for economic development is proposed off Winter Closes, Underwood comprising approximately 1.1 ha.
- Representation were made regarding the allocation at PJ2Sf A38/Coxmoor Road that the site should not be an allocation for economic development but should be allocated for housing purposes. The site was stated to be not viable for offices due to the anticipate rental values and it would not be suitable for B2 uses due to adjacent residential development.

Comment

- The Council should use plain English within its publications. Formal Latin phrases should be translated i.e. Sui Generis. Suggest replacing with: Unique Business uses where it can be demonstrated that the proposal is compatible with the predominant use and is of a scale, nature and form appropriate to the location.
- English Heritage expressed specific concerns regarding Site PJ2-Se (South-West Oakham) in terms of the impact on the significance and the setting of Hamilton Hill to the south-west, which contains a scheduled monument.
- Suggested that Castlewood (Pinxton Lane PJ2-Sa) should be utilised as a the ideal location for a mini multi-task force ' Police, Fire Rescue, Ambulance and Paramedical.
- Regarding the Summit Colliery site (Kirkby Wasteland SINC 2/221), this



site is subject to an ongoing planning proposal, through which compensation for habitat loss is being sought.

- Regarding the two employment land allocations at Huthwaite, it is assumed that the two SINCs (Hucknall Disused Railways SINC 2/181 and New Hucknall Sidings Grasslands SINC 2/146) can be accommodated within the developments; clarification of this would be welcomed (as would a redrawing of the allocation boundaries to exclude the SINC areas).

Comments received relating to Policy supporting text

None.

**Response:**

- 'Sui Generis' reflects the use of this phrase by the Government with the Town & Country Planning (Use Classes) Orders. It is utilised on the Planning Portal and is considered to reflect standard planning practice.
- South West Oakham is a site which already has outline planning permission and services have already put in to support employment allocations.
- The M1 is likely to be a key attraction to employment growth within the District and from an economic aspect sites close to the motorway are likely to be in demand. The sites at Annesley Road and Pinxton Lane are allocated in the existing development plan and have been partly developed. Consequently, it would be unrealistic not to take these sites forward. In terms of North of Fulwood the location of the site means that there are no other realistic uses of the site other than for economic development purposes.
- Additional work has been undertaken with regard to the alternative sites proposed. However, following this work the Council does not intend to allocate any additional land for economic development purposes. The Local Plan reflects the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework by meeting anticipated needs over the Plan period. It also incorporates flexibility through a criteria approach for additional sites to come forward if changes in demand reflect such a need over the Plan period. If a requirement for additional strategic sites arises the Local Plan in Policy SPKS3 identifies land to the north or west of the MARR as the prime area of search. (It excludes land to the southern side of the MARR as it is predominately rural in character and undulating in form. It is considered that the rural character of this land should be retained and protected accordingly). Taken together this provides a high degree of choice for potential economic development uses. Consequently, is considered that the Council has taken a positive approach to the demand for economic development within the District, which will deliver jobs and opportunities in Ashfield.
- The text which supports Policy SPH3 identifies that Hucknall forms part of the Greater Nottingham functional economic area. It recognises that the City of Nottingham will remain the main focus for office and commercial activity. This is already reflected in the commuting patterns from Hucknall

into Nottingham which are facilitated by the tram and the Robin Hood Line. Businesses looking for land and premises are unlikely to limit their area of search to Hucknall but will be searching across the whole of the Greater Nottingham local economy. As part of the joint working between the Greater Nottingham authorities, a strategic employment site has been identified at Rolls Royce, Hucknall which will serve the Greater Nottingham economy. Policies in the Local Plan Preferred Approach identify an approximately 27 ha Business Park at Rolls Royce together with a strategic residential development site. Effectively the Rolls Royce site would not be required if the Whyburn site was to be taken forward.

- In respect of the proposed rural allocation please see the response on Policy PJ3: Rural Business Development.
- In respect of the employment land allocations at Huthwaite, the two SINC's (Hucknall Disused Railways SINC 2/181 and New Hucknall Sidings Grasslands SINC 2/146) would be considered as part of any future planning application and assessed against Policy EV4: Green Infrastructure, Biodiversity and Geological Conservation.

**Changes to the Local Plan:**

- Permission has been granted on appeal for the allocation at PJ2Sf A38/Coxmoor Road to be used for residential purposes. Consequently, the site has been deleted from the allocations and the Policy Map.
- No other changes to the Local Plan are proposed in respect of the alternatives sites put forward.

Number of Comments		Number of Respondents	
25		22	
Objection to Policy	Support the Policy	Comment on the Policy	
10	10	5	

**List of Respondents**

Mr S Swift (2 responses); Mr Owen Walters for The Highways Agency; Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge for English Heritage; Mr & Mrs Chalkley; John Booth, Phoenix Planning (UK) Ltd; Mrs Louisa Cusdin, Framptons; Mr Dennis Pope,

Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners; Ms Jane Gardner, Marrons; Helen Winkler Bsc (Hon), DipTP, The Tyler-Parkes Partnership; Mr B Holmes, Oxalis Planning Ltd (2 responses); Ms S Ball for Selston Parish Council, Mr Peter Olko, Mrs Joan Olko, Mr John Shaw, Mrs Thompson, Miss Becky Chaukley, Mr Peter Ward, Mrs Elizabeth Ward, Mrs Patricia Shaw, Miss Angela Smith, P.Stone, Signet Planning for Peveril Homes.

### **Policy PJ3: Rural Business Development**

#### Comments received relating to Policy

##### Support

- Support for the Policy from the National Trust as it promote appropriate economic development in the rural areas whilst ensuring that the important features of these locations, which themselves are economically important (e.g. for tourism) are adequately safeguarded.
- The National Farmer Union supports paragraph 2 of this policy and paragraph 9.29 on the re-use of rural buildings and renewable energy.
- Selston Parish Council support the measures set out in the Policy but stress the requirement for a specific employment allocation for the rural area. Winter Closes, Underwood is specifically identified as a potential location for a mixed use site including an employment allocation.
- Landowners to the south of Winter Closes support the Policy and set out an illustrative masterplan with provision for a 1.8ha site for employment purposes.

#### Comments received relating to Policy supporting text

None.

#### **Response:**

- Policy PJ3 looks to support economic development within the rural area. The Policy, together with Policy SPV3, gives significant weight to protecting existing employment area from development for other purposes. As part of the masterplanning of the larger housing allocations in the rural area the Council will explore whether a small site for economic development could be included as part of any of the site. The amended Plan identifies that it may

be possible to bring forward small employment area as part of the housing allocations. However, it is acknowledge that the Local Plan does not specifically allocate land for employment purposes within in the rural areas. This reflects a number of factors:

- a) The nature of jobs is changing. With modern technology, there is an increasing trend for people to work or run businesses from their homes rather than operating from offices and units.
- b) The evidence would indicate that the only units brought forward in the rural areas have been by the public sector. Units have been brought forward at Cordy Lane, Underwood, Annesley Farm, Annesley and Pye Hill Road, Jacksdale. The development of these units was undertaken by the County and District councils with assistance from grant funding. Given the current financial climate it is unlikely that the public sector will bring forward units in the foreseeable future.
- c) The rural settlements are not isolated to the same extent as parts of Derbyshire or Lincolnshire. They are relatively close to the urban settlements such as Kirkby-in-Ashfield where units are available.
- d) Policies with the Local Plan support the reuse of rural buildings, which potential forms a supply of units if there is a demand.
- e) No evidence of a demand for or the viability of units within, the rural areas has been demonstrated in the employment land studies or from any other source.
- f) Allocation of employment land is likely to require a site in the Green Belt. Once taken out of the Green Belt, if there is no demand for the site, the site becomes vulnerable to alternative uses such as housing development. This reflects that the National Planning Policy Framework emphasises that planning policies should avoid the long term protection of site allocated for employment uses where there is no reasonable prospect of the site being used for that purpose.

#### **Changes to the Local Plan:**

- Amend error in Criteria 3a to read Safeguarding key landscape and 'heritage' assets.

<b>Number of Comments</b>		<b>Number of Respondents</b>	
4		4	
<b>Objection to Policy</b>	<b>Support the Policy</b>		<b>Comment on the Policy</b>
-	4		-

**List of Respondents**

Alan Hubbard for the National Trust; John Booth, Phoenix Planning (UK) Ltd for Keepmoat Ltd and landowners to the south west of Winter Closes; Mr P Tame for the National Farmers' Union; and Ms S Ball for Selston Parish Council.

**Policy PJ4: Agricultural, Forestry or Horticultural Development, Farm Diversification and Commercial Equine Development**

Comments received relating to Policy

Object

- Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (NWT) identified that a specific reference is made in the Policy to landscape and watercourse protection and there should also be specific reference to biodiversity protection in the Policy. NWT supports agricultural diversification as a means of securing a thriving rural environment, but such developments must not result in loss or damage to habitats or species of value. In many cases it should be possible to achieve both economic and biodiversity benefits from such development.

**Response:**

- The Policy refers to landscape and water in relation to specific issues associated with buildings in the case of landscapes, and watercourses in relation to pollution. The Local Plan emphasises that all policies are interdependent and must be read together in relation to their combined effect upon development proposals. Consequently, any application would consider the impact on the potential loss of habitats or biodiversity under Policy EV4: Green Infrastructure, Biodiversity and Geological conservation.

**Changes to the Local Plan:**

- Amend Policy Criteria 1. h) to emphasis that pollution of water courses relates to slurries and manures.

Number of Comments		Number of Respondents	
1		1	
Objection to Policy	Support the Policy	Comment on the Policy	
1	-	-	

**List of Respondents**

Andrew Lowe for Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust.

## Policy PJ5: Education, Skills and Training

### Comments received relating to Policy

#### Support

- There is support for the Policy in relation to development that contributes towards raising the level of skills and opportunities in the District. The response suggests that the Winter Closes, Underwood provides an opportunity for a new school to be built within Underwood which directly raises the level of skills and opportunities in the District.
- Selston Parish Council supports the Policy. However, the Council expressed concern that there appears to be no other pro-active policy text that will actually secure and deliver these schools within the Preferred Approach document. There is an issue over the size and adequacy of existing school sites in Underwood and Jacksdale and problems with the age of the buildings themselves. The emerging Local Plan should be more pro-active in addressing these educational needs by identifying specific schools sites rather than rely on the statement of intent contained within PJ5 that lacks substance without any site based allocations.

#### Object

- Nottinghamshire County Council considered that Policy PJ5 is not balanced in that it most frequently refers to 'education' in terms of adult education and work skills training. Whilst this is obviously important, the Policy fails to sufficiently recognise the fact that the vast majority of education undertaken in Ashfield is the Primary and Secondary education of young people in its schools.

### Comments received relating to Policy supporting text

None.

### Response:

- Policy SD4 identifies that along with housing development it is necessary for supporting infrastructure to be provided including, where necessary, schools or the expansion of schools. Changes are proposed to Policy SD4 to clarify that this may included land and buildings.
- The Council is working closely with Nottinghamshire County Council as the local Education Authority. As part of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan the County Council has identified specific requirements relating to educational contributions and the anticipated housing sites through out the District. No new school sites have been identifies as a requirement in Selston, Jacksdale or Underwood arising from the Local Plan proposed development.

**Changes to the Local Plan:**

- The Policy and supporting text have been expanded to meet the concerns of the County Council as the Education Authority. The Policy gives more emphasis on supporting school places where an additional demand is identified as arising from a development and this requirement cannot be met from the existing schools.

<b>Number of Comments</b>		<b>Number of Respondents</b>	
<b>3</b>		<b>3</b>	
<b>Objection to Policy</b>	<b>Support the Policy</b>		<b>Comment on the Policy</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>		<b>-</b>

**List of Respondents**

Sally Gill for Nottinghamshire County Council; John Booth, Phoenix Planning (UK) Ltd for Keepmoat Ltd and landowners to the south west of Winter Closes; and Ms S Ball for Selston Parish Council.



## Shopping

### Policy SH1: Retail, leisure and commercial development principles and town centre uses

#### Responses received relating to Policy SH1

##### Support

- Sport England supports Policy SH1 in principle.

##### Object

- The wording in Part 2, criterion B is not consistent with the terminology of the NPPF. The NPPF states 'only where development would have a 'significant adverse impact' should planning permission be refused. The policy omits the word 'significant' and simply states 'an adverse impact'. It is recommended that the wording is amended.
- Criterion g, which relates to out of centre development, does not accord with the National Planning Policy Framework as the wording is unduly negative. The NPPF is permissive of out of centre development and this should be reflected in the policy.

##### Comment

- Overall the Policy is framed in a positive manner but there are some elements which are considered to be inconsistent with the NPPF.
- Criterion e, f and g should be combined as they all relate to the sequential approach.
- Include in the definition of 'Primary Shopping Area' the north side of Station Street, from Ellis Street to Kirkby Motors.
- The Primary Shopping Area in Kirkby in Ashfield is incorrectly identified with regard to Morrison's car park.
- The shops to the north of Station Street, Kirkby in Ashfield form part of the primary shopping area and should be included.
- The Kirkby in Ashfield town centre boundary should include the junction of Lane End and Urban Road (currently vacant) and the Railway Station car park. This would allow the transport infrastructure to form part of the town centre and the land at Lane End provides an opportunity for leisure, social or economic development uses.
- Include a new paragraph to explain how social/leisure and transport links in relation to Kirkby town centre.
- There is no mention of shops for the Rolls Royce development – we have been told that this site will include shops.

#### Responses received relating to Policy supporting text

##### Object

- The text in paragraph 10.2 is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework as it seeks to prevent development which is considered

will change the role of the town centre. The NPPF states that only proposals which would have an adverse impact on a town centre should it be refused.

- With regard to the Hucknall area, the supporting text to Policy SH1 should make it clear that the policy will apply to centres outside the District in recognition of the role Hucknall town centre plays in the Greater Nottingham context. It is confusing that Ashfield has not used the same terminology as used in the Aligned Core Strategies which identifies Arnold, Beeston and Bulwell as town centres.
- Ashfield District Council needs to be influential in the choice of shops within Kirkby town centre; there is not enough choice in terms of comparisons goods (shoes, clothes, furniture etc) and there are too many fast food outlets.

**Response:**

- Policy SH1 sets out a range of criteria which is aimed at promoting the vitality and viability of the town centres and local centres in Ashfield District. The Policy has been developed in response to the recommendations of the Ashfield Retail Study Update (2011) and the policies contained within the NPPF. It seeks to promote sustainable development and competitive town centre environments and, as such, it is considered to be in conformity with the NPPF. The wording may not exactly match the NPPF but overall the policy is considered to be consistent with national policy. However, to ensure clarity, the text will be reviewed in light of the comments made and any necessary amendments will be undertaken.
- The Council acknowledges that it would be simpler to combine criterion e, f and g in part 2 of Policy SH1 all of which relate to the Sequential Approach. The Policy will be amended accordingly.
- The Primary Shopping Area in Kirkby in Ashfield (as defined on the 'Proposals Map') does include the area of Station Road between Ellis Street and Kirkby Motors.
- The areas identified as 'Primary Shopping Frontage' within Kirkby in Ashfield will be reviewed and any necessary amendments will be undertaken.
- It is not considered necessary to extend the town centre boundary to include Lane End. The proposed strategy seeks to enhance and/or maintain the vitality and viability of the town centre and is permissive of appropriate edge of centre development.
- The Kirkby Area policy (Policy APSK4) will be amended to more clearly demonstrate the importance of social/leisure activities and transport links within Kirkby in Ashfield town centre;
- It is anticipated that the Rolls Royce allocation will contain a small element of convenience shopping.
- Planning policy cannot significantly influence the type of shops which occupy the town centres. The Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended) puts uses of land and buildings into various

categories known as 'Use Classes'. A retail business must be included within the appropriate Use Class for it to be considered suitable to be located within a town centre. There are many different type of retail business included in the Use Class Order. As such, Council's have little control in this respect. However, planning policy does have an influence on the quality of the premises in terms of appearance. The policies contained within the Local Plan are seeking to achieve attractive town centres which function well.

- The terminology/hierarchy used to define Ashfield's town centres is set out in the Ashfield Retail Study 2011 update. WYG have indicated that this approach is sensible given the results of the study. The definition should not have a negative affect on other neighbouring town centres as the aims of the policy reflect national policy.
- Paragraph 10.2 will be amended to reflect the need to promote a high proportion of retail units within areas identified as 'Primary Shopping Frontages'. Town centres will accommodate a mix of suitable uses which accords with the approach taken by the NPPF.

**Changes to the Local Plan:**

- The requirement for the Sequential Approach will be cited in just one paragraph within the Policy.
- There is now more emphasis on the importance of social, leisure and transport facilities within Kirkby town centre in Policy SPKS4.
- Paragraph 10.2 has been amended to reflect the need to promote a high proportion of retail units within areas identified as 'Primary Shopping Frontages'.

Number of Comments		Number of Respondents	
8		6	
Objection to Policy	Support the Policy	Comment on the Policy	
3	1	3	

**List of Respondents**

Kate Girling, Indigo Planning, Ms A Gibson, Gedling Borough Council, Mr S. Barks, Mr John Kerry, Kirkby and District Conservation Society, Sally Wyatt, Reach Out Residents, Sport England

**Policy SH2: Local and minor shopping centres and single shops**

Responses received relating to Policy

Comment

- Selston Parish Council has expressed concerns about the lack of retail and community services in Selston and Underwood; the number of new homes planned for the area will also impact on the existing services. The Parish Council has made a request for a retail allocation to be included in the housing allocation on Alfreton Road, Selston (Policy HG1Va).

**Response:**

- Policy SP3 Settlement and Town Centre Hierarchies sets out the context for Selston with regard to future retail provision. It will enable a small element of retail to be incorporated into larger development schemes. Policy HG1Va will be amended to include a reference to small scale retail development.
- The Council will be formulating a development brief for the site at Alfreton Road, Selston. The development brief will set out the requirements for the site in terms of service provision and may include retail services if necessary.

**Changes to the Local Plan:**

- Add supporting text to the allocation of the site to the north of Alfreton Road relating to retail provision.

<b>Number of Comments</b>		<b>Number of Respondents</b>	
1		1	
<b>Objection to Policy</b>	<b>Support the Policy</b>		<b>Comment on the Policy</b>
1	0		0

<p><b><u>List of Respondents</u></b> Selston Parish Council</p>
---------------------------------------------------------------------

**Policy SH3: Food Drink and the Evening Economy**

<p><u>Comments relating to Policy</u></p> <p>No comments were received.</p> <p><u>Comments received relating to Policy supporting text</u></p> <p>No comments were received.</p>
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**Response:**

-

**Changes to the Local Plan:**

-

<b>Number of Comments</b>		<b>Number of Respondents</b>	
<b>0</b>		<b>0</b>	
<b>Objection to Policy</b>	<b>Support the Policy</b>		<b>Comment on the Policy</b>
-	-		-

<p><b><u>List of Respondents</u></b></p> <p>-</p>
---------------------------------------------------

## Providing Homes

### Policy HG1: Housing Land Allocations – Non site specific responses

#### Comments received relating to Policy

#### **Green Belt/Countryside/Previously Developed Land (PDL) responses - (majority refer to proposed Kirkby/Village sites)**

- Objections to development of green belt land – a lot has already been lost due to new builds in the quarries. Will spoil the countryside and lead to loss of natural wildlife habitats.
- Green belt land should not be re-classified – a law was passed to protect the land against development.
- There is plenty of brownfield land (e.g. Evans Halshaw eyesore, Coxmoor/Lowmoor pub site, CPO Kirkby Old Cinema, former budgens, old swimming pool) available for building on before green belt. There are also plenty of empty houses and buildings. Sites should be found in the town centres which would be closer to facilities and have better transport links. Developers like green space because it is clean and cheap to develop.
- Kirkby town centre includes many quasi-industrial buildings which would be better redeveloped for housing and ease congestion around one-way streets.
- Little thought has been given to the development for housing of derelict or underused sites in the town centres. This could provide sustainable accommodation for smaller households whilst underpinning the viability of the centres (S09). Similarly a larger allocation of housing to areas adjacent to the villages of Jacksdale, Underwood, Selston and Annesley would add to their viability as commercial and social centres. (See paragraph 2.29 on Page 20) Mention of the northern villages of Teversal, Fackley, Stanton Hill and Skegby on Page 45/46 paragraph 3.37 denotes them as 'capable of expansion' yet little or no allocation of land for housing has been made, despite there being several previous used, i.e. brownfield sites, nearby.
- Suggest converting empty public houses to residential use.
- Green field sites should not be considered due to the fact that we already rely too heavily on importing produce. More Housing is required, but so is land to feed an ever expanding population.
- Fully utilise non-green belt areas as a priority, then re-assess any outstanding housing requirement.
- The Countryside is very important for the well-being of all the local people and needs to be protected for future generations.
- Building on green field sites will not overcome the areas unemployment problems.
- Green belt sites have been allocated without a full review of the Green belt taking place, raising concerns about soundness. Local authorities should

have regard to the intended permanence in the long term. No evidence or explanation given in the Plan or SA of how the Council has given proper weight to the essential characteristics of the Green Belt or how the release of green belt land proposed demonstrates exceptional circumstances. Do the Green belt sites selected represent the most appropriate strategy and meet with the requirements regarding green belt set out in the NPPF.

- The Council should consider allocating larger sustainable strategic sites before looking to Green Belt release. A phased approach to development would ensure that delivery is consistent with the Council's aspirations for growth.
- It is clearly necessary to release some Green belt to allow for residential development in Kirkby. However, genuine green belt is open countryside and productive agricultural land that should never be considered for development wherever more appropriate alternatives are available, e.g., Previously Developed land (PDL) in the Green belt.

#### **Hucknall Area Responses**

- Watnall Road cannot sustain the amount of traffic which will come from proposed development at Rolls Royce, Hucknall Town Football Club site and Ruffs Farm. Concern is expressed that there is no mention of improvements at the Bulwell end of the by-pass to Moor Bridge roundabout are included in the Plan, or improvements to Watnall Corner at Watnall; 3 ponds junction at Nuthall; and Badger Box. It is suggested that a further tram line is looked into, spurred from Cinderhill, via Blenheim Estate to the new Rolls Royce development, which could also be accessed from the Ruffs Farm proposal. Also suggest a road access across green belt to Blenheim estate where the roads are better able to cope with the level of traffic than Watnall Road.
- Hucknall has already had more than its fair share of development and new housing. There should be a cessation of all future house building in Hucknall for the next 10 years.

#### **Sutton Area Responses**

- Sites HG1 St (North of Kingsmill Hospital) and HG1Ss (Beck Lane) would form relatively large urban extensions and are likely to have some impact on the setting of Grade II listed Dalestorth House (English Heritage)
- Due to the fact that Sutton has a number of traffic black spots, e.g., Sutton to Kirkby Road, Sutton Junction, Priestic Road and Huthwaite Road, we should be careful where new housing is built in large numbers. It would be better to be out of town somewhere like the Lindhurst project which has been put forward. Traffic would filter on to the road system more easily and with less impact. It would also give residents a sense of belonging to the new area and would police itself.
- No evidence any new community would police itself. Remote land is economically unfeasible.
- Building around Rookery Lane and Alfreton Road will add to existing traffic problems.
- Ashfield is becoming closer to Mansfield and will lose its identity.



- Don't oppose building new houses at Kings Mill hospital and Beck lane, but do have concern over increase in traffic that will result. Dalestorth road is already busy with traffic using it as a cut through, rather than using the MARR. If the development goes ahead, traffic calming measures should be looked at for Dalestorth Road.
- Concern over lack of school capacity in Sutton. Live 350m from school, but have to go to Derbyshire as no current spaces locally.
- Objection to building off A60 as the green space is a vital buffer between Mansfield and Harlow Wood and differentiates communities.

#### **Kirkby Area Responses**

- Kirkby is gridlocked and traffic on Bourne Avenue already travels in excess of 30 MPH – building new properties will make conditions worse. Also concern that Richmond Road, Abbey Road and Thoresby Avenue will become a race track due to more congestion on Derby Road.
- Why has Kirkby been singled out for the majority of proposed development? This will change the whole nature of the area.

#### **Villages (Selston, Jacksdale Underwood) Area Responses**

- The Council should not rely on longstanding allocations to deliver the required level of growth over the plan period when these have clearly not been developed to date, e.g., HG1Nf/Ng Westdale Road.
- A more flexible approach to housing growth is required as the Council has consistently under delivered through its existing plan period, particularly in relation to affordable housing in the rural areas. Consider a Rural exceptions policy under HG3.
- Rural housing allocations: the sites proposed for allocation would only deliver 397 units due to ecological and landscape constraints.
- There is no justification for the release of Green Belt land in the villages.

#### **Level of Growth/ Site Detail**

- Dwelling capacity figures should be indicated for proposed sites in the table and following text. This would be useful to the reader and relate to the density policy HG5, making clear that the numbers are a guide or a minimum for each site.
- It is hard to decipher the housing land allocations as the policy includes permissions and newly promoted sites. It would be helpful if plans/tables could identify these separately.
- The Council should plan for a level of growth needed in our area, not imposed by Central Government who say it is needed to restart growth in Britain's stagnant economy.
- The plan period should be extended to at least 15years. There is a need for additional sustainable sites over those which have been proposed to meet the longer term needs. These should include sites of a strategic nature.
- It is inappropriate that land at Whyburn is not included in the SA. Work undertaken on behalf of the Council (SUE study – Tribal) concluded that this is a sustainable site. Within this context it should be considered for

allocation.

- In accordance with the requirements of the NPPF to boost housing supply, the housing requirement should not be phased, but spread evenly over the plan period with any previous shortfall made up in the first 5 years of the plan. It is also inappropriate for the Plan to hide behind market conditions for lack of delivery and positive planning and bring forward housing as soon as possible. This should include flexibility in the type and number of sites allocated. The proposed Plan will not be able to maintain a 5 year supply of deliverable sites.
- The plan relies on a high number of SHLAA sites being delivered.
- The Plan does not include details about individual site allocations, the form development might take, scale of housing or viability or deliverability of sites. It is considered that a number of the proposed sites are not viable and deliverable within the plan period, e.g., Rushley Farm which is envisaged to form an extension to the Lindhurst site.
- General support for approach to distribution of development on small sites around the District. Weakness in larger proposals and also lack of detail regarding required infrastructure.
- All sites north of Annesley Woodhouse will exacerbate traffic congestion on the A611;
- 4 sites totalling 1.4 hectares but accounting for 105 dwellings are at apartment densities. The financial risk is high for the development of apartments and there is uncertainty with regard to the sites being developed;

#### **Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment responses**

- The Preferred Approach and the SHLAA that informs it are difficult and confusing documents to the professionals who have prepared the analysis;
- The SHLAA identifies sites with planning permission only by their application reference;
- The preferred approach designations are different from the SHLAA designations;
- The Preferred Approach sites do not tally with that of their SHLAA equivalents;
- Bowden Land's report indicates that the SHLAA figures are incorrect as Bowden Land's calculations do not tally with the Council's quoted figures;
- Landscape and ecological constraints reduce the overall capacity from 4136 to 3708 dwellings before any other considerations are made;
- Out of 63.2 hectares of land in Kirkby and Sutton, land on 10 of the sites will not come forward during the plan period and 14 are doubtful. 1338 dwellings out of the 3708 dwellings will not be deliverable;
- Traffic impact and access problems on 6 sites totalling 33.3 hectares require third party land for access;

#### **General Responses**

- Concern expressed that the sites put forward have not been robustly selected having regard to the alternatives available. There are

inconsistencies in the SHLAA and SA. Considered that sites have not been properly or fairly assessed and that the decision making process is lacking objectivity. The plan is therefore not considered to be sound in terms of NPPF para.182.

- The Plan does not meet the need to boost housing supply and to secure economic growth.
- Notts Wildlife Trust (NWT) consider the policy should acknowledge that where permission has been in place for some time and the site is still undeveloped, protected species checks should be updated before development commences. If several years have elapsed since the development was permitted it may be necessary to update all the ecological information as there may have been material changes in the biodiversity value of the site, this is particularly relevant within the Buffer Zone for the prospective SPA.
- NWT - Not all sites in the list have permission and so it cannot be categorically stated that development will be permitted, as it should be based on a full assessment of the material considerations at the time. SHLAA assessments are not detailed enough, as they are, necessarily, developed at such a strategic level.
- The housing will most likely be used by City employees, not local people and will therefore increase traffic drastically, particularly from the motorway. The current traffic situation is unacceptable.
- Notts CC need to make traffic flow easier and smoother before any additional development of any type can be considered on Derby Road. The effect of any development on existing residents needs to be considered before the need for new houses. (Reference to pages 96, 97 of the 3rd Transport Plan Evidence base indicating the poor performance of the A611).
- ACCESS group raised issues regarding the potential increase in traffic density and air pollution from the proposed housing and other development along the A611 Corridor from its junction near the A60/A617 near the West Notts Technical College to the B6009 junction at Hucknall. This included that:
  - The A611 through Annesley is one of the country's most congested roads with a number of sites within a 2km corridor of the A611 already having planning permission or yet to be fully occupied;
  - Major junctions are up to capacity, namely B6139/A611 (Coxmoor), B6020/A611 (Diamond Avenue), B6021/A611 (Shoulder of Mutton), Forest Road/A611 (Badger Box) and Annesley Cutting/A611, and the A611/A608 (Sterling Island) are already up to full capacity;
  - Given the wording of Policy HG5 Housing Mix & Density higher densities will be sought that set out in Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment;
  - Heavy Good Vehicles (HGV's) traffic on the A611 is likely to increase such as through the proposed Silica Sand Quarry at Two Oaks Farm.
  - Substantial concerns were raised regarding the transport infrastructure as: the Ashfield Transport Study, Nov 2010 concentrated on 3 major 1000 dwelling developments around Ashfield; Newark and Sherwood

Council study on the traffic impact of the proposed mixed use Lindhurst development not reflecting the proposals; developments within Gedling Borough Council will also impact on the A611. Recommended the Council should commission a joint Transport report with Newark and Sherwood District Council, Mansfield Council and Gedling Council to determine the impact on the A611 network from the A60/A611/A617 junctions to the B6009 junction which take account of existing levels of traffic and the effect of developments with planning permission and proposed allocated sites (including those 3 miles outside of the Council Boundary), together with Newstead Eco park and additional potential traffic from empty properties on Sherwood Business park.

- The Preferred Approach indicates a Development corridor along the A611 Derby Road, from the MARR in the north, to Mutton Hill in the South. Such a strategy would be jeopardised by the proposed sand quarry and its associated HGV movements. It is suggested the ADC contact NCC with regard to the impact of a quarry on its abilities to provide housing in the area.
- More development will bring increased pollution.
- Increased congestion and poorer air quality will not only affect the quality of life for residents of the District, but also the ability to attract jobs
- Several comments related to effects on residential amenity e.g., objection to any new roads close to our property; loss of view; overlooking; devaluation of existing properties on the edge of town; security issues.
- Object due to availability of/pressure on schools, amenities and other facilities cannot be justified by a large scale build of this type.
- Affordable housing will downgrade other local properties.
- Concern expressed that the public have not been consulted on the Plan, and one accusation that the Council has deliberately attempted to make it difficult for the public to comment on proposed sites.

**Comments received on specific individual sites are summarised in separate documents.**

**Several sites were suggested as alternatives/additions to those included in the Preferred Approach Plan. These are set out in a separate summary document.**

### **Response:**

#### **Green Belt/Countryside/PDL Issues**

- Whilst it is acknowledged that open countryside is important for well-being and agriculture, the Council has to make difficult decisions in balance the needs for housing against the environment. Some of the proposed development sites will result in a loss of countryside/green belt. The Council's analysis (through the SHLAA) identified that there are insufficient

brownfield site (including derelict sites) available to meet the housing requirements and therefore homes will need to be built on Greenfield sites.

- Any site put forward for housing allocation in the Local Plan must be realistically available for development, otherwise it would be deemed undeliverable and the Plan would be found 'unsound' at Examination stage. To this end the Council must be confident that landowners are willing to release their site for housing development.
- Although a number of industrial buildings are currently empty, this reflects the recent major recession with limited economic growth. We cannot simply develop all industrial sites for housing as this will result in insufficient local jobs over the longer term. Nevertheless, the proposals in the Local Plan Preferred Approach included utilising a number of existing employment sites for housing purposes. This is in addition to approximately 27 previously used for industrial purposes, which has been redeveloped for housing from 2001 to 31<sup>st</sup> March 2012.
- In respect of habitat loss, policy EV4: Green Infrastructure, Biodiversity and Geological Conservation, offers a level of protection against impacts on internationally, nationally or locally designated areas of importance. These include Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs), Local Nature reserves (LNRs), Sites of Importance for nature conservation or Geological Significance (SINCS). In addition, part 5 of the policy requires an ecological survey to be undertaken where there is a reason to suspect the presence of protected wildlife or geodiversity.
- It is not considered appropriate to direct a larger allocation of housing towards Jacksdale, Underwood, Selston, Annesley, Teversal and Fackley. Whilst it is acknowledged that a certain level of growth will help to maintain the vitality of an area, the role of these smaller settlements differs from that of the main towns in the District. The Council has adopted an approach which looks to concentrate development in and adjoining the main urban areas, with lower levels of development in and around the villages in line with an employment led growth scenario. This approach aims to maintain the character of the villages and job levels, whilst directing the majority of growth to the most sustainable locations. It should be noted that Skegby does have significant proposed allocation at Beck lane and close by at North of Kings Mill Hospital.
- The conversion of empty pubs to housing could come forward through the usual planning application process, subject to design, access, amenity etc. and provided that the sites are in a sustainable location. However, sites allocated in the Local Plan are those with an anticipated capacity in excess of 9 dwellings, or 0.4ha. It is unlikely that this source will have any significant impact on the housing requirements over the Plan Period.
- House building/unemployment - There is both a direct relationship between jobs and new housing and an indirect relationship between housing and the wider economy. In 2008, 10% of Ashfield's jobs by industry were in construction and this excluded persons who were self employed. New housing potentially generates jobs, e.g., in serving new household needs such as education, health, & transport. New households will also spend money on retail goods, services and leisure activities which in term may generate additional jobs. The Housing & Communities Agency's

Employment Density Guide suggests that approximately 150 additional new jobs per 1,000 increase in the population is typically generated outside London.

- Fully utilise non-green belt areas as a priority, then re-assess any outstanding housing requirement – The Green Belt areas proposed for release have been assessed as being deliverable and are considered to be sustainably located. Restricting growth to non-Green Belt countryside would lead to an uneven distribution of growth and the loss of opportunity in respect of Kirkby town centre regeneration and maintaining the vitality of the villages.
- Green belt sites allocated without a full review – A detailed survey of all Green Belt boundaries has been undertaken to inform the minor changes proposed in the Preferred Approach document. A strategic review for the Nottingham Outer Housing Market Area (i.e., excluding Hucknall) will be published at the next stage of the Local Plan process.
- The Council's preferred approach to the location and scale of allocated sites is set out in a separate technical paper – 'Housing Growth: Choice of Strategic Area Based Housing Policies'. This paper explains the reasoned justification for the choice of smaller sites in preference to larger strategic sites to meet the housing requirement, and also how the sites were chosen through the SHLAA and Sustainability appraisal process. The decision to release green belt sites in Kirkby was arrived at due to the sustainable location and resulting regeneration for the town centre. The villages (Selston, Underwood and Jacksdale) are currently tightly constrained by the green belt and inevitably will require green belt release in order to meet housing needs in the area.
- Preferential to redevelop PDL in the green belt rather than open greenfield land – Agreed if sites are comparable in other respects and are capable of bringing equivalent benefits, e.g., highway issues, location, regeneration, etc. The proposed allocations represent planned growth in sustainable locations which will assist in regeneration of their respective centres/urban areas.

### **Hucknall Area**

- It is recognised that traffic is a substantial issue for a number of larger sites. A Transport Assessment was undertaken in 2010 based on the requirements of an increase in by 11,200 dwellings. Additional work is currently being undertaken to examine the impact of the housing and employment land allocations proposed and measures necessary to mitigate the effects of the growth. A transport Study will be published in due course and any specific reference to improvements be included in the emerging Infrastructure Delivery Plan
- There are currently no proposals to extend the tram line to the north of Hucknall Station.
- The housing requirement for the 10 year plan is set out in the Local Plan and explained more fully in the Housing Technical Paper (Sept 2012).

### **Sutton Area**

- Noted that sites HG1Ss and HG1st may have an impact on the setting of Dalestorth House. It is considered that any impact is capable of being mitigated through carefully designed development. Reference to the Grade II building will be included in site briefs for the developments.
- Any new development will have a level of traffic impact despite location. Assessments will be undertaken prior to any development taking place in order to help identify particular areas of concern and measures needed mitigate these.
- An integrated part of planning for sustainable development is taking into account the physical, economic, social and environmental infrastructure necessary to enable the development to progress. The Council has undertaken an Infrastructure Capacity Study and has had meetings with infrastructure providers such as the Education Authority and PCT. The Council is currently working on an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which looks to identify: what infrastructure is required, how it will be provided, where/when is infrastructure needed and when can any constraints be overcome. Policy SD4 addresses these issues.
- Whilst it is acknowledged that development off the A60 will encroach into countryside south of Mansfield, it is considered that this does not significantly impact on the strategic gap between Sutton, Kirkby and Mansfield.

### **Kirkby Area**

- See comments above regarding traffic impact
- Proposed sites for development are distributed throughout the District in the most sustainable available areas and with a view to achieving the Council's vision for economic growth.

### **Villages (Selston, Jacksdale, Underwood)**

- The Council are not relying solely on the Westdale Road sites for development in the Villages. Discussions have been undertaken with the landowners and they have confirmed that the site can be taken forward as a housing allocation.
- The lack of delivery across the District in recent years has been brought about by the 'credit crunch'. In the short term, it is not a lack of housing land supply that has restricted development, but the lack of availability of credit. Over the longer term of the Plan period, it is anticipated that the market will make a modest recovery. A rural exceptions policy has been considered by the Council at earlier stages of the plan making process but did not receive local political support. However the higher level of proposed growth alongside a lower threshold for requiring affordable housing on sites in the Selston, Jacksdale and Underwood areas should significantly increase the delivery of affordable units without the need for a separate policy. Delivery will be monitored and the possibility of a Rural Exceptions policy will be addressed at an early review of the Local Plan.
- There is no evidence to suggest that landscape or ecological constraints would reduce the yield. The Bowden Land report does not provide details on densities, house types or site layout. The approach taken by Bowden Land

is clearly not consistent with the Council's approach. In determining the yield, the SHLAA has taken a consistent approach across the District.

- There is no land available within the settlement boundaries in the villages, which makes it necessary to amend the Green Belt boundary to accommodate the level of growth required.

#### **Level of Growth/Site Detail**

- Site capacity figures can be included in policy HG1. However, these will only present an approximate yield for each site based on current knowledge.
- It is not considered necessary to identify sites with permissions and allocations separately within the policy. The status of sites will inevitably change throughout the plan period with sites being built out, permissions gained or lapsing. The supporting text does however set out the current situation of each site at the time of writing.
- Housing Requirements: This Preferred Approach document sets out policies that will manage and direct the future development of Ashfield to 2023. It reflects national planning guidance issued by the Government (National Planning Policy Framework) which requires councils to objectively assess the need for market and affordable housing and identify a supply of deliverable housing sites to meet that housing requirement. The Council has undertaken extensive work, set out in the evidence base supporting the Plan to identify the housing requirements for different areas of the District. This includes the Population & Housing Forecast (Edge Analytics), the Housing Technical Paper, the SHMA and the Affordable Housing Viability Assessment. An increasing population and demographic changes means that new homes will be required to meet anticipated local housing requirements. The Council has adopted an approach which looks to concentrate development in and adjoining the urban areas, but it is required to identify sufficient sites to meet the assessed demand for housing growth. The proposals are informed by an analysis of where the houses could potentially be located through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment and by the Sustainability Appraisal.
- The justification for the timescale of the Plan is set out in paragraph 1.9 of the Local Plan Preferred Approach and will be addressed in more detailed in a technical note to accompany the Local Plan Publication Draft in the spring of 2013. Para. 157 of the NPPF refers to a 15 year time horizon as 'preferable', however, in the interests of actively promoting the localism agenda and maintaining a 5 year land supply, a decision has been taken to plan for a shorter period in the first instance, whilst looking to an early review to plan for longer term. It is acknowledged that due to timescale and likely adoption date, this may result in a plan with a remaining period of 9 years. The plan period will be amended to 2024 to address this issue. Any future sites required to meet established levels of growth beyond this period will be arrived at in a review of the Local Plan working with local communities in the spirit of Localism.
- The site at Whyburn will be included in the Sustainability Appraisal at the next stage of Plan preparation. The site is however located in the Green belt



and sufficient available sites exist within Hucknall's Main Urban Area to meet the established housing need.

- The proposed allocations are a mixture of sites with planning permission and those in the most sustainable locations deemed to be deliverable in the SHLAA. The plan does not rely heavily on SHLAA sites, but allocations to meet future requirements. It is anticipated that a very small number of sites may come forward through the usual planning application process on sites with a capacity below 10 dwellings identified in the SHLAA where they are not constrained by policy.
- It is acknowledged that some of the major sites allocated in the Plan are unlikely to be delivered in their entirety within the Plan period. This has been taken into account in the housing trajectories and will contribute to supply post 2024. This does not mean the sites aren't viable and is not a reason to discount them as allocations in this Plan.
- The Ashfield Transport Study Update 2013 acknowledges that the A611 will require a number of highway improvements. The Council is working very closely with Nottinghamshire County Council to identify a package of appropriate mitigation.
- Whilst it is acknowledged that there has been a shift away from apartment developments, there is no evidence to suggest that the sites in Ashfield with planning permission will not be developed as such.

### **Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment**

- The format of the SHLAA document has been reviewed and amendments have been made where considered necessary.
- The SHLAA update now includes site location details.
- There is no requirement for the allocated sites to exactly match those in the SHLAA.
- There are some minor errors in the SHLAA reports which have now been amended.
- Bowden Land has not used the same base date as the Council. The Council monitors housing completions from 1<sup>st</sup> April through until 31<sup>st</sup> March each year. It is inevitable that the figures will be different on this basis.
- The SHLAA provides a realistic estimate of the number of dwellings which could be accommodated on each site based on a consistent approach using a low density of 30 dwellings per hectare. The assessment provides a conservative estimate taking into consideration on-site infrastructure requirements which has reduced the area of land available purely for housing quite considerably. The report produced by Bowden Land provides no detail on the density of development nor is there any detail on the type of property envisaged for each site, or on the site layout.
- All sites are considered to be deliverable and this has been confirmed by landowners, agents and developers of sites put forward. Furthermore, viability assessments undertaken indicate that development would be viable. There is no evidence to suggest that development would not be deliverable or viable.
- It is acknowledged that some allocated sites have access constraints, which is also the case for many other sites not taken forward. The Council is

confident that access constraints can be overcome and is working closely with landowners, agents and developers to resolve such issues.

### **Other General Comments**

- The SHLAA and SA, whilst based on agreed methodologies are living documents which will be refined as additional information, comments and advice are forthcoming. The SA was assessed by a professional officer outside of the policy making process and is therefore considered to be fair. The SHLAA is purely a technical document. Both documents have now been reviewed and any inconsistencies have been addressed for the next stage of Plan preparation.
- The objectively assessed housing need set out in the Plan represents a level of growth above the figure which would retain current employment levels. This approach has been taken in order to secure economic growth in accordance with the Council's 'Vision' for Ashfield. More details on the level of growth can be found in the Housing Technical Paper which supports the Plan.
- Notts Wildlife Trust (NWT) : where permission has been in place for some time and site still undeveloped, protected species checks should be updated before development commences - This will be addressed through the development management process
- NWT consider that it cannot be stated that development will be permitted on the sites listed under HG1 which don't currently have planning permission. Housing allocations are identified to meet the objectively assessed need for the District in accordance with Government Policy and the requirements of the NPPF. Detailed issues, including those of an ecological nature will be addressed and mitigated where necessary at planning application stage.
- Policy SD7 addresses issues in respect of environmental protection, including air quality, lighting and noise pollution.
- The value of any residential property is dependent on a number of factors which will include title, the property's characteristics, accommodation, the site, sitting qualities and the state of the market. Only a local valuer could identify the potential impact of the proposed development on the value of your property. However, in planning terms there is no right to compensation for new residential development. The planning system has to balance a number of competing economic, social and environmental objectives. The housing figures set out in the Local Plan are based on providing for housing need based on demographic change. This reflects a rising population, people living longer and changing lifestyles with more single occupancy. The evidence identifies that there is a need for more housing and as a planning authority we have no option but to identify sites to meet the anticipated housing need.
- Empty Homes: There will always be some homes that are empty for a variety of reasons. This may be due to the owner moving house or entering a nursing home with the property still on the market; the owner has died and the estate is being settled, the house is undergoing refurbishment or the house has been repossessed. In Ashfield, as at May 2012 there were approximately 814 long term empty homes which are potentially actionable

by the Council. The Council is taking steps to reduce the number of long term empty properties.

- Consultation: As part of legislative requirements, the Council has an adopted Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) which sets out how, who, when and by what methods the Council will undertake public consultations on the Local Plan. The consultation process undertaken for the Local Plan provided for a range of methods for ensuring that people heard about the consultation including radio and press coverage, letters to parties on the Council’s Local Plan’s database, leaflets and posters, letters to organisations, site notices for new proposed housing allocations, presentations to various community groups and contact with schools. The Council has to make a balanced judgement between the cost of any form of consultation method and trying to ensure that people are aware of the proposals.

**Changes to the Local Plan:**

- Revise plan period to 2024 to achieve full 10 years post adoption.
- The approximate dwelling capacity of each proposed housing site will be set out in policy HG1 to give more clarity.
- Include additional supporting text with regard to delivery and a 5 year land supply, i.e., sites vary with regard to deliverability and lead in periods and this has been taken account of in the Council’s housing trajectory - not all sites are anticipated to be completed in full within the plan periods.

Number of Comments		Number of Respondents	
		<b>90 + ACCESS</b>	
Objection to Policy	Support the Policy	Comment on the Policy	

**List of Respondents**

Annesley Community Committed to Ensuring Sustainable Settlements (ACCESS); (English Heritage); Ms A Gibson, Gedling BC; Andrew Lowe, Nottinghamshire wildlife trust; Mr & Mrs David & Anne ?; Mr g Barkes; Mr Alan Rooksby; Mr Samuel Hemstock; Mrs Joan Staley; Mr & Mrs L Blower; Mrs Olivia Pearson; Mr Kevin Hooton; Chris Hall; Mr & Mrs Alan & Monika ?; Mr Peter Robertson; Mrs Shirley Lock; Mr Terry Lock; Mrs Joyce Goodall; Sarah Chalkley; Tim Henstock; Mrs Ellen Elizabeth Kitching; Jenny Allen; Mr & Mrs J A Moore; Mr Peter, Joan & Deborah ?; Peter Fowkes; Mrs Margaret Costall; Mr S pollard; Mr Jonathon Gregory; Mr Alan Jones; Mr Neil Harvey; Mr Alan Cater; Mrs Diane Massey; Mr David turner; Mr

Harold & Christopher ?; Mrs C Kemp; Mr Brian Davies; Guy Longley, Pegasus Planning Group; John Deakin, David Wilson Homes; Paul Stone, Signet Planning; Rob Hughes, Ian Baseley Assocs; Mr N Basely, Ian Baseley Assocs; Mr Aaron Smith, Caldecott Consultants; Gareth Jones, URS Infrastructure & Environment UK; John Collins, J D Collins & Assocs; Guy Longley, Pegasus Planning Group; Dennis pope, Nathaniel Litchfield & Partners; Mr B Holmes, Oxalis Planning Ltd; Emma Fawcett; Mr John Kerry, KDCS; Sally Wyatt, Reach Out Residents. Mr Andrew Cameron, Locheil homes; Mrs Mary Rutter; Miss Patricia Stevens; Hugh Nicholl; Karan Hunt; Deborah Bacon; Christine Kingswood; Mr Stuart Jones; Mr Robert Halsey; Mr & Mrs Paul Taylor; Mr & Mrs G & J Burton –Naylor; Mr Peter Smith; Miss Charlotte McPhail; Mr Darren Ward; Mr J G H Szejter, The Houldsworth Trust; Mr John Barlow, Annesley & Felley Parish Council; Mr A Marshall, Greasely Parish Council; Mrs Angela Morris; E Hutchinson; Mr Roy Coleman; Mr David Rixon, Vincent & Goring; Hugh Nicholl; Jenny Allen; Denise Barraclough; Sally Gill, NCC; Robert Barsby; Russ Aram; Helen Boddice; Dr David Cross; Felicity Pether; Jennifer Walters; Oxalis Planning Ltd on behalf of Westerman Homes, Mr Robert Collier, Mrs Julia Collier, Miss Deberah Olko, Mr William Cooper, Ms Ann Cooper, Mr & Mrs M & P Dear, Mrs Margaret Lathall, Mrs Micaela Stanley, Mrs Anne Chalkley, Mr Stewart Chalkley, Mr Stephen Jacksdale, Mrs Alison Jackson, Mrs Pauline Cumberland, Mr Donald Bailey, Mr Mark Raynor, Mr Philip Wood, Mrs Margaret Johnson, Mr John Lowe, Miss Becky Chalkley, Mr David Connah, Mrs Patricia Starling, Mrs Valerie Alcock, Mr David Alcock, Mr & Mrs R & M Hufton, Ms Julie Craft, Mrs Madeline Allsop, Mr Dick Bend, Mrs Margaret Bend, Mrs Pauline Hodson, Mr Roger Dean, Ms Kathryn Shaw, Mr John Bolger, Mr Richard Shaw, Mr & Mrs M & M Lowe.

## **Policy HG1: Site HG1Hp; Rear 162-220 Nottingham Road**

### **Responses received relating to Policy**

#### Support:

- Is a sustainable form of development within established settlement limits.
- Close to services and amenities.
- No loss of countryside or green belt.
- Bus service available.
- No major infrastructure required.
- Even though some owners may object, the site could become available in the future. (See Manydown Company Ltd Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council 2012 EWHC 977).
- Land needed for development to meet housing requirements.

Object:

*Social community and infrastructure:*

- Putting strain on existing infrastructure, especially schools, medical facilities and transport.

*Transport:*

- Nottingham Road is already congested at peak times and this will make traffic worse.
- Access will not be safe.
- Additional traffic will be added to roads which are already busy.

*Environmental*

- Close proximity of the SSSI.
- Loss of wildlife, flora and fauna, serious impact on bio diversity
- Green spaces contribute to good health.
- Loss of hedgerows.
- Loss of mature trees.

*Other issues*

- Some owners objecting to their land being included in site-have not agreed to sell land to developer.
- Planning permission hasn't been granted for this development proposal.
- Shouldn't use gardens for development.
- Will increase housing density in the area further.
- Will mean that Hucknall soon joins with Bulwell.
- Site is neither achievable nor deliverable.
- Doubt the need for so many new homes in Hucknall.

**Response:**

- It is acknowledged that this site is in a number of ownerships (some of whom do not wish the development to go ahead) which means that achieving its development is unlikely.
- Please refer to the responses to Policy HG1 in relation to the approach to Housing Requirements.
- It is recognised that traffic is a substantial issue for a number of sites. A Transport Assessment was undertaken in 2010 based on the requirements of an increase in by 11,200 dwellings. Additional work is currently being undertaken to examine the impact of the housing and employment land allocations proposed and measures necessary to mitigate the effects of the growth.
- An integrated part of planning for sustainable development is taking into account the physical, economic, social and environmental infrastructure necessary to enable the development to progress. The Council has undertaken a Infrastructure Capacity Study and has had meeting with

infrastructure providers such as the Education Authority and PCT. The Council is currently working on an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which looks to identify: what infrastructure is required, how it will be provided, where/when is infrastructure needed and when can any constraints be overcome.

- It is acknowledged that the use of garden land is now not considered to be brown field land.
- It is acknowledged that the proposed development will result in a loss of garden land and some mature trees and hedges. However, the Council's analysis identified that there are insufficient brownfield site to meet the housing requirements and therefore homes will need to be built on Greenfield sites. The land in question is not identified as having special ecological value and the Council has to make difficult decisions in balance the needs for housing against the environment.

**Changes to the Local Plan:**

- Delete site allocation HG1Sp rear 162 – 220 Nottingham Road from Policy HG1.

<b>Number of Comments</b>		<b>Number of Respondents</b>	
<b>14</b>		<b>13</b>	
<b>Objection to Policy</b>	<b>Support the Policy</b>		<b>Comment on the Policy</b>
<b>12</b>	<b>2</b>		<b>0</b>

**List of Respondents**

2X anonymous, P.Shanley, C.B&M Pascoe, Mrs A.Cowie, Mrs M.Whilde, Mrs V.Kelly, Mrs M Umney, B.Stirland, E.Whittaker, T.White, S.Spolton

Pegasus Planning Group Ltd.

## Policy HG1: Site HG1Kd; Opposite Vernon Farm, Derby Road

### Responses received relating to Policy

#### Support:

- No objections in principle to the building of houses on the site.
- The site is within a boundary of three existing developed sites, this site should bring economic growth into Kirkby due to its centralised location with the town centre being in easy reach. Housing development will blend in with the existing housing surrounding the site and good quality housing development can only be good for the area.

#### Object:

- No information in regards to access for this development, unwise off Derby Road due to fast growing traffic and unlikely would be off Diamond Avenue due to the covered reservoir.
- Use of Bourne Avenue to provide access to the development.
- Should use existing brownfield land and infill development opportunities rather than build more housing on Green Belt land.
- Loss of countryside and open space.
- Lack of infrastructure.
- Additional traffic will be added to roads which are already busy.
- Will cause traffic congestion through Kirkby centre, Diamond Avenue, Station Street, Victoria Road, Lowmoor Road and Kingsway.
- Parking is a growing problem.
- Putting strain on existing infrastructure, especially local schools and doctor's surgeries.
- Loss of wildlife.
- Increased population.
- Loss of amenity – overlooking/overshadowing.
- Concerns regarding drainage and sewerage.
- Loss of views.
- Noise pollution.
- Need to preserve green spaces for air quality, mental health and physical well being.
- Devaluation of property.
- Possible increase in crime rates.
- The land is at present productive farmland and should stay as such.
- Destruction of hedgerows.
- Destruction of the environment.
- No need for more houses to be built in Kirkby, the area is already over saturated with empty homes and few prospective buyers.
- Overcrowded schools.
- This proposed housing allocation relates to land proposed to be removed from the Green Belt for which there is no justification or evidence in support. Considered to be in conflict with NPPF paragraph 84 in respect of

promoting sustainable development.

- Clear evidence of archaeological features in the three fields concerned which will be lost.
- Current plans are very extensive and will change the face of Kirkby in Ashfield and anyone driving through it for the worse.
- Lack of knowledge of the consultation.
- Ashfield has many individual towns but the increasingly sprawling development on its outskirts means that green corridors are disappearing fast, the area is merging into one large lump of brick and concrete.
- There are doubts regarding the deliverability of development on this site due to traffic impact; Green Belt release; ecological constraints; and major public opposition.

Responses received relating to Policy supporting text

- In supporting Policy EV1 residents largely in Annesley Woodhouse commented that the description relation to the proposed allocations in the Green Belt by using the wording “has been excluded” indicates a decision has already been made. The wording should be changed to “is being proposed to be excluded from the Green Belt and placed within the urban boundary”. This would remove any ambiguity about the current designation and the proposed designation.

**Response:**

- The NPPF requires Council’s to provide sufficient housing land to meet the objectively assessed needs of the local community. The Council has set out the requirement in the Housing technical paper and has adopted a strategic approach to the allocation of land for housing. There is insufficient brown field and infill land to meet the housing requirement and therefore the plan sets out the allocation of land for housing on sites that are adjacent to existing urban areas.
- Planning for the District must be supported by evidence of what physical, social and environmental infrastructure is needed to enable the development to progress. The Council is currently working on an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which looks to identify: what infrastructure is required, how it will be provided, where/when is infrastructure needed and when can any constraints be overcome? It builds on the Infrastructure Capacity Study, which has already been undertaken by the Council, and examined in broad terms the existing capacity relating to education, health, leisure, emergency services, social services, transport, community and utilities. In addition, a Watercycle Study has been undertaken examining water related issues such as water supply, flooding and sewerage disposal. As an authority we have also had meetings with various infrastructure providers including Severn Trent, The Highway Authority, The Highway Agency, the Coal Authority, the education authority and the PCT. From



these meetings no specific issues relating to the broad strategic approach have been identified. However, the comments on the utilities in the area are noted and will be taken up with the relevant service providers.

- The Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment of the sites including liaising with the Highway Authority to identify any general highway issues which would prevent the site being brought forward. If the sites are taken forward and site specific requirements would be considered as part of any planning application.
- Consultation: As part of legislative requirements, the Council has an adopted Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) which sets out how, who, when and by what methods the Council will undertake public consultations on the Local Plan. The consultation process undertaken for the Local Plan provided for a range of methods for ensuring that people heard about the consultation including radio and press coverage, letters to parties on the Council's Local Plan's database, leaflets and posters, letters to organisations, site notices for new proposed housing allocations and contact with schools. The Council has to make a balanced judgement between the cost of any form of consultation method and trying to ensure that people are aware of the proposals.
- Empty Homes: There will always be some homes that are empty for a variety of reasons. This may be due to the owner moving house or entering a nursing home with the property still on the market; the owner has died and the estate is being settled, the house is undergoing refurbishment or the house has been repossessed. In Ashfield, as at May 2012 there were approximately 814 long term empty homes which are potentially actionable by the Council. The Council is taking steps to reduce the number of long term empty properties.
- There are a number of factors which are taken into account when assessing future housing need:
  - Population increase;
  - Changes to the family structure (i.e. divorce/separation/people choosing to live alone);
  - Increasing life expectancy (aging population); and
  - Need for a labour pool to resource employment needs (inward investment)

The number of households in the District is expected to grow by approximately 9% by 2023.

The Government stipulates that any future housing growth must be based on evidenced need and as such, the Council commissioned a Housing and Population Projections Study which set out certain scenarios based on future housing completions in the District and showed what the profile of the District would be in the future dependant on these. To ensure that the Council's Vision for economic growth in the three main urban areas is achieved, a future housing requirement above the 2008 jobs levels is required.

As such, taking into account the Council's Vision for Ashfield and the evidence bases, the Council have identified a future housing requirement (2010 to 2024) of:

- Hucknall: 2,460
- Kirkby and Sutton: 4,438
- Selston, Jacksdale and Underwood: 742

- It is widely accepted that there is a large need for new housing, both nationally and locally. Whilst fewer homes are being built or sold at present this is often because people cannot access mortgages. The evidence suggests that there is a significant 'pent up' demand for housing, and we must take this into account when planning for new housing over the longer term.
- Recent Government announcements have been made to assist first time buyers in accessing the housing market. Other initiatives have also been announced including 'Get Britain Building' grants for developers.
- In addition, housing developers will only build houses if it is viable to do so. However, the Local Plan is a long term plan which will take the District through to 2023. Housing markets will vary over this time scale and we are required to plan for the number of houses that are required over the long term.
- Access to existing services and facilities will be key considerations in deciding which Green Belt and Countryside sites are most suitable for development. Sites on the edge of the urban areas are normally more accessible than those sites in the middle of the countryside. If any Green Belt or Countryside sites were developed this would need to be supported by essential services and infrastructure. These would be agreed through the planning application process.
- As part of the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) we have ruled out any areas in Ashfield that are protected as International or National nature sites, which by law we have to protect. We have also worked with local ecologists to identify any other land that should be protected for its nature value. Where nature conservation sites may be affected, the Council will seek to improve existing nature sites or ensure new habitat land is created.
- The Council is working closely with the Highway Authority to develop a package of appropriate mitigation. Ecological constraints are not considered to render the site unsuitable as these can be mitigated at a later stage. Public opposition is not a reason in itself to the restriction of development. Objections have been taken into consideration where they are based on planning matters.
- We are all using cars more. All the evidence identifies that without any more housing or employment roads in Britain will all be used more. Therefore the Council has to balance housing and employment needs with highway improvements. The Council has worked with the Highway Authority (Nottinghamshire County Council) to ensure that each site is suitable in terms of highway capacity. A strategic Transport Study was commissioned By the Council for the district in 2010 which considers the impact the growth

will have on the road network at a strategic level. This study is currently being updated and will be available prior to the consultation of the next stage of the Local Plan production (Publication Draft).

- More detailed transport assessments will be required as the Local Plan progresses and through the planning application process.

### **Changes to the Local Plan**

- No changes are proposed to the allocation of the land as a housing site.

Number of Comments		Number of Respondents	
113		47 (ACCESS Supporters) 63	
Objection to Policy	Support the Policy	Comment on the Policy	
64	2	47	

### **List of Respondents**

Mr Robert Collier, Mrs Julia Collier, Mr Peter Olko, Mrs Joan Olko, Miss Deberah Olko, Mr William Cooper, Ms Ann Cooper, Mr & Mrs M & P Dear, Mrs Margaret Lathall, Mr John Shaw, Mrs Micaela Stanley, Mrs Anne Chalkley, Mr Stewart Chalkley, Mr Stephen Jacksdale, Mrs Alison Jackson, Mrs Pauline Cumberland, Mr Mark Raynor, Mr Philip Wood, Mrs Margaret Johnson, Mrs Thompson, Mr John Lowe, Miss Becky Chaukley, Mr David Connah, Mrs Patricia Starling, Mrs Valerie Alcock, Mr David Alcock, Mr & Mrs R & M Hufton, Ms Julie Craft, Mrs Madeline Allsop, Mr Dick Bend, Mrs Margaret Bend, Mrs Pauline Hodson, Mr Peter Ward, Mrs Elizabeth Ward, Mr Roger Dean, Mr George Cordy, Mr Russell Lathall, Mrs Patricia Shaw, Ms Kathryn Shaw, Mr John Bolger, Mr Richard Shaw, Mrs Kirsty Cohen, Mr & Mrs M & M Lowe, Miss Angela Smith, Mrs Haydee Lafferty, Mr David Simpson, Mr Adam Heathcote. Mr S Swift, Denise Barraclough, Mr and Mrs Hartley, Mr and Mrs Louth, I Markham, Mr F Lee, Mr A Carter, Mr J Woolley, Mr and Mrs Parkin, Mrs D Massey, Mr K Hooton, Mr and Mrs Shepherd, Mrs J Carr, Mr N Harley, Mr K Kania, Mr A C Taylor, Mr D Leivers, Miss E Jeffs, Mr R H Denny, B & C Saunders, Ms K Brearley, Mrs K Johnson, Dr D Cross, O Wright, Mr A Holmes, Mr A Sivers, Mrs B Britton, Mr I King, Miss J Britton, Mrs V Bowler, Mr E Mann, Mr D Hare, Mrs M Hare, Mr and Mrs Sharman, S Hartley, Mr J

Shaw, Mr L Dacunha, Mrs L Chambers, Mr E Patchett, Mr and Mrs Gibson, Mr and Miss Spolton, J Campbell, Mr A Rooksby, Mr S C Hemstock, Mr J Staley, Mr P Garvican, Mrs L Brabury, Mrs E Fowler, Mr T Lock, Mrs J Goodhall, Mr G Greaves, Mr D Ensor, Mrs Ruth Taylor, Mr D Taylor, Mr N Gear, Mr T Turner, Mrs M Costall, Mr G Morgan, Ms S Kiddy, Ms J Knowles, Mr and Mrs Lewis, Mrs D Gent

### **Policy HG1: Site HG1Ke; Derby Road, (Off Abbey Road/ Richmond Road), Kirkby-in-Ashfield**

#### Responses received relating to Policy

##### Support

- The site can be released from the Green Belt without compromising Green Belt objectives. The A611 Derby Road provides a very strong defensible boundary to the east, whilst the site is bounded to the south and west by residential development with access roads up to the boundary. The site is available and deliverable.

##### Object:

- Should use existing brownfield land and infill development opportunities rather than build more housing on Green Belt land.
- Will increase traffic on Abbey Road.
- Loss of views.
- Devaluation of property.
- Use of Thoresby Avenue for all traffic to access this new development.
- The traffic will feed out onto Derby Road which is already overloaded.
- The proposed development will add to existing traffic problems and will form a gridlocked traffic situation.
- Will prove a considerable disadvantage for pedestrians and school children.
- Loss of wildlife.
- Loss of countryside.
- Will alter the rural character and countryside.
- Putting strain on existing infrastructure, especially local schools, doctor's surgeries and policing.
- Any increase in traffic within the vicinity would cause yet more problems.
- A development here would add to an increase in traffic in Kirkby town centre which cannot cope with the current level of congestion let alone any increase.
- Lack of infrastructure.

- Will lead to an increase in population.
- What size classrooms will be required to accommodate this development.
- The extra traffic generated would pass a nursery and primary school which already has parking issues.
- Current plans are very extensive and will change the face of Kirkby in Ashfield and anyone driving through it for the worse.
- Loss of residential amenity through overlooking/overshadowing.
- The Council need to concentrate on updating and maintaining affordable homes they have to an acceptable, reasonable standard, improving all our lives.
- Not enough facilities in Kirkby to cope with this development.
- Site is currently productive farmland and should stay as such.
- This is the only approach into Mansfield which is aesthetically pleasing and any development on this site will completely alter the character of this approach.
- Why do we need this extra housing when houses are being built in Kirkby and remain empty.
- What employment plans are proposed for the people moving to this area.
- Potential flooding issues.
- Loss of flora and fauna.
- Potential for the increase in traffic leading to the delay of emergency services.
- More housing will invite more crime into the area.
- Query as to why the need to build houses at the bottom of Richmond Road when perfectly good houses and flats have been demolished in Warwick Close.
- This proposed housing allocation relates to land proposed to be removed from the Green Belt for which there is no justification or evidence in support. Considered to be in conflict with NPPF paragraph 84 in respect of promoting sustainable development.
- Lack of knowledge of the consultation.
- There are doubts on the deliverability of development on this site due to traffic impact; Green Belt release; Major public opposition.

Responses received relating to Policy supporting text

- In supporting Policy EV1 residents largely in Annesley Woodhouse commented that the description relation to the proposed allocations in the Green Belt by using the wording “has been excluded” indicates a decision has already been made. The wording should be changed to “is being proposed to be excluded from the Green Belt and placed within the urban boundary”. This would remove any ambiguity about the current designation and the proposed designation.
- Suggests a tree buffer between Derby Road and the new housing which would cut down on traffic noise from the main road.

**Response:**

- The NPPF requires Council's to provide sufficient housing land to meet the objectively assessed needs of the local community. The Council has set out the requirement in the Housing technical paper and has adopted a strategic approach to the allocation of land for housing. There is insufficient brown field and infill land to meet the housing requirement and therefore the plan sets out the allocation of land for housing on sites that are adjacent to existing urban areas.
- Planning for the District must be supported by evidence of what physical, social and environmental infrastructure is needed to enable the development to progress. The Council is currently working on an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which looks to identify: what infrastructure is required, how it will be provided, where/when is infrastructure needed and when can any constraints be overcome? It builds on the Infrastructure Capacity Study, which has already been undertaken by the Council, and examined in broad terms the existing capacity relating to education, health, leisure, emergency services, social services, transport, community and utilities. In addition, a Watercycle Study has been undertaken examining water related issues such as water supply, flooding and sewerage disposal. As an authority we have also had meetings with various infrastructure providers including Severn Trent, The Highway Authority, The Highway Agency, the Coal Authority, the education authority and the PCT. From these meetings no specific issues relating to the broad strategic approach have been identified. However, the comments on the utilities in the area are noted and will be taken up with the relevant service providers.
- The Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment of the sites including liaising with the Highway Authority to identify any general highway issues which would prevent the site being brought forward. If the sites are taken forward and site specific requirements would be considered as part of any planning application.
- Consultation: As part of legislative requirements, the Council has an adopted Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) which sets out how, who, when and by what methods the Council will undertake public consultations on the Local Plan. The consultation process undertaken for the Local Plan provided for a range of methods for ensuring that people heard about the consultation including radio and press coverage, letters to parties on the Council's Local Plan's database, leaflets and posters, letters to organisations, site notices for new proposed housing allocations and contact with schools. The Council has to make a balanced judgement between the cost of any form of consultation method and trying to ensure that people are aware of the proposals.
- Empty Homes: There will always be some homes that are empty for a variety of reasons. This may be due to the owner moving house or entering a nursing home with the property still on the market; the owner has died and the estate is being settled, the house is undergoing refurbishment or the house has been repossessed. In Ashfield, as at May 2012 there were approximately 814 long term empty homes which are potentially actionable

by the Council. The Council is taking steps to reduce the number of long term empty properties.

- There are a number of factors which are taken into account when assessing future housing need:
  - Population increase;
  - Changes to the family structure (i.e. divorce/separation/people choosing to live alone);
  - Increasing life expectancy (aging population); and
  - Need for a labour pool to resource employment needs (inward investment)

The number of households in the District is expected to grow by approximately 9% by 2023.

The Government stipulates that any future housing growth must be based on evidenced need and as such, the Council commissioned a Housing and Population Projections Study which set out certain scenarios based on future housing completions in the District and showed what the profile of the District would be in the future dependant on these. To ensure that the Council's Vision for economic growth in the three main urban areas is achieved, a future housing requirement above the 2008 jobs levels is required.

As such, taking into account the Council's Vision for Ashfield and the evidence bases, the Council have identified a future housing requirement (2010 to 2024) of:

- Hucknall: 2,460
  - Kirkby and Sutton: 4,438
  - Selston, Jacksdale and Underwood: 742
- It is widely accepted that there is a large need for new housing, both nationally and locally. Whilst fewer homes are being built or sold at present this is often because people cannot access mortgages. The evidence suggests that there is a significant 'pent up' demand for housing, and we must take this into account when planning for new housing over the longer term.
  - Recent Government announcements have been made to assist first time buyers in accessing the housing market. Other initiatives have also been announced including 'Get Britain Building' grants for developers.
  - In addition, housing developers will only build houses if it is viable to do so. However, the Local Plan is a long term plan which will take the District through to 2023. Housing markets will vary over this time scale and we are required to plan for the number of houses that are required over the long term.
  - Access to existing services and facilities will be key considerations in deciding which Green Belt and Countryside sites are most suitable for development. Sites on the edge of the urban areas are normally more

accessible than those sites in the middle of the countryside. If any Green Belt or Countryside sites were developed this would need to be supported by essential services and infrastructure. These would be agreed through the planning application process.

- As part of the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) we have ruled out any areas in Ashfield that are protected as International or National nature sites, which by law we have to protect. We have also worked with local ecologists to identify any other land that should be protected for its nature value. Where nature conservation sites may be affected, the Council will seek to improve existing nature sites or ensure new habitat land is created.
- The Council is working closely with the Highway Authority to develop a package of appropriate mitigation. Ecological constraints are not considered to render the site unsuitable as these can be mitigated at a later stage. Public opposition is not a reason in itself to the restriction of development. Objections have been taken into consideration where they are based on planning matters.
- We are all using cars more. All the evidence identifies that without any more housing or employment roads in Britain will all be used more. Therefore the Council has to balance housing and employment needs with highway improvements. The Council has worked with the Highway Authority (Nottinghamshire County Council) to ensure that each site is suitable in terms of highway capacity. A strategic Transport Study was commissioned By the Council for the district in 2010 which considers the impact the growth will have on the road network at a strategic level. This study is currently being updated and will be available prior to the consultation of the next stage of the Local Plan production (Publication Draft).
- More detailed transport assessments will be required as the Local Plan progresses and through the planning application process.

### Changes to the Local Plan

- No changes are proposes to the allocation of the land as a housing site.

Number of Comments		Number of Respondents	
112		47 (ACCESS Supporters) 60	
Objection to Policy	Support the Policy	Comment on the Policy	
64	1	48	



### List of Respondents

Mr Robert Collier, Mrs Julia Collier, Mr Peter Olko, Mrs Joan Olko, Miss Deberah Olko, Mr William Cooper, Ms Ann Cooper, Mr & Mrs M & P Dear, Mrs Margaret Lathall, Mr John Shaw, Mrs Micaela Stanley, Mrs Anne Chalkley, Mr Stewart Chalkley, Mr Stephen Jacksdale, Mrs Alison Jackson, Mrs Pauline Cumberland, Mr Mark Raynor, Mr Philip Wood, Mrs Margaret Johnson, Mrs Thompson, Mr John Lowe, Miss Becky Chaukley, Mr David Connah, Mrs Patricia Starling, Mrs Valerie Alcock, Mr David Alcock, Mr & Mrs R & M Hufton, Ms Julie Craft, Mrs Madeline Allsop, Mr Dick Bend, Mrs Margaret Bend, Mrs Pauline Hodson, Mr Peter Ward, Mrs Elizabeth Ward, Mr Roger Dean, Mr George Cordy, Mr Russell Lathall, Mrs Patricia Shaw, Ms Kathryn Shaw, Mr John Bolger, Mr Richard Shaw, Mrs Kirsty Cohen, Mr & Mrs M & M Lowe, Miss Angela Smith, Mrs Haydee Lafferty, Mr David Simpson, Mr Adam Heathcote. Mr S Swift, D Barraclough, Mr and Mrs Simpson, Mr and Mrs Maltby, I Markham, R Butler, Mr F Lee, Mrs W Betts, Mr A Cater, Mrs C Walker, Mr J Woolley, Mr G Caunt, Mr I Garratt, Mr and Mrs Parkin, Mr J Gregory, Mrs D Massey, Mr K Hooton, Mr P Simpson, Mr S Pearson, Miss S K Galvin, Mr D Archer, Mr A C-Taylor, Mr R Moulouycliff, Dr D Cross, Mr I Marshall, Mrs J Stewart, Mrs M Jackson, Mr M Higgins, Mrs V Bowler, Mr E Mann, Mr D Hare, Mrs M Hare, Mr and Mrs Martland, M Davies, Mrs S Hall, Mr J Shaw, A Holmes, Mr L Dacunha, Mr R Bradley, Mrs E Bradley, Mrs D Rogers, Mr W Morrison, Mr N Flint, Mr J Wilkinson, Mr J Jordan, Mr A Rooksby, Mr S C Hemstock, Mrs J Staley, Mrs E Fowler, Mrs J Goodall, Mrs K Taqvi, Mr D Ensor, Mrs L Harrison, Mrs R Taylor, Mrs L Biro-Moore, Mr N Gear, Mrs M Cossall, Mrs J Crane, D Harding, Ms S Kiddy, Mr K Oliver (Taylor Wimpey), Mr and Mrs Taylor; Oxalis Planning on behalf of Westerman Homes

### **Policy HG1: Site HG1Kg; Skegby Road Annesley Woodhouse.**

#### Responses received relating to Policy :

##### Object:

##### *Access and traffic*

- Access via Swifts View is narrow and inappropriate, only designed for 50 houses, is a quiet cul de sac and a safe community with children playing in the street.
- Children play on the grassed areas in Swifts View and increased traffic would increase likelihood of accidents.

- Swift Close already congested during school start and end times.
- parking on Swifts View is difficult.
- Already illegal parking on Swifts View.
- How will construction traffic and construction workers get through and where will they park.
- Access should be from Skegby Road if development goes ahead.
- Traffic entering Nuncargate Road is bad.
- Traffic on Derby Road is a big problem.
- Access road would cross busy footpath used by school children.
- Swifts View closed in bad weather.

*Social, community and infrastructure*

- Will increase potential for crime in the area.
- Additional noise from additional traffic.
- Schools and doctors locally are full –no additional infrastructure suggested for the area.
- Detrimental effect on amenity of existing residents.
- Drainage problems already experienced in Swifts View-this will make it worse.

*Open Space and environmental issues*

- Urban growth has a negative effect on environmental green spaces, flora and fauna will suffer terribly.
- Open spaces support wildlife and allows natural drainage-don't build on them.

*Other*

- Only need houses due to excessive population growth, immigration and family breakdown.
- Number of houses provided doesn't justify the upset to existing residents.
- Planning permission refused for residential development in 2004 –why change now.
- Not a fair and reasonable consultation –not enough notices put up (none in Swifts View where access is proposed), no documents sent to householders-Council does not listen to residents, map was misleading.
- Doubts on deliverability due to: access constraints; ransom strip affecting viability; previous planning permission refused.

Responses received relating to Policy supporting text

None.

**Response:**

- The consultation process undertaken for the Local Plan provided for a range of methods for ensuring that people heard about the consultation including radio and press coverage, leaflets and posters, letters to organisations and contact with schools. Whilst the Council recognises that there is always more that can be done the level of responses received shows that there has been widespread interest in the Plan.
- It is recognised that traffic is a substantial issue not just for this site but a number of larger sites. The Highway Authority (Nottinghamshire County Council) had previously indicated that the access to the site had to be via Swifts View which would alleviate one of the main concerns with this site.
- It is acknowledged that the proposed development will result in a loss of countryside. However, the Council's analysis identified that there are insufficient brownfield site to meet the housing requirements and therefore homes will need to be built on Greenfield sites. The land in question is not identified as having special ecological value and the Council has to make difficult decisions in balance the needs for housing against the environment.
- NPPF government guidance requires Councils to provide land for the objectively assessed needs of the local community, this means that sites must be found within the strategy of meeting the housing requirement in or adjoining the urban edges of the settlements in the District.
- An integrated part of planning for sustainable development is taking into account the physical, economic, social and environmental infrastructure necessary to enable the development to progress. The Council has undertaken a Infrastructure Capacity Study and has had meeting with infrastructure providers such as the Education Authority and PCT. The Council is currently working on an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which looks to identify: what infrastructure is required, how it will be provided, where/when is infrastructure needed and when can any constraints be overcome.
- There is now a requirement for any new development to use sustainable drainage systems unless there are substantial reasons to use a conventional system (National Planning Policy Framework and Policy CC3: Flood Risk). This includes, where appropriate, a site specific flood risk assessment to identify any flood hazards and how these will be managed as part of the development proposals. It is anticipated that the time the Local Plan is adopted, a new system will have been introduced, in addition to planning permission, requiring the surface water drainage to be approved by the County Council as the SuDS Approving Body.
- The housing needs of the area have been objectively assessed and are set out in the Housing Technical Paper which provides information on the level of housing required.
- The reason for the previous planning refusal relates to the fact that it is a Greenfield site and there was previously a restriction on development on such sites. It is acknowledged that there are some constraints but these can be mitigated and should not have a significant impact on the delivery of development.

**Changes to the Local Plan**

- No changes are proposed to the allocation of the land as a housing site.

<b>Number of Comments</b>		<b>Number of Respondents</b>	
47		43	
<b>Objection to Policy</b>	<b>Support the Policy</b>		<b>Comment on the Policy</b>
47	0		0

**List of Respondents**

AnonymousX2, Miss S. Styles, S Poxon, Dr S. Abbas, Mr R Stanley, Ms S Haslam, Miss N Bowe, Mrs J English, Miss S Derbyshire, Mrs M Stanley, N&M Lowe, Mr and Mrs Martinez, K Sisson, G. Howell, G. Cirignano, M Tootell, M Willis, L Brown, N Jackson, B Abbas, J Cartledge, S Cartledge, D Buston, J Parker, Miss E Curtis, Mrs J Wilcock, Mr and Mrs Harris, Mrs S Glass, Mrs KJ Hemingray, Mrs A Giles, Mr C Christodoulou, Mr C Smith, Mrs H Davies, Mr & Mrs Yarlett, S Cooke, Mrs P Shaw, Mrs C Wraith, K Shaw, Miss E Kirk, M Lyons, Ms H Puntha, Mrs E Matthews; Oxalis Planning Ltd on behalf of Westerman Homes.

**Policy HG1: Site HG1Si; Rookery Lane Farm, Rookery Lane**

Responses received relating to Policy :

Support

- Site will provide additional services and boost economic growth.

Object

*Impact*

- Site will affect character of the area and is contrary to current local and

national planning policy.

- Development will raise levels of crime in the area.
- Existing property value depreciation.
- Concerns raised about potential impact on neighbouring properties, which have no footings if development is granted.
- Loss of residential amenity particularly privacy and overlooking issues
- Loss of attractive views for existing occupants of properties in the area.
- Building of housing will create disturbance for the existing residents
- Increased traffic will raise congestion, noise and air pollution (in an areas with poor air quality)
- A38 and Alfreton Rd are extremely congested and cannot accommodate further development.

#### *Policy*

- The allocation of housing at Rookery Lane is contrary to proposed policy EV6Sb.
- It is unsustainable to use protected green space within the urban area, should allocate sites on the urban fringe. Fonton Hall Drive, Ashfields Estate and Rowsey Court have all been built these provided Ashfield with sufficient housing stock.
- SHLAA outlines access constraints while SA states it has good access question over robustness of evidence base.
- Would like to see homes built for local people.

#### *Access and Site constraints*

- The access to the site is difficult if not impossible to achieve and would affect highway safety.
- The road has a narrow dog leg at the top which is unable to be widened to provide the necessary width required.
- It would not be possible to widen the road on the industrial site as it is very steep and it would not be possible to remove or move the hedge and a sound proof fence erected on the instructions of the Traffic Commissioner.
- Part of Rookery Lane is owned by residents of No. 1-12.
- Access requires demolition of existing houses.
- Site is unsuitable as it is close to a noisy industrial park.

#### *Economic*

- Raised concerns over financial viability and deliverability of the site. Doubt over whether the site is achievable and deliverable.
- Electricity Pylon on site would have to be moved raising costs.
- Topography of land with steep slopes means fewer houses and access issues in snow and ice.
- Proximity of the industrial/commercial estate adjacent to the subject site will significantly affect the marketability of the land for housing development.

#### *Lack infrastructure*

- Infrastructure to support extensive house building has not been provided.

- There are not sufficient school places in the locality to accommodate additional students.
- Development will put strain on emergency services

#### *Flooding*

- Land is prone to flooding; extensive surface water drainage would be needed.
- Present sewage/drainage systems need to be extended or replaced.

#### *Environment*

- There is natural wildlife on the area, which would be affected and should be protected including bats and great crested newts.
- Loss of farmland. Development should be focused on brownfield sites.
- Ash tree on site should be preserved.
- History of coal mining in the area will raise geological and contamination concerns. There is a history of methane and possible presence of clay in the strata could affect development.

#### *Alternative options*

- Objections sites are equally deliverable and have less level of protection.
- Suggestion of including within the proposals map a larger strategic allocation incorporating HG1Si & EV6sb.

### **Response:**

- Planning for the District must be supported by evidence of what physical, social and environmental infrastructure is needed to enable the development to progress. The Council is currently working on an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which looks to identify: what infrastructure is required, how it will be provided, where/when is infrastructure needed and when any constraints can be overcome. It builds on the Infrastructure Capacity Study, which has already been undertaken by the Council, and examined in broad terms the existing capacity relating to education, health, leisure, emergency services, social services, transport, community and utilities. In addition, a Watercycle Study has been undertaken examining water related issues such as water supply, flooding and sewerage disposal. As an authority we have also had meetings with various infrastructure providers including Severn Trent, The Highway Authority, The Highway Agency, the Coal Authority, the education authority and the PCT. From these meetings no specific issues relating to the broad strategic approach have been identified. However, the comments on the utilities in the area are noted and will be taken up with the relevant service providers.
- The Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment of the sites included liaising with the Highway Authority to identify any general highway issues which would prevent the site being brought forward. If the sites are taken forward then site specific requirements would be considered as part of any

- planning application.
- The value of any residential property is dependent on a number of factors which will include title, the property's characteristics, accommodation, the site, siting qualities and the state of the market. In planning terms there is no right to compensation for new residential development. The planning system has to balance a number of competing economic, social and environmental objectives. The housing figures set out in the Local Plan are based on providing for housing need based on demographic change. This reflects a rising population, people living longer and changing lifestyles with more single occupancy. The evidence identifies that there is a need for more housing and as a planning authority we have no option but to identify sites to meet the anticipated housing need.
  - Neither the Environment Agency Flood Maps nor the Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment has identified any specific flood issues relating to the sites in question. However, as part of any development a requirement is the use of sustainable drainage systems (Policy CC3: Flood Risk). This includes, where appropriate, a site specific flood risk assessment to identify any flood hazards and how these will be managed as part of the development proposals. In addition, it is anticipated that the time the Local Plan is adopted in addition to planning permission, any drainage system for new development of more than one dwelling will require permission from The County Council as the SUDS Approving Body.
  - It is acknowledged that the proposed development will result in a loss of land currently designated an open area within a main urban area as outlined by Policy RC2 of the Ashfield Local Plan Review 2002. However, the Council's analysis identified that there are insufficient brownfield sites to meet the housing requirements and therefore homes will need to be built on Greenfield sites. The land in question is not identified as having special agricultural or ecological value and the Council has to make difficult decisions in balance the needs for housing against the environment. The natural break between Huthwaite and Sutton will be retained under the protection provided by proposed policy EV5.
  - The Council acknowledges the concerns raised in relation to access, topography and site constraints and the knock on impact on deliverability of this site within the plan period. Paragraph 173 of the NPPF states that careful attention to viability and costs are required in the plan making process and the Council will analyse and seek further information on the issues raised. The landowner has appointed a transport consultant to undertake detailed assessment as necessary to provide evidence in regard to the deliverability of the site for housing development,
  - The Council acknowledge the observations and representations received in relation to the Sustainability Appraisal. With regard to the assessment of the residential site allocations, the Council is in the process of reviewing and updating the appraisal in light of comments and information received through the preferred options consultation stage. A revised sustainability appraisal will go out at the next stage of public consultation with the publication draft of the Local Plan for further comments and representations.
  - It is acknowledged that some of the proposed development sites will result in a loss of countryside/green belt and designated open space. However,

the Council's analysis identified that there are insufficient brownfield site (including derelict sites) to meet the housing requirements and therefore homes will need to be built on Greenfield sites. The Council has to make difficult decisions in balance the needs for housing against the environment.

### **Changes to the Local Plan**

- No changes are proposed to the allocation of the land as a housing site.

Number of Comments		Number of Respondents	
111		149	
Objection to Policy	Support the Policy	Comment on the Policy	
107	3	1	

### **List of Respondents**

Wayne & Ann Allen; Kerry Knowles; Mrs Debra Wharton; Mr David Ross; Ms Yvonne Shaw; Mr & Mrs Gibson; Mr & Mrs Kelsall; Mr & Mrs Connell; Mr & Mrs Berry; Mr Dean Reynolds; R A Sharpe; Mrs Linda Lakin; David, Joshua & Linda Reynolds; Mr & Mrs Ford; Paul and Anne Hemstock; Mr & Mrs Wiggins; Mr & Mrs Poole; Mr & Mrs Wright; Mrs Sylvia Hardwick; Mr Kenneth Payne; Mr Ryan Neary; Mrs Jepson; Adam Brown; Mrs Valerie Demiral; Mr Ronald Marriot; Michael Wade; Kenneth, Lesley & Julia Steeples; Richard Newton; Mr Wayne Jeffs; Miss Terri-Ann Eyre; Carl Alton; Mr & Mrs Alan & Josephine Siddall; Ms June Hudson; Mr & Mrs Mayhew; Mr & Mrs Michael and Kathleen; Mrs Shirley Wiffen; Miss Charlotte McPhail; Caroline Bird; Carl Alton; Caroline Bird; Kelly Wright; Mrs Irene Gasgoine; Deborah & Paul Thompson; Mrs Carly Watson; Mrs Charlotte Henton; Mrs Kathleen Allatt; Mr & Mrs Fisher; Mr & Mrs Wallace; Mr & Mrs Hopkinsin; Mr & Mrs Coleman; Mrs Mary Sheasby; Mr & Mrs Mayhew; Miss Elaine Abbott; Mr & Mrs Barnes; Christian Wakelin; Mr Martin Ward; Mrs Kathleen Poole; Mr & Mrs Wiggins; Mr & Mrs Wiggins; Miss Janine Vardy; Miss Helen Brewster; Mrs Fay Williams; Mr M Harby; Mr & Mrs Ford; Claire Bailey; Elaine Bird; Andrew Clark; Mr & Mrs Brown; Mrs Brenda Reynolds; Mr & Mrs Brown; Mr Alexander Brewster; Mrs H Newbury; Miss M Saunders; Ms Jill West; Mr Stuart Jones; Mr Darren Ward; Miss Charlotte McPhail; Mrs Shirley Wiffen; Mr



S Swift; Denis Jones; Ms Christina White; Mrs Jill Brewster; Mr David Davies; Mr John Asling; Mr & Mrs Hartwell; Mr Robert Carlin; Miss Frances Ryan; Mr Roy Slater; Paul and Anne Hemstock; Miss Kirsty Evans; Linda Swann; Mrs Linda Lakin; Mr & Mrs Brown; Mrs Sylvia Hardwick; Mrs Catherine Cox; Mr Ansell; Ian & Ruth Shepherd; Anna, Georgina, Lorna, Janet; Mr & Mrs Poole; Mr Clifford Speed; Mr Clifford Speed; Mrs Helen Wood; Mrs Helen Wood; Mr William Bowker;; Mr Rob Hughes, Ian Baseley Associates for Miss Esther Smith; Mr Christopher Dwan, RPS Newark; Miss Sarah Challands; Mr Michael Rich, Beverly Howard, Mr, Mrs & Adam Brown; Oxalis Planning Ltd on behalf of Westerman Homes

## **Policy HG1: Sites HG1Sj, HG1Sk and HG1SI, Fackley**

Responses received relating to Policy :

### **Sites HG1Sj, HG1Sk and HG1SI**

#### **Object**

##### *Lack infrastructure*

- Sewerage infrastructure is inadequate as it already floods when there is heavy rainfall.
- The poor public transport system means the site does not meet the sustainable transport criteria.
- The proposals will increase road traffic significantly on an already congested and busy road. Questions were raised on highway safety due to increased traffic.
- Questions raised over main utilities. Stated that it was not unusual for the electrical supply in the area to be subject to power-cuts in periods of adverse weather. The mains gas pipeline ends just around the corner from the Carnarvon Arms.
- Lack of local services in terms of schools, shops, doctors dentists, bus services to support an additional 55 homes.
- Concerns raised regarding the impact from the dwellings arising from parking on roads and access on to existing roads due to existing parking issues and volume of traffic.

##### *Economic*

- There are already new and existing houses which cannot be sold.
- Housing should be built on sites at Sutton/ Kirkby.

- The Council should be building affordable housing so how does building in Teversal, a place where house prices tend to be higher, aid this process.
- The subsoil in this area is solid clay to a depth of approximately three metres, with the result that the ground is often waterlogged, and is likely to require considerable land drainage. This will also impact on build costs due to the depth foundations to account for this.
- It would be detrimental to build on the Fackley site, in relation to the Trails to Tibshelf. Tourists and locals use these trails on a regular basis and to alter the feel and countryside views from the trail by adding 13 homes here.

#### *Flooding*

- Whenever a substantial amount of rain falls the backs of the houses on Tibshelf Road flood and the bottom of Meden Bank also floods.
- Concerns expressed that the land is low lying and will this result in risks from flooding.

#### *Impact*

- The proposals will bring significant changes to the rural environment and loss of countryside.
- The proposals will have an adverse impact on green infrastructure. Silverhill wood and the Teversal and Skegby Trails are attractive for walking, cycling and horse riding. This development will spoil what is an attractive place to visit.
- Open breaks should be left within the villages rather than build on all open areas between the Carnarvon Arms and the Sir John Cockle public houses.
- The proposals will have an adverse impact on the area's history and character.
- Land is current protected as Countryside in the Ashfield Local Plan Review 2002 and as set out in Policy EV1 it should remain protected.
- Development should be on sites within the existing urban area and only break into greenfield sites where there is no alternative and where the development can be contained within natural boundaries which act as a barrier to development creep. There is no natural boundary beyond these parcels that could restrict future development on surrounding land.
- Fackley is a distinct community within the Teversal area and is essentially a rural environment. The two parcels of land will allow 43 extra dwellings to be built which will almost double the overall number of dwellings in the immediate locality. In the context of the area it is vastly out of proportion and will substantially alter the character of the area to its detriment.
- Lack of knowledge of the consultation
- Local people are not aware of the proposals. Because of their importance and the impact a display should have been undertaken in Teversal Scout Hut so that the local population could acquaint themselves with the possible impact and formulate their comments accordingly.

### **Specific to Silverhill Lane**

#### Support

- Support for site HG1SJ being allocated. This is a reflection of progress and without development much of the area would still be blacked top spoil heaps. The improvements undertaken to the green infrastructure and local businesses help to contribute towards the local economy.
- Support for the development for housing on Silverhill Lane but including an objection in that it does not allocate land in the parties ownership.

#### Object

- The proposal is a clear breach of five of ADC's own objectives within its new Local Plan: S05 - Safer Communities, S09 - Reducing the Need to Travel by Car, SO10 - Environmentally Responsible, SO11 - Natural Assets, SO 13 - Character of the District.
- Inappropriate site for development due to impact on setting of Hardwick Hall (Mott McDonaldson Study).

#### *Economic*

- It would take away the 'open countryside feel" in this area, and this may impact on local businesses if visitor numbers decreases due to the proposed site being used.

#### *Loss of countryside*

- The development on Silverhill Lane will form a ribbon development which will result in an obtrusive finger piercing into the countryside in an area which attracts visitors into the area.
- Disturbance of wildlife.
- It would have an adverse impact on the wider environment including the conservation area.
- The countryside at this point has also been declared by a planning inspector (1999 - when refusing an appeal for just five dwellings parallel to the now proposal) as 'particularly valuable" in landscape terms.
- The site will be visually intrusive and will result in an adverse impact on Silverhill Wood.
- Adverse impact on the openness and character of the countryside.

#### *Traffic*

- Access to Silverhill Lane is poor and it will result in more traffic onto a narrow winding lane.
- Silverhill Lane is not on a bus route.

#### *Design*

- Concerns expressed that in the current economic climate design would be poor looking to cut costs. However, this is a sensitive area between in the setting of Hardwick Hall and the Teversal Conservation Area.
- Concern expressed about the design of any development integrating with the existing buildings on Silverhill Lane.
- Current designated as 'Countryside' and this designation should not be

changed as any development will change the character of the area.

- Suggested there are Bell Pits on the site.
- Should be looking to develop brown field site rather than Green Belt.

*Lack infrastructure*

- Services are poor with inadequate infrastructure
- Drainage is poor in the area.
- No local services available such as shops, post offices etc so the proposals will increase car journeys.

**Specific to Tibshelf Road (HG1Sk)**

Object

- Inappropriate location for development due to lack of public transport.

**Specific to Molyneux Farm (HG1Si)**

Object

- The site does not adjoin the urban boundary and development would affect the gap between Fackley and Stanton Hill. It is considered to be unsuitable on that basis.

Responses received relating to Policy supporting text

None.

**Response:**

- Any planning applications submitted today will be considered on the basis of the National Planning Policy Framework and the Ashfield Local Plan Review, 2002 which designated land around Silverhill Lane as part of the Countryside. Policies and land designations are considered as part of the review of the Local Plan of which this consultation forms part. Changes to policies and allocations are required to reflect changing national planning policy and the evidence relating to the social, economic and environmental demands and requirements relating to the District. If the Policies in the Local Plan are taken forward and adopted they will form the basis of determining planning applications.
- The site in question is not in Green Belt but is a greenfield site. Green Belt is specifically designated land which is subject to national planning policy set out in the National Planning Policy Framework. Greenfields simply means that the land is typically agricultural or open space which has not seen any development for a substantial period of time.
- A core principle of the National Planning Policy Framework is the reuse of previously developed land. However, national guidance no longer sets out a national target for at least 60% of new housing to be built on 'brownfield' sites. The Local Plan is based on an analysis of what brownfield sites can be brought forward for housing. It proposes the development of a number of brownfield sites, such as the former textile factory at Unwin Road, for

development. This is set in the context that approximately 66 acres (27 ha) of former employment land in the District has been developed for housing since 2001. However, given the amount of housing required, we have insufficient 'brownfield' sites to meet the housing requirement. Therefore, the Council has no option but to locate new homes on green field sites.

- The Coal Authority has been consulted on the Local Plan and no issues have been identified with the sites in question.
- There is no evidence to suggest that the number of dwellings proposed on the three sites will have a detrimental impact on the economy of the area. There is some evidence from studies into rural areas that additional development helps to support local services and facilities.
- It is not anticipated that the proposals will impact on the conservation area at Teversal.
- Planning for the District must be supported by evidence of what physical, social and environmental infrastructure is needed to enable the development to progress. The Council is currently working on an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which looks to identify: what infrastructure is required, how it will be provided, where/when is infrastructure needed and when can any constraints be overcome? It builds on the Infrastructure Capacity Study, which has already been undertaken by the Council, and examined in broad terms the existing capacity relating to education, health, leisure, emergency services, social services, transport, community and utilities. In addition, a Watercycle Study has been undertaken examining water related issues such as water supply, flooding and sewerage disposal. As an authority we have also had meetings with various infrastructure providers including Severn Trent, The Highway Authority, The Highway Agency, the Coal Authority, the education authority and the PCT. From these meetings no specific issues relating to the broad strategic approach have been identified. However, the comments on the utilities in the area are noted and will be taken up with the relevant service providers.
- The Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment of the sites included liaising with the Highway Authority to identify any general highway issues which would prevent the site being brought forward. If the sites are taken forward and site specific requirements would be considered as part of any planning application.
- Neither the Environment Agency Flood Maps nor the Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment has identified any specific flood issues relating to the sites in question. However, as part of any development a requirement is the use of sustainable drainage systems (Policy CC3: Flood Risk). This includes, where appropriate, a site specific flood risk assessment to identify any flood hazards and how these will be managed as part of the development proposals. In addition, it is anticipated that the time the Local Plan is adopted in addition to planning permission, any drainage system for new development of more than one dwelling will require permission from The County Council as the SuDS Approving Body.
- As part of legislative requirements, the Council has an adopted Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) which sets out how, who, when and by what methods the Council will undertake public consultations on the Local Plan. The consultation process undertaken for the Local Plan provided for a range

of methods for ensuring that people heard about the consultation including radio and press coverage, letters to parties on the Council's Local Plan's database, leaflets and posters, letters to organisations, site notices for new proposed housing allocations and contact with schools. The Council has to make a balanced judgement between the cost of any form of consultation method and trying to ensure that people are aware of the proposals.

- Including dwellings on Silverhill Lane and Fackley Road to the River Meden, there are approximately 192 existing dwellings. Based on an estimate of 55 properties on the three proposed allocation this will not result in a doubling of the existing number of dwellings in Fackley.
- Although the SHLAA report acknowledges the findings of the Mott McDonaldson Study with regard to HG1Sj, the Council has not adopted it as a supplementary planning policy document. The Council does not consider that development on the site would affect the setting of Hardwick Hall.
- The NPPF recognises that development in less populated settlements can help to support and retain local services. The site is within 250 metres of a bus stop and the increase in population in Fackley will help to maintain services within the area. As such, the allocation is consistent with the aims of the NPPF.

### **Changes to the Local Plan**

- No changes are proposed to the allocation of the land as housing sites.

<b>Number of Comments</b>		<b>Number of Respondents</b>
<b>24</b>		<b>24</b>
<b>Objection to Policy</b>	<b>Support the Policy</b>	<b>Comment on the Policy</b>
<b>21</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>-</b>

**List of Respondents**

Mr John Brunt; Mr C Woods; Mr & Mrs K & G Hall; Mr & Mrs J.E & S.E Bunting; R Davidson; Jane Devonshire; John Evans; D & J McLean; C Hewitt; John G Tasker; Susan Mohammed; Steve Shaw; Mrs Clare Marshall; J.Webster & L.Ives; Mrs B Weeks; John Marples; Julia Shaw; M W and S Vardy; Vicky & Peter Swaisland; Mr Adrian Woodhouse; Mr Victor Lawley; Mr and Mrs David Hardy; M. Spencer; and Oxalis Planning Ltd on behalf of Westerman Homes

**Policy HG1: Site HG1Ss; West of Beck Lane, Sutton**

Responses received relating to Policy :

Support

- The allocation is a highly sustainable site and it's development would represent sustainable development in terms of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Object

*Impact*

- The proposed development would have an adverse effect on the nature and historic character of Skegby as a village.
- The Council should not be building houses simply because the government says houses should be built.
- The allocations at West of Beck Lane, Sutton and North West of Kings Mill Hospital Sutton, combined with the Penniment Farm, Abbot Road, Mansfield permission will significantly reduce the open break aspect in this location. It taken forward, the countryside to the north and east should be considered as an important open break with additional protection such as EV5/6.
- The site has a significant open outlook towards Teversal and Hardwick Hall. The development of the site will have a negative impact on this natural open aspect.
- The area is already subject to anti social behaviour e.g. young boys on motor bikes on the fields at the back of the properties which the proposals would increase.
- Loss of the views of open fields and countryside.
- If proposals like this go ahead it will not be long before Ashfield and Mansfield become one. The open countryside act as a break between the

built up area of Mansfield and Skegby

- Skegby is a village in a rural setting. Settlements are slowly becoming joined up to other villages and towns i.e. no fields left between Kirkby and Sutton and not many between Skegby and Mansfield.
- Additional traffic will result in increased air pollution for residents off the main roads.
- The Sustainable Appraisal has not been scored correctly for the site.
- The proposals will have an adverse impact on the security, privacy and decent living conditions for existing residents.
- Ashfield feels and looks a deprived and poor area. The council estates and town centre are very unattractive and business is at an all time low. There is no necessity for more housing when there is no work, no businesses or economic stability?.
- The proposal conflict with other policies in the Local Plan including Policy SPKS3 for employment as car transport will be essential, Policy EV3 & CP6 as it will result in the loss of greenfield environment & landscape, Policy SP1 for Sustainable Development as it will not improve the economic, social and environmental conditions in the area, Policy SD8 for highway safety & good access and Policy SP3.
- Large housing developments create issues associated with hooliganism, vandalism, graffiti, anti-social behaviour, crime, burglary, motor bikes, and skate boarding.

#### *Economic*

- There is no requirement for the development as there are thousands of houses for sale or to rent on the market or existing development sites for which there is no demand.
- Brownfield sites should be developed first.
- Uncompleted buildings sites must be considered and used first.
- It is unsustainable for local employment given the need will be to travel from the area to find work.
- Where will people occupying any new houses get jobs?
- Empty homes should be utilised before developing greenfield sites.
- It will result in a loss of value in properties in the area.
- There are undeveloped industrial areas with empty units and waste ground which should be used for housing development rather than the site in question.
- Homes should not be compulsory purchased for access onto the site.
- The site is remote from employment opportunities and there are other sites in Kirkby Folly Road where housing could be located closer to employment opportunities.
- Development should be within the centre of Sutton.
- Resources should be spent on improving Sutton Town Centre rather than on developing the housing site.

#### *Lack infrastructure*

- The site is unsustainable as it is not located close to local amenities.
- There is a lack of infrastructure to support the development in terms of



poor bus service, no schools or lack of school places, no or limited shops, limited pubs, no or limited locally available doctors and other health services and one post office.

- It location will encourage the use of the car rather than alternative transport means.
- There are issues supplying enough gas, electricity, water etc for existing properties without developing more houses.
- Adjoining roads including Omberley Avenue, Chancery Close, Pavilion Gardens, Court Field Rd, Hardwick Ave and Pleasley Road are too narrow and unsuitable to provide access to the proposed allocation.
- There are safety concern with Pleasley Road as it is a single width road with in parts no pavement.
- There is a lack of public transport to serve the development with no buses available within a 10 min walking distance.

#### *Traffic*

- The MARR route is already congested at this point with queues at peak times.
- The proposal will result in substantial congestion at the junction between Dalestorth Road, Mansfield Road, Beck Lane, Skegby Lane, and Kings Mill Road.
- There are road safety issues as there have been accidents at the Fox and Crown crossroads and Dalestorth Road and increased traffic would result in additional accidents occurring.
- There are already difficulties on Mansfield Road, Skegby in both accessing the road from side streets and in backing out onto the road from residential properties due to the volume of traffic.
- Traffic parking on Mansfield Road, Skegby is already a problem and will result in increased congestion from the additional traffic from the proposed development.
- The sites affect on traffic at the A38/B6018 junction must be assessed before confirming an allocation of this site. Reduce capacity to 401 (from 432).

#### *Flooding*

- Beck Lane floods after longer periods of rainfall.
- The area is prone to heavy flooding during persistent rainfall, pointing to inadequate drainage and surface water flows from the terrain.

#### *Environment*

- It is a green field sites which should not be used for development.
- The sites should not be developing as it is in the Green Belt.
- High graded agricultural land is important to meet the ever increasing demand for food and should be protected for this purpose.
- It will result in the loss of local wildlife and fauna.
- The hedgerows are ancient hedgerows and species rich which contain much important flora and fauna and should be protected. All the hedgerows are above 30m in length and are above 100 years old.

- It will result in the loss of country side in the local area which is importance and valued by local residents and is used as a recreational facility for walking.
- The proposal will increase the carbon footprint due to occupiers travelling to work in their cars.
- The proposal will increased pollution caused by increase of traffic, noise pollution and light pollution which are detrimental to the environment and living standards.
- The proposal impact negatively on the adjacent SSSI off Mansfield Lane.
- In the area there is also a large population of bats which would be severely affected by noise and light pollution if the proposed development is taken forward.
- Concern expressed regarding the loss of public footpaths.

#### *Design*

- The mix of housing should be addressed if the site proceeds so that low buildings adjoin existing properties with gardens to maintain privacy.
- Opposition to affordable housing in the development.
- Concerns over the impact during any development in terms of interference with local resident's normal activities, additional medical complaints, noise and dust.
- Concerns expressed regarding access to the site. The MARR is already congested and backed up to standstill at peak hours. Alternative access roads including Pleasley Road and Mansfield Lane are not designed for heavy traffic use or pedestrian use.
- Loss of privacy if houses are built too close to the existing bungalows.

#### *Alternative sites*

- A number of respondents set out that a better place for this development would be opposite the Sutton Parkway railway station on Kirkby Folly Road with its bus and rail links.
- The area off the MARR running up towards Cauldwell was suggested as an alternative as it has already been set aside for development.
- The Council should be developing small pockets of houses such as Pavilion Gardens where traffic and people can integrate rather than large sites such as Beck Lane.
- Housing should be built at Pleasley (Chesterfield Rd, Clarence St & Hillmoor St area) and also off the MARR route adjacent to Water Lane.
- An objection was made in relation to the site as there are alternative sites which are considered to be wholly suitable for inclusion, (Land off Gilchrist/St Andrews Street, Skegby and Vere Avenue, Sutton-in-Ashfield).

#### *Consultation*

- A number of respondents raised that there was a lack of knowledge of the consultation.
- Suggested that everyone should have been sent a letter regarding the proposals.
- Comments that the information on the consultation was difficult to access

on the website.

- Suggested by a number of respondents that the previous Spatial Plan 2 years ago was kept quiet with only 20 to 30 responses were received.

**Response:**

- Please refer to the responses to Policy HG1 in relation to the approach to Housing Requirements, Land for Economic Development, Empty Homes Affordable Homes and the Consultation Process Adopted.
- The site in question is not in the Green Belt but is a greenfield site. Green Belt is specifically designated land which is subject to national planning policy set out in the National Planning Policy Framework. Greenfield means that the land is typically agricultural or open space which has not seen any development for a substantial period of time. Ideally the Council would prefer to utilise brownfield land for development and a core principle of the National Planning Policy Framework is the reuse of previously developed land. The Local Plan Preferred Approach is based on an analysis of what brownfield sites can be brought forward for housing and what sites are required to provide for a supply of land for economic development and the provision of jobs. The Local Plan proposes the development of a number of brownfield sites, such as the former textile factory at Unwin Road. However, it needs to be borne in mind that approximately 66 acres (27 ha) of former employment land in the District has been developed for housing since 2001. Given the housing requirements there is insufficient 'brownfield' sites and therefore it is necessary to bring greenfield sites to meet the housing requirement.
- It is recognised that traffic is a substantial issue not just for Beck Lane but a number of larger sites. A Transport Assessment was undertaken in 2010 based on the requirements of an increase in by 11,200 dwellings. Additional work is currently being undertaken to examine the impact of the housing and employment land allocations proposed and measures necessary to mitigate the effects of the growth.
- An integrated part of planning for sustainable development is taking into account the physical, economic, social and environmental infrastructure necessary to enable the development to progress. The Council has undertaken an Infrastructure Capacity Study and has had meetings with infrastructure providers such as the Education Authority and PCT. The Council is currently working on an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which looks to identify: what infrastructure is required, how it will be provided, where/when is infrastructure needed and when can any constraints be overcome.
- The Council evidence base and meetings with infrastructure providers has not identified and strategic issues in relation to utility services to Beck Lane.
- The Council has regular meetings with the County Council as the Education Authority. We have been provided with information on the capacity of

schools and the requirements of both primary and secondary schools for the District into the future.

- No determination has been made on where access to the site will be undertaken from and additional discussions are being undertaken with the Highway Authority. However, the Council does not anticipate compulsory purchasing any properties to gain access to the site.
- Any development is a requirement is the use of sustainable drainage systems unless there are substantial reasons to use a conventional system (National Planning Policy Framework and Policy CC3: Flood Risk). This includes, where appropriate, a site specific flood risk assessment to identify any flood hazards and how these will be managed as part of the development proposals. It is anticipated that the time the Local Plan is adopted, a new system will have been introduced, in addition to planning permission, requiring the surface water drainage to be approved by the County Council as the SuDS Approving Body.
- It is acknowledged that the proposed development will result in a loss of countryside. However, the Council's analysis identified that there are insufficient brownfield sites to meet the housing requirements and therefore homes will need to be built on Greenfield sites. The land in question is not identified as having special ecological value and the Council has to make difficult decisions in balance the needs for housing against the environment.
- The date of hedges is far from simple. In the 1960s Hopper's hypothesis stated that in every 30 yards of hedge, every species represents one century of age. However, this hypothesis was not confirmed by subsequent empirical test. Dating hedges needs to take into account various factors. As part of any planning application the value of a hedge will be assessed and if considered to be an ancient hedgerow it is likely that it will be protected as part of any planning permission.
- It is acknowledged that currently the site is not within 800m or 10 minutes walking of local services other than a post office.
- Any development is likely to increase artificial light. Design guidance is available from the Institution of Lighting Engineers "Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Obtrusive Light" on how lighting can be designed to minimise the upward spread of light near to and above the horizontal. Light pollution can be reduced by utilising High Pressure Sodium Lighting for street lights which I understand is the light source favoured by many environmentalists and astronomers as the light output is so well controlled when used in flat glass luminaires.
- The Council is not aware of evidence that new development sites developed by the private sector result in an increase in anti social behaviour.
- The value of any residential property is dependent on a number of factors which will include title, the properties characteristics, accommodation, the site, sitting qualities and the state of the market. Only a local valuer could identify the potential impact of the proposed development on the value of your property. However, in planning terms there is no right to compensation for new residential development. The planning system has to balance a number of competing economic, social and environmental objectives. The housing figures set out in the Local Plan are based on providing for housing need based on demographic change. This reflects a rising population,

people living longer and changing lifestyles with more single occupancy. The evidence identifies that there is a need for more housing and as a planning authority we have no option but to identify sites to meet the anticipated housing need.

- The planning system has to balance a number of competing economic, social and environmental objectives. The Council does take into account the economic and other benefits of the best and most valuable agricultural land but this also has to be considered against the need for housing in reaching a conclusion on this issue.
- The site off the MARR at Cauldwell Road (Prologis Park) has been assessed by independent chartered surveyors as one of the best sites from a market perspective for this purpose. Prologis Park, MARR has planning permission for employment uses and has been laid out as a site for economic development. The site is a high quality employment site, which has an excellent frontage onto MARR. It forms a natural extension to the well established Oakham Business Park providing opportunity for businesses to purchase either service plots or bring forward floorspace on a design and build basis. It has been assessed by independent chartered surveyors as one of the best sites in Ashfield from a market perspective for this purpose. If allocated for other purposes the Council would be faced with finding an additional 20 ha of land (approximately) to meet the anticipated demand for economic development. From a housing aspect, there are a number of issues with the site in that: there is a potentially conflicting use to the north east of the site in the Oakham Business Park, the site is isolated in terms of pedestrian access to the wider area and from local facilities.
- There is not a SSSI close to the proposed allocation. A SINC site, which is a local rather than national nature designation, is located at Woodhouse Lane Quarry (94355) adjacent to the proposed allocation. The land is identified as a SINC due to the calcareous grasslands in the former quarry.
- A footpath (Sutton FP No1) runs to the north-west corner of the proposed allocation. If taken forward the site design would need to take account of retaining a footpath link.
- The Ashfield Transport Study Update has identified a requirement for highway improvements. The Council is working with the Highway Authority to identify a package of mitigation measures. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan will incorporate the transport requirements for each site.
- The proposals for housing in the Local Plan include smaller sites. However, there are insufficient smaller sites to meet the housing need.
- The proposal for the Kirkby Folly Road sustainable urban extension (SUE) in the Core Strategy 2010 was highly influenced by the requirements set out in the Regional Spatial Strategy. A further key consideration was the ability to deliver greater infrastructure/service provision. However, it was recognised that the SUE's at Kirkby-in-Ashfield and Sutton-in-Ashfield would have potentially significantly negative impacts on biodiversity and green infrastructure. There was little support from the local community in general and considerable opposition from the very local communities for the SUEs at Kirkby-in-Ashfield or Sutton-in-Ashfield. Subsequently, it has also been recognised in research that the prospect for bringing forward large SUE

sites in the near future is limited due to the cost of delivery including infrastructure, environmental credentials, affordable housing and other Section 106/CIL requirements which at the present time can outweigh the current value of schemes. Following the 2010 consultation on the Core Strategy, there have been fundamental changes in the approach to planning through the Localism Act 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework, March 2012 (NPPF). The Act gives powers to abolish regional spatial strategies but the NPPF requires Council to “boost significantly the supply of housing” (NPPF para 47) using objectively assessed needs for housing. It also stresses that viability and deliverability are key issues in planning. In weighing up various considerations the Council determined that, in meeting the requirements for homes, the most appropriate strategic approach is to take forward a larger number of smaller sites around the urban edges of the towns to deliver development more quickly. The sites allocated were in general those which scored best on the Sustainability Appraisal and which would be able to come forward in the plan period.

- The comments that were only 20 to 30 responses were received to the Core Strategy Consultation, March 2010 is incorrect. 1092 responses to the consultation were received by the Council.
- The Council is reviewing the Sustainable Appraisal in relation to the comments and information received through the Preferred Approach consultation.

### **Changes to the Local Plan**

- No changes are proposes to the allocation of the land as a housing site.

<b>Number of Comments</b>		<b>Number of Respondents</b>	
<b>149</b>		<b>124</b>	
<b>Objection to Policy</b>	<b>Support the Policy</b>	<b>Comment on the Policy</b>	
<b>144</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	

**List of Respondents**

B.Weston; Mr R Routledge for Mansfield District Council; Mr Charles and Mrs Kathleen Wright (2 comments); Mr & Mrs J Redfern; Mr Michael Randall; Mr & Mrs R Elliott; Mrs Pauline Alsop; S & W Sykes; Mr & Mrs J R Brewster; S Oliver; J Lowe; Mr & Mrs J.A Karakurt (4 comments); Hugh Nicoll (22 comments); Mrs Caroline Quin; Mr & Mrs N Crofts; Mr John C Ward; E Hutchinson; Ms Ruth Norman; Mr and Ms R & P Hallam; Ms Teresa Jackson; MC Allen; Mr John Barrow; P.Bustin; J Wordley; Mr & Mrs R Elliott; T Renshaw; N Cooke; Mr J Oakes; Mr & Mrs S & M McCamdless; Adrian Pitchford; Helen Orwin; Mr & Mrs T Wesley; S & J Radford; Joe Poismans; Pam Shelton; Ms Sandra Kirton; Mr David Caunt; Mrs Valerie Caunt; Mr Hall; Mrs J McGinney; Mr & Mrs D Radford; Ms Sarah Reditt; Y & K Daniels; Mr & Mrs Smith; Mr J Bacon; Sandra Stringfellow; Mrs Carolyn Brown; Mr Ivan Brown; Mrs Barbara Mee; Mr WD Shaw; J & A Dare; John Dring; Mr & Mrs L Shaw; Steve Goodgroves; Stuart Stone; Mr & Mrs Wilson; Ms Marie Moore; Mrs Noreen Bustin; Ms Angela Ludlam; Stephen Whitehead; Ken Waterfield; Neil Turk; Mr.S.Street; Mr David Raybould; Mr Brian Millett; Mr & Mrs R Elliott; Mr Trevor Marsh; Mr C Clay; Mr & Mrs J Redfern; Michelle Hardy; Mr B & G Wardle; Mr Alfred Peter Thorpe; Mr Paul Earnshaw; Mr & Mrs A & A Stokes; Mrs Beryl Anthony; Jean, Peter and Joanne Green; Mr. James Kenneth Draycott; R & B Bull; Mrs Irene Redfern; Mrs C Bartle; K Lee; Mrs M Ford; Iona Nicoll; Mr P Nicoll; A Keeling; Joanne Morley; Mr M Fisher; Mrs C Bartle; Mrs Karen Wright; Mr Rob Hallam; D Bramley; Mr & Mrs C Hallam; Mr and Mrs Mannix; Mrs J.M Caunt; A V Holmes; Mr & Ms Paul & Kay Buttery; Mrs Michelle West; Mr & Mrs Ian and Mary Dyer (100); Mr & Mrs M.K Adams; Mr & Mrs S.J Szubert; Mr & Mrs S & J Payne; Mr and Mrs L L Fox; Mr and Mrs A F & J E Oneill; Annette Holmes; Mr Ross Brown; Mr Douglas Smith; Mrs M Pritchard; Carol & Adrian Bennett; Mr K Wardle; Mr and Mrs G Bircumshaw; Mr and Mrs R and M Facer; J Barratt; Mr & Mrs C Shaw; B Weston; N Cooke; Mr & Mrs Andrew and Jane Wilson; Mr Aaron Smith, Caldecotte Consultants for Scottish & Newcastle PLC; Mr R.Fletcher, Ian Baseley Associates for Millward, Shaw & Webster; Mr Paul Stone, Signet Planning for Peveril Homes; Sutton North Labour Party (with 6 attached response with no contact details or names provided); Mr David Swain; and J.Mathews; Oxalis Planning Ltd on behalf of Westerman Homes.

## Policy HG1: Site HG1Sv; Rushley Farm

### Responses received relating to Policy :

#### Object:

##### *Contrary to strategic approach of plan*

- Contrary to the plan strategic objective as worded as not adjacent to the urban areas in the strategic policy-if that policy modified to include Mansfield then it would be in accordance with the policy
- NPPF seeks to prevent urban sprawl and protect green belt
- Local people have been refused planning permission for small scale improvements due to countryside policies-therefore this site should not be allocated as is hypocritical
- Contradicts policy SPKS3
- The site is remote from Ashfield and brings no gain to Ashfield.
- Over 1Km from the town centre therefore isolated
- The development will lead to loss of business from Ashfield and Sutton to Mansfield.
- The proposal contradicts policy SPK3 para 5.21 as the land to the south of the MARR would not be open countryside.
- Site acts as green area separating towns and villages of the district from Mansfield-would alter the character of the area and create traffic problems
- Contrary to the vision as not adjacent to existing urban areas, no infrastructure, wouldn't reduce the need to travel by car and would destroy natural assets and would change character of the area completely.
- Not a sustainable proposal as it is an urban extension of Mansfield only-doesn't help the housing needs of Ashfield district
- Do we really need more houses and if so use unoccupied and derelict property

##### *Open countryside and farming land:*

- Not a brown field site and is destruction of the countryside.
- Good quality agricultural land and close to area of special bio diversity
- Will swallow up whole swathes of the open countryside.
- There is ample brown field and infill development opportunities including derelict sites, quasi industrial buildings eg Prologis site
- Shortage of land for food production so proposal makes no sense

##### *Infrastructure and flooding*

- Will cause flooding onto the A60 and Thieves Lane
- No infrastructure to support this development
- . Remote from existing infrastructure such as local shops, schools, bus services and health provision.
- No facilities for young people nearby, no schools, doctors etc-would rely on Mansfield for facilities.



*Traffic.*

- The site is separated from the Lindhurst development proposal by the A60 and this development will add to severe congestion.
- Nottinghamshire county council are the owners of the site-they can't produce an independent traffic survey as they are a vested interest-need an independent traffic assessment
- Would create traffic congestion on the MARR
- With the additional development at Mansfield sand quarry and the Lindhurst development, these three will lead to traffic congestion which will be catastrophic.
- Increase in traffic noise for existing residents

*Landscape and biodiversity*

- Detrimental effect on landscape, protected species and habitats including nightjar breeding and nesting ground at Thieves Wood, sand lizards and cowslips.
- Need to protect countryside and habitats
- Green buffer between Mansfield and Harlow Wood is essential-as provides a sense of space and leisure and enables a sense of community
- Loss of hedgerows, public footpaths, fields
- The current landscape and views are worth protecting and is a natural productive and environmentally rich buffer zone.
- SPA nearby needs protecting and this site should be retained as a countryside area.
- Site abuts an area known to support breeding Nightjar (and potentially also breeding Woodlark), and as such development would have to be very carefully planned to avoid impacts on these species.

*Community participation.*

- Lack of knowledge of the consultation
- Local people have consistently opposed the Lindhurst development proposals –this is also opposed. As the Lindhurst development may not get built then this proposal is not realistic.

Comments:

- Development should be phased to the end of the plan period to ensure integration into the Lindhurst development.

Responses received relating to Policy supporting text

None.

**Response:**

- Please refer to the responses to Policy HG1, PJ2 and HG3 respectively in relation to the approach to Housing Requirements, Land for Economic Development, Empty Homes and Affordable Homes.

- The NPPF requires Council's to provide sufficient housing land to meet the objectively assessed needs of the local community. The Council has set out the requirement in the Housing technical paper and has adopted a strategic approach to the allocation of land for housing. There is insufficient brown field and infill land to meet the housing requirement and therefore the plan sets out the allocation of land for housing on sites that are adjacent to existing urban areas. In this regard this site is adjacent to the urban area of Mansfield and will be integrated into the urban area through the development of the proposed adjoining Lindhurst development.
- The site in question is not in Green Belt but is a greenfield site. Green Belt is specifically designated land which is subject to national planning policy set out in the National Planning Policy Framework. Greenfields simply means that the land is typically agricultural or open space which has not seen any development for a substantial period of time.
- It is recognised that traffic is a substantial issue not just for Rushley farm but a number of larger sites. A Transport Assessment was undertaken in 2010 based on the requirements of an increase in by 11,200 dwellings. Additional work is currently being undertaken to examine the impact of the housing and employment land allocations proposed and measures necessary to mitigate the effects of the growth.
- An integrated part of planning for sustainable development is taking into account the physical, economic, social and environmental infrastructure necessary to enable the development to progress. The Council has undertaken a Infrastructure Capacity Study and has had meeting with infrastructure providers such as the Education Authority and PCT. The Council is currently working on an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which looks to identify: what infrastructure is required, how it will be provided, where/when is infrastructure needed and when can any constraints be overcome.
- The Council evidence base and meetings with infrastructure providers has not identified any strategic issues in relation to utility services to Rushley Farm
- Planning for the District must be supported by evidence of what physical, social and environmental infrastructure is needed to enable the development to progress. The Council is currently working on an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which looks to identify: what infrastructure is required, how it will be provided, where/when is infrastructure needed and when can any constraints be overcome? It builds on the Infrastructure Capacity Study, which has already been undertaken by the Council, and examined in broad terms the existing capacity relating to education, health, leisure, emergency services, social services, transport, community and utilities. In addition, a Watercycle Study has been undertaken examining water related issues such as water supply, flooding and sewerage disposal. As an authority we have also had meetings with various infrastructure providers including Severn Trent, The Highway Authority, The Highway Agency, the Coal Authority, the education authority and the PCT. From these meetings no specific issues relating to the broad strategic approach have been identified. However, the comments on the utilities in the area are noted and will be taken up with the relevant service providers

- A development of this size would be required to provide the infrastructure required for the development including schools, health facilities, community facilities etc. In this regard as this site is located close to the Lindhurst proposed development the infrastructure provision would be coordinated with and integral to the combined developments.
- The Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment of the sites including liaising with the Highway Authority to identify any general highway issues which would prevent the site being brought forward. If the sites are taken forward and site specific requirements would be considered as part of any planning application.
- Neither the Environment Agency Flood Maps nor the Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment has identified any specific flood issues relating to the sites in question. However, as part of any development a requirement is the use of sustainable drainage systems (Policy CC3: Flood Risk). This includes, where appropriate, a site specific flood risk assessment to identify any flood hazards and how these will be managed as part of the development proposals. In addition, it is anticipated that the time the Local Plan is adopted in addition to planning permission, any drainage system for new development of more than one dwelling will require permission from The County Council as the SuDS Approving Body.
- The Scoping Report for the Habitat Regulations has been prepared and assesses the potential impact of both the Local plan policies and the allocated sites in terms of impact on SPA/potential Spa including the site at Thieves Wood. It also assesses the necessary mitigation measures necessary to ensure that proposed development does not adversely impact on the SPA.
- As part of legislative requirements, the Council has an adopted Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) which sets out how, who, when and by what methods the Council will undertake public consultations on the Local Plan. The consultation process undertaken for the Local Plan provided for a range of methods for ensuring that people heard about the consultation including radio and press coverage, letters to parties on the Council's Local Plan's database, leaflets and posters, letters to organisations, site notices for new proposed housing allocations and contact with schools. The Council has to make a balanced judgement between the cost of any form of consultation method and trying to ensure that people are aware of the proposals.

### **Changes to the Local Plan**

- Mansfield to be included in the Settlement and Town Centre Hierarchy Policy SP3 to clarify that the Rushley Farm site will constitute development adjacent to urban areas.
- Add supporting text at paragraph 11.49 to set out that site delivery is anticipated to commence subsequent to development at Lindhurst SUE site in Mansfield District. Delivery will extend beyond the Plan period.
- No changes are proposed to the allocation of the land as a housing site.

<b>Number of Comments</b>		<b>Number of Respondents</b>	
<b>85</b>		<b>32</b>	
<b>Objection to Policy</b>	<b>Support the Policy</b>	<b>Comment on the Policy</b>	
<b>83</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	

**List of Respondents**

Unknown; Mr R Routledge for Mansfield District Council; Barbara Rose (15 Responses); David Rose (19 Responses) I Parkinson (2); Grace Palmer (7 Responses); James Briggs; Karen Parkinson (6 responses), Mrs M Turner; Mr & Mrs K Townsey (2 responses); Denise Barraclough; Paul Fowkes (3 responses); Mr Ivor Walker; Mr Robert H Denny; Mrs S M Holland; Mr S Swift; Mr Neil Footitt; Mr Peter Musgrove; Mrs Hilda Patricia Musgrove; Mrs Mavis Allen; Mr & Mrs Hubbard (5 responses); Mrs Josephine Wood; Mrs Angela Morris; Mr Rob Hughes, Ian Baseley Associates for Miss Esther Smith; Mr Shlomo Downen, Andrew Copson, C Kingswood, S Taylor. D Rixson for Nottinghamshire County Council

**Policy HG1: Site HG1Vg; Winter Closes, and HG1f Main Road, Underwood**

**Responses received relating to Policy:**

**Petition and other objections to allocation of HG1Vg Winter Closes because:**

*Traffic and transport*

- Access via Winters Close onto Main Road-on a dangerous bend and immediately adjacent to the primary school.
- On road parking already reduces the access to a single carriageway

- Density of traffic on the road is already unacceptable and more traffic through Underwood is unacceptable -also lot of agricultural traffic and roads cannot be upgraded.
- Road junction form Main Road onto Mansfield Road is already very difficult.
- Public transport is inadequate.
- Further traffic is unacceptable.
- No provision for off street parking means that the road is a single carriage width, risk of obstruction and accident.
- Proximity of the school and two tight bends in the road mean reduced vision and thus development would increase risks of accidents.
- HGVs regularly use Winter Closes and Main Road which creates congestion and vehicular conflict.
- Visibility Splay to the left of Winter Closes and Main Road is not good
- Most commuters who live in Selston/Jacksdale/Underwood drive along Main Road-new development would cause grid lock on Main Road at peak times.
- Underwood is a relatively remote village with very limited bus services.
- Winters close is unsuitable for access.

#### *Environmental issues*

- Loss of green belt land.
- Forms green boundary between Ashfield and Broxtowe borough.

#### *Social community and infrastructure*

- Infrastructure cannot support development.
- Primary school already oversubscribed.
- Main sewerage disposal system is overloaded already.
- Health facilities are inadequate.
- No retail outlet other than village shop.
- Local key services will not be able to accommodate the growth.
- Currently only one health centre –doesn't have capacity.
- Primary school lacks potential for expansion and has no room to take more.
- Very little retail provision in village.

#### *Other issues*

- Land is seriously contaminated a former pit head site, still subject to methane and other gases from colliery shaft.
- The proposal would destroy the village (with the Broxtowe BC proposals as well).
- here are no plans to develop further employment opportunities so new residents will have to commute, compounds road problems.
- New developments proposed are not wanted by residents of the village.
- Affordable housing would bring anti-social behaviour and crime.
- The current excellent community spirit could be lost.

**Petition suggests alternative proposal for the site HG1Vg at Winter**

**Closes :**

- Any development must have access directly onto a main highway-propose land at the bottom of Winter Closes and adjacent to Cordy lane to allow access directly from Cordy Lane.
- Would allow sewerage to be dealt with and divert HGV traffic from the village, Winter Closes would become a no through road.
- Allow land at the colliery head (HG1Vg) to be used for car parking for the school, sports and leisure facilities and an extension to the school, or use it for school parking or use it as green space..
- -mixed use development at Winters Closes can provide additional employment growth-allocation should be larger and reconfigured to enable a new school to be built along with homes and leisure facilities to meet the needs of the local community in a sustainable way.
- - but concern about the education provision for Selston –there is a need for a new site for education provision and this must be catered for in the Plan-would support land in green belt being released as part of package of proposals which deliver new educational facilities.

**Support/Object:**

- Parish Council object to current proposal due to access arrangements via Winter Closes, traffic problems being exacerbated. The Parish Council has been approached by landowners adjacent to the proposal for a mixed use development including a link road to Cordy Lane. If this is achievable then the Parish Council supports in principle the proposal subject to the road link being implemented, the relocation of the school with improved parking, and modest employment land provision adjacent to the new A608 Cordy Lane access. The Parish Council proposes that the potential enlargement of this allocation would off set the reduction in the proposed allocation HG1Va North of Alfreton Road.
- Support for principle of development on the south western edge of Underwood but object to current proposal as the Highway assessment by HSP Consulting.
- Shows that the proposed access via Winter Closes is unacceptable. Other development within Underwood is also unacceptable, it is considered that a larger allocation off Winter Closes would be more appropriate and would provide better facilities and access.
- Concern about the education provision for Selston –there is a need for a new site for education provision and this must be catered for in the Plan-would support land in green belt being released as part of package of proposals which deliver new educational facilities.
- Objection to access arrangement off Winter Closes for 150 dwellings
- This site needs a full Arboricultural and ecological assessment due to tree cover.
- Severe highway constraints and ecological constraints. Ground instability due to former colliery site; no natural or artificial boundaries and the site protrudes into open countryside. Not justifiable Green Belt release.

### **Support**

- Support allocation subject to a larger site allocated to provide opportunity for provision of a new school and additional recreational facilities as part of a wider development.
- Receipts of the sale of the existing school site and the redevelopment of land at HG1Vg could provide range of new services. Existing school is not fit for purpose and in poor state of repair, existing site has no room for expansion, the outdoor and other play and sports provision is lacking and car parking is poor. A larger allocation would provide new facilities and car parking with improved sports and other facilities and dual use facilities could be provided for childcare facilities, nursery education, community café and other youth facilities.
- Clients own land to SW offer a mixed use development providing a vehicular link road from Winter Closes and onto the AG08 Cordy Lane and community facilities.

### **Petition objecting to HG1Vf Main Road because:**

- Would need to raise the development to facilitate services (such as sewers) is unacceptable to adjoining residents.
- Would overload existing sewers which are already overprescribed.
- Cause more traffic on overused village roads.
- No employment potential and so impractical for social housing.
- New development should be close to towns or cities.
- No access to services, facilities and employment.

**N.B.** Selston Parish Council's response reflects that they undertook their own consultation events at Selston, Underwood and Jacksdale. The Parish Council has identified that in relation to HG1Vg Winter Closes, Underwood it received 24 responses. The main issues were identified as lack of facilities/amenities, traffic congestion/road safety/access/parking issues, lack of public transport, potential contaminated land from old mine shafts, the level of development is too high, and the loss of rural character. The responses largely reflected objections to the proposed housing allocation.

### **Response:**

- The Council's preferred approach to the location and scale of allocated sites is set out in a separate technical paper – 'Housing Growth: Choice of Strategic Area Based Housing Policies'. This paper explains the reasoned justification for the choice of smaller sites in preference to larger strategic sites to meet the housing requirement, and also how the sites were chosen through the SHLAA and Sustainability appraisal process. Whilst it is acknowledged that open countryside is important for well-being and agriculture, the Council has to make difficult decisions in balance the needs for housing against the environment. The villages of Selston, Underwood and Jacksdale are tightly constrained by the Green Belt and inevitably will require green belt release in order to meet housing needs in the area. The

proposed development at Winter Closes will result in a loss of open land within the Green Belt. However, the Council's analysis identified that there are insufficient brownfield sites to meet the housing requirements and therefore homes will need to be built on Greenfield sites which are located in the Green Belt.

- It is acknowledged that simply accessing the proposed housing allocation from Winter Closes is unsatisfactory. The owners of the site have identified that the site can be accessed via Cordy Lane is both physically possible and the proposal is economically viable.
- The land forming the allocation is not identified as having special ecological value and the Council has to make difficult decisions in balance the needs for housing against the environment. The Council's housing projections (see Housing Technical Paper) shows that the villages in this area do require new housing provision to ensure that the employment level in the rural area is maintained.
- Landowners have proposed an extension to the site at Winter Closes. They maintain that this would afford opportunities to provide for safer and improved access and could include a dedicated car park for the school. Extending the site from 6 to 17Ha will present opportunities for additional community benefits including employment, health, education, open space, sustainable public transport, affordable housing and extra care housing, helping to achieve the Council's vision. The Council has no plans to extend the Winter Closes site allocation at this current time for several reasons. These include strong objections from neighbouring authority which will cause major obstacles for cross boundary planning and the 'Duty to Co-operate'; much of the land is contaminated and significant areas of the expanded site have SINC status.
- An integrated part of planning for sustainable development is taking into account the physical, economic, social and environmental infrastructure necessary to enable the development to progress. The Council has undertaken an Infrastructure Capacity Study and has had meetings with infrastructure providers such as the Education Authority and PCT. The Council is currently working on an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which looks to identify: what infrastructure is required, how it will be provided, where/when is infrastructure needed and when can any constraints be overcome.
- Any development is a requirement is the use of sustainable drainage systems unless there are substantial reasons to use a conventional system (National Planning Policy Framework and Policy CC3: Flood Risk). This includes, where appropriate, a site specific flood risk assessment to identify any flood hazards and how these will be managed as part of the development proposals. It is anticipated that the time the Local Plan is adopted, a new system will have been introduced, in addition to planning permission, requiring the surface water drainage to be approved by the County Council as the SuDS Approving Body.

### **Changes to the Local Plan**

- No changes are proposed to the allocation of the land as a housing site.



<b>Number of Comments</b>		<b>Number of Respondents</b>	
66		<b>Petition:48 Others:5</b>	
<b>Objection to Policy</b>	<b>Support the Policy</b>		<b>Comment on the Policy</b>
<b>Petition:48 Others:16</b>	<b>Subject to change to allocation 2</b>		1

<p><b><u>List of Respondents</u></b></p> <p>Petition-48 people, Derbyshire Environmental Services, Phoenix Planning (UK) Ltd, Selston Parish Council, Ms J Smith, A and S Pellicciari, Oxalis Planning Ltd.</p>
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## **Policy HG1: Individual Housing Sites with a Low Level of Responses**

### **Housing Sites:**

- HG1Hh: Hucknall Town Football Club
- Site HG1Hg: Surplus Land at Rolls Royce
- HG1Hk: Rear of 364 to 376 Watnall Road
- HG1Hr: Land at Broomhill Farm
- HG1Kf: Land at Summit Close
- HG1Kh: Kirklands Residential home, Fairhaven
- HG1Ki: Larwood Park
- HG1Sa: Rear Hilltop Farm, Main Street, Huthwaite
- HG1Sb: Greenwood Falls Farm, Mill Lane

- HG1Sd: Common Road, Huthwaite
- HG1Sg: Off The Avenue, Sutton
- HG1Sh: Off Alfreton Road South
- HG1Sm: Cross Row, Stanton Hill
- HG1Sn: Priestsic Road, Sutton
- HG1So: Former Government Buildings, Outram Street, Sutton
- HG1Sp: Station House, Outram Street, Sutton
- HG1Sq: The Twitchell, Sutton
- HG1St: North West of Kingsmill Hospital
- HG1Su: Millward House, Eastfield Side
- HG1MUa South of West Notts College
- HG1Va: North of Alfreton Road
- HG1Vc and HG1Vd: Westdale Road/Rutland Road
- HG1Ve: Church Lane, Underwood
- HG1Vf: Main Road, Underwood
- HG1Vh: Rear 64-84 Church Lane, Underwood
- HG1Vi: Land at Station Road, Selston

Responses received relating to Policy :

**Site HG1Hh: Hucknall Town Football Club**

Object

- Watnall Road cannot sustain additional traffic taking into account additional sites proposed off Watnall Road. The traffic will also result in congestion at Moorbridge roundabout, Watnall Corner at Watnall, also the three ponds junction which is already a bottleneck at Nuthall and the Badger Box from roundabout near Sherwood Business Park. Hucknall will be grid locked with traffic.
- A further tram line should be investigated with a spur from Cinderhill to the new Rolls Royce housing.

**Site HG1Hg: Surplus Land at Rolls Royce**

Object:

- Raised environmental concerns about the wildlife in the area, as well as water course, quality of the water and the white clawed crayfish that inhabit the ponds on Woodhall Farm land. The land (and ponds) are SSSI, SINC and protected by Natural England.
- Would not like to see loss of Merlin Flying Club to development
- Objection to housing as local infrastructure is inadequate ie. Roads, fire services, police.
- Raised concerns over geological faults.
- Belief that negotiations around development of the site between developers and Council have not been transparent.
- It is not a sustainable site at present and therefore the basis for choosing it

is not in accordance with what is stated to have been the approach to housing site selection.

- The approach which has been adopted to assessing the sustainability of sites is simply not reliable, as the unsuitability of sites which have not been selected is not identified and these may have achieved higher scores than at least some of those which have been.
- The approach which does appear to have been followed has been to identify the preferred sites and adjust the sustainability appraisal of them to suit the purpose of ensuring that they score highly.
- The Rolls Royce development HG1HG of 32.5h is too large for existing road infrastructure surrounding Hucknall.
- Need to look into traffic management on Watnall Road with the increase of vehicles from the development.
- Section 2 of policy SPH2 states that the protection and enhancement of areas of biological importance will be required to achieve sustainable development at Rolls Royce. Given that a large proportion of the allocation is designated as a SINC it is unclear how this can be achieved. Significant compensatory habitat works may be required, which could be delivered through an approach such as Biodiversity Offsetting.

Support:

- Support for jobs and industry on the Rolls Royce site but NO to empty vandalised factory units like those on Blenheim Industrial Estate.
- Representation in support of shared ownership helping young people on to the property ladder but have major concerns about the wholesale purchase by social landlords who seem not to care about the problems some of their tenants bring to the detriment of the area and the quality of life of other residents.

Comment:

- Is it possible to develop housing at Blenheim Lane It would take traffic out of Hucknall centre and have easy access to M1.
- Desire to reinstate public footpath that connected Blenheim Lane to Watnall Road.
- Suggestion that a further tram line is looked into, spurred from Cinderhill via Blenheim Estate to the new Rolls Royce housing.
- No mention of retail at development. This needs to be clarified.

#### **Site HG1Hk: Rear of 364 to 376, Watnall Road**

Support

- Site HG1Hk represents sustainable development in a location close to local facilities with no technical impediments to delivery.

#### **Site HG1Hq: Ruffs Farm, Watnall Road**

Object

- Watnall Road cannot sustain additional traffic taking into account

additional sites proposed off Watnall Road.

**Site HG1Hr: Land at Broomhill Farm**

Comment

- DELETE '(Phased Development)' from HG1 Hr for reason stated under objection to Policy SPH 2 paragraph 3.

**Site HG1Kf Summit Close, Kirkby in Ashfield**

Object

- There are doubts on the deliverability of development due to: Traffic impact; cost of remediation works; landownership constraints; poor location for residential development/poor land values which would result in development being unviable.

**Site HG1Kh: Kirklands Residential home, Fairhaven**

Object

- This site is no longer available for redevelopment.

**Site HG1Ki: Larwood Park, South A38**

Object

- Does not maintain Green Wedge between Sutton and Kirby, contrary to Strategic area based policies. Suggestion to half number of the planned housing in order to keep a green wedge at the A38 side. This would also lessen the traffic impact likewise one could form; football field(s), play area(s) and extra tree area(s) etc.
- The building of houses behind the fire station will cause more problems to the already overloaded road at peak times and we must take into account the impact of emergency vehicles.

Support

- Development is deliverable on this site.

**Site HG1Sa: Rear Hilltop Farm, Main Street, Huthwaite**

- The access road to this proposed site is currently unadopted and is in a very poor state of repair and needs to be brought up to legislative standards. (lighting columns, carriageway, footway, kerbing, drainage etc).
- Doubts regarding deliverability due to: public highway constraints; landownership constraints relating to access; highway improvement works make the scheme unviable.

**Site HG1Sb: Greenwood Falls Farm, Mill Lane**

- It is felt that EV6Sb would fall within the HG1Si category and is suitable as a housing allocation, either as a whole or in part. EV6Sb should be combined with HG1Si. The combined allocation would be integrated into the settlement boundary of Huthwaite and be located near to local services and the highway infrastructure. HG1Sv is located outside the main built area. The proposed combined site would offer a far more inclusive and sustainable location from a social, economic and environmental perspective.
- This site should be treated as a commitment, not an allocation, as it benefits from planning permission, and is under construction. The Council should check to ensure that there are no other examples of sites with permission that are being treated as allocations.
- If HG1 Sb is maintained as an allocation, then the extent of the housing site should be shown correctly on the Local Plan Proposals Map, as shown on the attached amended version. The current Proposals Map excludes part of the site that has permission for residential development.

#### **Site HG1Sg: Off The Avenue, Sutton**

- In 2010 I was advised by Taylor Wimpey that there was a Ransom Strip in place to prevent development on this land. In addition I own a section of the land opposite my property. When I telephoned the Forward Planning Department at the council I was informed that you would be able to build there regardless of the Ransom Strip and was told that access would most likely be from Pendean Way. Having looked at the map and the land itself I am very concerned how this will impact on my property
- There are bats on this site and may well also be dormice. I believe that a survey has to be done with regard to the bats before any development can be carried out and I would request that a survey is done for dormice.
- Doubts regarding deliverability due to: public highway constraints; landownership constraints relating to access; highway improvement works make the scheme unviable.

#### **Site HG1Sh: Off Alfreton Road South / (HGSi, Rookery Farm)**

##### **Object**

- A large number of houses have been built along Alfreton Road putting strain on the drainage system. This will be worsened by development of this site.
- Traffic flow is very heavy along Alfreton Road. Rush hour traffic creates queues and more housing will mean more traffic, noise and pollution.
- There is wildlife in the area that will be affected such as deer, bats, foxes, tawney owls, woodcock, buzzards, nightingales, thrushes, hares and squirrels.
- Development will affect my residential amenity and create overlooking issues. Individual bought the property for the views beyond their garden. Resultant development will lead to existing houses being positioned in the

centre of a modern housing estate.

- The land provides a green lung between Alfreton Road and the A38.
- Public highway constraints; landownership constraints relating to access; noise impact from A38; and highway improvement works make the development scheme unviable.

Comment

- Will new homes proposed be for local people or for an expected increase in the population.
- Are local amenities adequate ie. Can schools handle the extra demand created, are their sufficient employment opportunities locally.

**Site HG1Sm: Cross Row, Stanton Hill**

Object

- The site received planning consent in 2008. It has not yet come forward and it is not likely to be viable or deliverable.

**Site HG1Sn: Land at Priestsic Road, Sutton**

Object

- Development on this site is not likely to be deliverable or viable.

**Site HG1So: Former Government Buildings, Sutton**

Object

- Development on this site is not likely to be deliverable or viable.

**Site HG1Sp: Station House, Outram Street, Sutton**

Object

- Development on this site is not likely to be deliverable or viable.

**Site HG1Sq: The Twitchell, Sutton**

Object

- Development on this site is not likely to be deliverable or viable.

Support

- Welcomes the re-development of the Reform Street area, between Cursham Street and Station Street.

**Site HG1St: North West of Kingsmill Hospital**

- Beck Lane and the Site North West of Kingsmill Hospital are in areas, which contribute to the open break between the settlements. The Proposals Map doesn't illustrate Mansfield's employment allocation at Penniment Farm on Abbot Road, just inside Mansfield's urban boundary, where planning permission has been granted for 430 dwellings and 12 Ha. of employment land.
- MDC has also faced development pressures to the east of this open break. It is therefore considered that any development in this area should be subject to cross boundary considerations and master-planning in order to maximise the public benefit and minimise the environmental impact of any development.

- MDC would wish to co-operate with ADC in terms of Master-planning considerations, without prejudice to any future decision.
- The development of this site will inevitably cause the direct coalescence of Mansfield with this part of Ashfield, contrary to all normal planning objectives.
- The development would directly place more strain on already overcrowded road networks. Concerns raised over the massive increase in traffic using congested Dalestorth Road for access to and from the area.
- There are not enough places at Dalestorth Primary School.
- The site is well away from any of the schools in Skegby.
- The fact that it is located close to the major road infrastructure is of little or no relevance if they do not carry public transport facilities, because this factor will simply increase car usage
- The detachment of this site from Skegby, heavily emphasised by the existence of the main road between them makes it impossible that it could have scored so much higher (15'16 points) than the Objection sites in any true and accurate Sustainability Appraisal.
- There is no good reason why the Objection sites should not have scored equally in the given categories but in fact more highly in respect of some of them, such as the category of maximising use of existing transport infrastructure.
- Lack of employment in the area meaning people would have to travel to find work which adds to pollution.
- The allocation is inappropriate as it closes the gap between Sutton and Mansfield. There would be a serious affect on traffic at the A38/B6018 and the A60/Sherwood Way junctions.

**Site HG1Su: Millward House, Eastfield Side**

- The site looks unsuitable for housing due to the busy main road and nearby road junctions.
- Alternative site suggested. Eg. Nearby on Priestsic Road one has a disused car dealership on which housing could be built. Also Sutton Town Social Club (off Davies Avenue) which I think is still closed. (Possible housing)

**Site HG1MUa South of West Notts College**

- The mixed use allocation south of West Nott's College (HG1MUa) lacks detail as to the residential/employment mix and timing of the proposal.
- This land is good quality agricultural land, which deserves protection.
- The empty Prologis Park site provides ample room for expansion of commercial/retail/industrial development within Ashfield. This site is more suited to housing rather than mixed use development.
- Development can only be delivered if Rushley Farm does not go ahead as the highway infrastructure costs would make the scheme unviable.

**Site HG1Va: North of Alfreton Road**

Object

- Objection due to the loss of Greenbelt land and (perceived) loss of children's playground;
- Objection on grounds of lack of public transport facilities.
- Objection to the scale of the development proposed as it will detrimentally change the character of the local area.
- Objection to the impact upon the highway network. A detailed Transport Assessment should be undertaken by the site promoter.
- It is also considered that the eastern section of the allocation is also visually prominent and unnecessarily extends the settlement boundary into the greenbelt and encroaches into the open countryside. .
- The reduction of housing numbers from this large site can be redistributed to Underwood
- This allocation causes coalescence within the village structure, sites within is contrary to the sequential approach.
- This land is on coal measure outcrop which are geologically unstable.
- Site is of archaeological, social and industrial importance.
- There is no justification for the release of Green Belt land. SHLAA site V335 should be used for structural landscaping to prevent the coalescence of settlements if the allocation is taken forward.
- In the context of the housing requirements identified by the District Council for Selston, the Parish Council had no issues with the principle of a housing allocation to the north of Alfreton Road but objects to the scale of the allocation. The Parish Council expressed concerns regarding access to the site and considered a smaller site, by approximately 100 dwellings, should be brought forward. The site should include retail facilities to the frontage with Alfreton Road. The reduction in housing numbers was proposed to be redistributed to Winter Closes at Underwood.

Support:

- Designation wholly supported by the landowners of this site;
- Site will allow local services to be sustained and enhanced.
- A comprehensive development of the scale envisaged will ensure the development is both viable and deliverable within the Plan period.

Comment:

- DCC asks to be consulted on the Transportation Assessments for development on either of these two sites, and for any other site that potentially would generate significant volumes of cross boundary traffic;
- The site could lend itself more reasonably to a smaller development by deleting the more sensitive easternmost field from the allocation.
- an area on the Alfreton Road frontage immediately to the west of the Bull and Butcher public house should be safeguarded within this application for local shops.

**Sites HG1Vc and HG1Vd: Westdale Road/Rutland Road**

Object:

- This site needs to be retained for long term education requirements and should therefore be deleted as a housing allocation.



- Concerns raised on deliverability.
- The Parish Council recognised that these sites were allocated for housing as part of the Ashfield Local Plan Review, 2002. However, at least part of the site is in the ownership of Nottinghamshire County Council and was earmarked for a replacement school for Jacksdale Primary and Westwood Nursery. From a local perspective, the Parish Council considers the site should be retained as a potential school site with the existing Jacksdale Primary School site offering an alternative housing site.

**Site HG1Ve: Church Lane, Underwood**

- Green Belt release is not acceptable.
- Concern is raised with regards to the impact of the development on the landscape character of the village and the wider mature landscape area.
- Potential 15 dwellings could be accommodated within the extended Winter Closes site which would provide a more sustainable option.

**Site HG1Vf: Main Road, Underwood**

Object:

- The ground is unsuitable for any building
- Flooding and Drainage concerns; The land is below road level, which is prone to flooding, topography makes drainage difficult., houses still use cesspits, you can smell drains/sewer during wet weather
- Development would detrimentally impact landscape character and benefit of 6 houses does not outweigh this negative impact.
- Development cannot continue without amenity and road improvement
- This site would create an unnecessary ribbon effect.
- There are not sufficient school places to accommodate development.

Comment:

- Suitable housing site subject to Green Belt release.

**Site HG1Vh: Rear 64-84 Church Lane, Underwood**

Object:

- Development will affect character of the area
- Development will exacerbate existing traffic congestion
- Site will not provide affordable housing to local people
- Will cause flooding issues with urban run off to Bagthorpe Brook
- Will affect safety of children using church lane to walk to school.
- The site is covered in trees and in need of a tree survey. This will limit development.

**Site HG1Vi: Land at Station Road, Selston**

Object:

- Objection to the scale of development, Unless specific proposals are brought forward to mitigate current and envisaged levels of congestion as outlined in Nottingham Core Strategy Modelling Stage 1 Transport Assessment Report. Key areas of concern include the A608, B600, B6009, B6010 and the A61 0 from Eastwood to the M1 Junction 26.

- Steep gradient and heavy tree coverage make viability doubtful. There is no realistic justification for removing this site from Green Belt.
- Concerned about housing allocation on a SINC between Selston and Pinxton, called Hall Green Grassland SINC 1/49. This is described as 'a classic Coal Measures grassland', and forms an area of diverse grassland, scrub and woodland on a steep bank. It should also be noted that the site sits within one of the District Strategic Corridors identified in the Green Infrastructure Strategy.

Responses received relating to Policy supporting text

None

**N.B.** The District Council received a low level of response in relation to the sites identified in this Section. However, it is recognised that Selston Parish Council's response reflects three separate consultation events held at Selston, Underwood and Jacksdale. The Parish Council has identified that it received the following number of responses:

- HG1Va North of Alfreton Road, Selston – 56 responses.  
Main issues were identified as lack of facilities/amenities, traffic congestion/road safety/access/parking issues, lack of public transport, lack of employment provision, flooding, loss of Green Belt, level of development is too high, loss of rural character and devaluation of existing properties.
- HG1Vb Off Portland Road, Selston – 15 responses.  
Main issues were identified as lack of facilities/amenities, traffic congestion/road safety/access/parking issues, flooding, and the level of development is too high,
- HG1Vc Westdale Road/Rutland Road, Jacksdale – 11 responses.  
Main issues were identified as lack of facilities/amenities, traffic congestion/road safety/access/parking issues, flooding, loss of wildlife habitats and green space and devaluation of existing properties and increase in noise levels.
- HG1V1 Land at Station Road Selston – 13 responses.  
Main issues were identified as lack of facilities/amenities, traffic congestion/road safety/access/parking issues, lack of public transport, lack of employment provision, flooding, increased antisocial behaviour and the level of development is too high.

The responses largely reflected objections to the proposed housing allocations.

**Response:**

- Please refer to the responses to Policy HG1 in relation to issues identified in relation to the approach to housing requirements, land for economic development, empty homes affordable homes and the consultation.
- Planning for the District must be supported by evidence of what physical, social and environmental infrastructure is needed to enable the development to progress. The Council is currently working on an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which looks to identify: what infrastructure is required, how it will be provided, where/when is infrastructure needed and when any constraints can be overcome. It builds on the Infrastructure Capacity Study, which has already been undertaken by the Council, and examined in broad terms the existing capacity relating to education, health, leisure, emergency services, social services, transport, community and utilities. In addition, a Watercycle Study has been undertaken examining water related issues such as water supply, flooding and sewerage disposal. As an authority we have also had meetings with various infrastructure providers including Severn Trent, The Highway Authority, The Highway Agency, the Coal Authority, the education authority and the PCT. From these meetings no specific issues relating to the broad strategic approach have been identified. However, the comments on the utilities in the area are noted and will be taken up with the relevant service providers.
- The Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) of the sites included liaising with the Highway Authority to identify any general highway issues which would prevent the site being brought forward. If the sites are taken forward then site specific requirements would be considered as part of any planning application.
- The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out the definition of 'deliverable' sites in paragraph 47, it states: '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 in five years, and in particular that development of the site is viable. A recent appeal decision relating to a site in Sutton in Ashfield advocates this approach (APP/W3005/A/12/2179635). The Planning Inspector, Ms Julia Gregory, stated in her report (paragraph 131) that there was no evidence that the development would not be deliverable or viable. It should be noted that the applicant submitted no supporting evidence relating to the viability of the site. On that basis, all sites with planning permission should be considered deliverable unless there is evidence which demonstrates that development is not viable.
- The value of any residential property is dependent on a number of factors which will include title, the property's characteristics, accommodation, the site, sitting qualities and the state of the market. Only a local valuer could identify the potential impact of the proposed development on the value of your property. However, in planning terms there is no right to compensation for new residential development. The planning system has to balance a number of competing economic, social and environmental objectives. The housing figures set out in the Local Plan are based on providing for housing need based on demographic change. This reflects a rising population,

people living longer and changing lifestyles with more single occupancy. The evidence identifies that there is a need for more housing and as a planning authority we have no option but to identify sites to meet the anticipated housing need.

- Neither the Environment Agency Flood Maps nor the Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment has identified any specific flood issues relating to the sites in question. However, as part of any development a requirement is the use of sustainable drainage systems (Policy CC3: Flood Risk). This includes, where appropriate, a site specific flood risk assessment to identify any flood hazards and how these will be managed as part of the development proposals. In addition, it is anticipated that the time the Local Plan is adopted in addition to planning permission, any drainage system for new development of more than one dwelling will require permission from The County Council as the SUDS Approving Body.
- The Council acknowledges concerns in relation to constraints to development and the knock on impact on deliverability of this site within the plan period. Paragraph 173 of the NPPF states that careful attention to viability and costs are required in the plan making process. A viability assessment of sites has been undertaken as part of the SHLAA assessment. Although the Council is confident that the sites taken forward are deliverable, the Council will analyse and seek further information on the issues raised where necessary.
- HG1Kh Kirklands Residential Home, HG1Sa Land rear of Hilltop Farm and HG1Sg Land off The Avenue, Sutton in Ashfield have been removed from the Local Plan as development is not considered to be deliverable on these sites.
- HG1Vi Land at Station Road has been removed from housing allocations due to the impact development would have on site important nature conservation.
- With regard to land to the north west of Kingsmill Hospital (HG1St), the Council has been liaising closely with Mansfield District Council on strategic planning matters. It is considered appropriate to incorporate a well designed landscaping scheme which will retain that the gap between Mansfield and Sutton. The Ashfield Transport Study Update has identified a requirement for highway improvements and the Council is working with the Highway Authority to identify a package of mitigation measures. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan will incorporate the transport requirements for the site.
- The Council acknowledges that HG1Sa Hilltop Farm, Huthwaite and HG1Sg The Avenue, Sutton in Ashfield are not capable of delivering housing within the Plan period due to viability relating to access constraints; the size of the sites would make development unviable. The sites have been removed from the Local Plan
- In terms of North of Alfreton Road, Selston, the availability of sustainable, deliverable housing sites to meet the required need is limited in this area. It is considered that site HG1Va presents a sustainable location for growth in the villages and has the potential capacity to deliver community benefits, e.g., education, a small amount of commercial/retail use in accordance with policy SP3 (additional text to support SP3 will be included for clarity and cross referred in policy HG1Va). The approximate number of houses to be

delivered on this site has been reduced since the Preferred Approach consultation as a result of investigations surrounding old mining activities.

- The Portland Road site at Selston has planning permission for residential development.
- Discussions have been undertaken with the County Council regarding Westdale Road/Rutland Road, Jacksdale and as landowners they have confirmed that the site can be taken forward as a housing allocation.

**Proposed changes to the Local Plan**

- If HG1Sb is maintained as an allocation, then the extent of the housing site should be shown correctly on the Local Plan Proposals Map, as shown on the attached amended version. The current Proposals Map excludes part of the site that has permission for residential development.
- Remove Kirklands Residential Home from allocations.
- Remove HG1Sa Hilltop Farm, Huthwaite from the local Plan as access constraints could not be mitigated within the Plan period.
- Remove HG1Sg The Avenue, Sutton in Ashfield from the local Plan as access constraints could not be mitigated within the Plan period.
- HG1Vi Land at Station Road has been removed from housing allocations due to the impact development would have on site important nature conservation.

<b>Number of Comments</b>		<b>Number of Respondents</b>	
<b>56</b>		<b>41</b>	
<b>Objection to Policy</b>	<b>Support the Policy</b>		<b>Comment on the Policy</b>
<b>40</b>	<b>4</b>		<b>11</b>

**List of Respondents**

Sally Wyatt for Reach Out Residents Community Group; Mr Paul Stone, Signet Planning Consultant for Peveril Homes, Mr David Rixson on Behalf Nottinghamshire County Council, Mr S Swift, Mr & Mrs J A Moore, Paul Bough, Mr Christopher Dwan for RPS Newark, Mr M Eagland of Peacock and Smith for WM Morrison Supermarkets PLC, Alison Corbett, Antonia Walker, Carl Alton, Mr M Harby, Mr R Routledge for Mansfield District Council, Carol & Adrian Bennett, Mrs Karen Wright, A Keeling, Mr Rob Hughes of Ian Baseley Associates for Miss Esther Smith, David & Barbara Rose, Mr Ian Goldstraw Derbyshire Environmental Services, Ms Bettina Sutcliffe, Mr Aaron Smith of Caldecotte Consultants for Scottish & Newcastle PLC, John Booth of Phoenix Planning (UK) Ltd, Ms S Ball for Selston Parish Council, Mr John Kerry of KDCS for Community Group, Mr David Rixson of Vincent and Gorbing for Nottinghamshire County Council, Mr Keith Hallam, Ms Jane Smith, Roger Smith, Mr A Marshall for Greasley Parish Council, Mr Ken Creed, Miss Ann Elizabeth Smith, Mr Victor Bagshore, Mr Malcolm Hodgkinson, Mr & Mrs G Holmes, Mr R Fletcher of Ian Baseley Associates for James Mellors Ltd, Mr R N Gow on behalf of Hucknall Safer Neighbourhoods Committee - North Community Group, Sally Gill, NCC; Oxalis Planning Ltd on behalf of Westerman Homes

## Policy HG1: Alternative Housing Sites Proposed in the Consultation

### Responses received relating to Policy :

- **Land adjacent to Silverhill Lane, Teversal (Site HG1Sj).** Support for the development for housing on Silverhill Lane but including an objection in that it does not allocate land adjacent to the site allocated. (Ref. 598)
- **Existing employment allocation at Coxmoor Road** should be allocated for residential. There is an oversupply of employment land and a shortage of 5 year housing supply. NPPF para 22 states that planning policies should avoid the long term protection of sites allocated for employment where there is no reasonable prospect of a site being developed for that purpose. Potential capacity for up to 58 homes. (Ref. 1875/983)
- **Allocate site s96, Mansfield Road, Skegby.** – Logical rounding off with capacity for up to 37 dwellings. The Council's rationale for overlooking a number of smaller, far more logical extensions to the Main Urban Area on the basis of respecting the views of the local communities is not accepted. Nor is the suggestion that larger developments are preferable on the basis of the major positive implications arising from financial contributions, since a 'pooling' of off-site contributions via the Community Infrastructure Levy and/or S106 obligations can be equally as effective in collectively delivering the Council's wider infrastructure Requirements. The site can be developed immediately, thereby assisting the Council in contributing towards its existing housing land supply. (Ref. 5507/1095)
- **Allocate site s95** – no visual or ecological interest and bounded on 3 sides by existing residential development (Ref. 5507/1095) (ref. 2523/966)
- **Land East of Lowmoor Road and South of Newark Road.** – The response identifies that the approach the Council has taken in the Local Plan Preferred Approach means that a large number of sites are proposed for housing development, including sensitive Green Belt land, unnecessarily. The range of sites proposed do not provide the opportunities associated with more comprehensive development proposals to provide for new housing alongside new social and environmental infrastructure. It put forward a substantial sustainable urban extension on 90 ha of agricultural land to the east of Lowmoor Road and to the south of Newark Road. The proposal includes:
  - Up to 1,000 homes at 30 dwellings per hectare;
  - A new primary school;
  - A neighbourhood centre to provide shopping, employment and community facilities;
  - Improved public transport connections and
  - Improved road linkages.

The site is identified as having the potential to meet a substantial part of the housing requirements set out in the Local Plan Preferred Approach for Kirkby-in-Ashfield/Sutton-in-Ashfield. It is maintained that it meets the strategic development principles of social, economic and environmental sustainability. Significant areas of green infrastructure and recreation space will be provided as part of the development. It is set out that the location makes best use of the high quality public transport linkages available. The indicative masterplan shows how a flexible approach to phasing can allow the development to come forward in accordance with the Council's growth aspirations. The indicative masterplan shows how the site could be developed to provide a high quality development, sympathetic to the local context. The respondent set out that the sustainable urban extension should be included as an allocation in the Local Plan to ensure that the identified housing needs in the area can be met in a sustainable way.

- **Kirkby Folly Road** –(see above site)
- **Land adjacent 282 Main Street, Westwood (SHLAA site V14)**, presents a logical rounding off of the built up area and is capable of being delivered immediately to meet the housing needs of Jacksdale. Despite the Council removing land adjoining the Named Settlements of Underwood and Selston from the Green Belt to accommodate the levels of additional growth required in the Rural Areas, the Green Belt boundary around Jacksdale has remained untouched despite the land adjacent 282 Main Street, Westwood comprising an extremely logical 'rounding-off' of this part of the settlement. The SHLAA also identifies Site V14 as falling within Flood Zone 3 where the SFRA recommends new development should be avoided. However, the site is evidently higher where it meets Main Street and, following advice from flood consultants, Opus International Ltd, there is a developable area of the site which is considered to fall outside of the area at risk of flooding and therefore capable of accommodating a small number of dwellings to help to contribute towards meet the identified local housing need. The land will be promoted for a small number of modestly sized dwellings (3.no) which will be suitable and affordable for the Village's younger generations to ensure that they are able to continue to live in the area which they grew up, close to their families. Given the intended permanence of Green Belt boundaries it is considered that the boundary of the Green Belt in this particular location ought to be reviewed either to include the site as an additional small housing allocation capable of delivering 3.no modest dwellings, or alternatively to allow for its delivery as a 'windfall site' over the course of the new plan period as a matter of good forward planning<sup>6</sup> and to enable the opportunity for development to occur on the site in the event that either existing housing allocations HG 1Nf and HG 1Ng do not transpire. The landowners are in the process of commissioning a localised Hydraulic Assessment to demonstrate that part of the site falls outside of an area at risk of flooding. If the above flood modelling exercise confirms that part of the site can be developed without



risk of flooding, or causing risk of flooding elsewhere, then there is no longer a technical reason why the site cannot be brought forward for development. (More details ref.1302).

- **Extension to site at Winter Closes** would afford opportunities to provide for safer and improved access and could include a dedicated car park for the school. Extending the site from 6 to 17Ha will present opportunities for additional community benefits including employment, health, education, open space, sustainable public transport, affordable housing and extra care housing, helping to achieve the Council's vision. See Masterplan submitted by Phoenix Planning (Keepmoat).
- **Adjacent the Gables, Kirkby Woodhouse.** Old site of approximately 70 cottages (along Todd's Row and Harvey's Row). The rubble and foundations still remain for these cottages, making it unusable as arable land, yet ADC continue to class it as Greenbelt. It is on the edge of housing and is, with out neighbour, ideal for building. (Ref. 5517/1217)
- **Land at Ashland Road** Sutton in Ashfield should be added to the sites that are included as proposed Housing Allocations. It is in a sustainable location and does not form Green Belt Land. Should be sequentially more preferable to release non-Green Belt land in a settlement which is deemed a great deal more sustainable than any other settlements In the District (Ref. 6038/1256)
- **Land off Millers Way,** Kirkby-in-Ashfield, Notts – 50 dwellings. The site is in a highly sustainable location for a number of reasons: 1 Proximity to Kirkby railway station 2 Proximity of good and frequent bus services 3 Easy walking distance to Kirkby Town Centre with its shops, schools and medical facilities. 4 Adjacent to the Aldi store 5 Close to a number of employment opportunities in the town centre and other locations 6 Close to Kingsway Park with its recreational facilities. Development would clearly involve the loss of a football pitch which would need mitigation under Saved Policy RC3 and emerging policy EV5. New development in Sutton and Kirkby will no doubt provide the necessary facilities to meet its recreational needs. The existing population will, to a large extent, be dependent on the existing facilities; supply may be in surplus or deficit in relation to need. It is understood that the Council is reviewing its Pitch Provision and that the results of such should be available in the New Year. Clearly this will inform the debate. The 2008 Playing pitch strategy clearly demonstrated that there was a surplus of football pitches both in Kirkby and in the broader sub-area of Sutton/Kirkby. (more details ref. 3471/1292)
- **Sites off Gilcroft/St Andrews Street and Vere Avenue,** Skegby. It is considered that the sites clearly meet with all of HG1 its requirements and therefore should be included in the list of Housing Allocations. It is also alleged that for the purposes of the Sustainability Appraisal which has been undertaken, these sites have not been properly or fairly assessed,

but that the results of the exercise have been skewed in order to dismiss them. (More details ref.5487/1295).

- **Land at Carnarvon Cottage, off Silverhill Lane, Fackley.** As a suitable location for a small housing development it was expected that it would be so allocated so meet part of the residential need, but has been overlooked. It has not been included in the SA, but as three other small sites adjoining the village framework in the same way that this one does, have been concluded to be sustainably located, the same consideration must apply to this site. (More details ref.5487/1300).
- **Land adjacent to 149 Stoney Lane, Selston (SHLAA site V86).** The failure to identify this site does appear to be contrary to both the previous consultation comments received and the above summarised site selection process, because it is a site which is immediately deliverable subject only to the minor necessary change to correct the anomalous Green Belt boundary in this locality, This is considered to be particularly remiss when alternatively the development needs for the area have been largely directed to a substantial site (reference HG1Va) relatively nearby to the north of Alfreton Road, Selston which involves removing a substantial area (11ha) from the Green Belt that presently performs one of the important Green Belt functions of preventing the coalescence of Selston with the smaller settlement of Selston Green. the site not only meets with the general criteria for the identification of appropriate housing sites but also clearly constitutes a wholly sustainable location for new housing as its is conveniently accessible to the services and facilities of the village including its public transport connections. The positive elements of the Sustainability assessment confirm that it constitutes previously-developed land and would therefore minimise soil losses and negative impacts on habitats and biodiversity. Also, development on it would have access to plentiful green space in the vicinity and there will be only minor negative implications for a reduction in waste and the minimisation of energy consumption. Sustainability Appraisal indicates that the site is on the edge of the settlement boundary but then indicates as a result it 'could have a detrimental impact on the openness of the surrounding Green Belt'. This contrasts remarkably to the conclusion on the same issue in the SHLAA assessment which similarly indicates that the site is situated adjacent to the residential area but 'is well screened by mature trees and vegetation". The Sustainability Appraisal records that although existing public transport will be utilised, 'the rural location means the car is still likely to remain the preferred method of transport, particularly in order to reach more varied employment opportunities". By contrast the SHLAA assessment concludes in respect of the matter of 'Access to Services" that 'the site is suitable'. In accordance with the principles that have been adopted for the allocation of housing sites the failure to identify this site is an omission and these representations seek to address that failing by requesting that the situation be reviewed and this site positively identified as a housing allocation, involving the necessary adjustment of the Green Belt/Settlement Framework Boundary. (More details ref.1304).

- **Land at the Former Annesley Miners Welfare, Derby Road, Annesley.** 2.75Ha - the now overgrown former playing fields are currently covered by a generally restrictive policy EV5. No longer used or needed for its former use that ceased around 10 years ago. Evidence of this is that over all of that period there has been no approach to the landowner to seek either the use or reinstatement of the former senior football pitches, as does regularly occur in instances where there is a clear unsatisfied demand for such facilities. The development potential of the overall site needs to also be recognised by an appropriate allocation. The most appropriate development scenario for this site, because of its particular location, is for a mixed use development with modest retail and community facilities on the road frontage, and residential development to complement that which adjoins and largely surrounds it further back into the site away from the Derby Road frontage. A definite interest in it for the introduction of a modest neighbourhood type supermarket unit has already been expressed and at least a preliminary interest for a community facility as a replacement for others which presently exist in the locality but in premises that are no longer considered to be fit for purpose. This is a very sustainable location, which is obviously most directly relevant to the residential element but also the reverse situation arises in relation to the community and retail facilities because they would be located in a central point to be both accessible to the local resident community and some of the passing trade generated by the large employment park to the south. (More details ref.1975/1308).
- **Land at Mill Lane, Huthwaite.** There is no sound, basis for designating the site as an open area. No constraints to development of Mill Lane, Huthwaite for housing in the short term. Development of the site for housing would reduce the need to release more sensitive, less sustainable land on the edge of the built up area for housing. There is a need to provide for additional residential development in Huthwaite to meet the housing needs of the new employment that will be created at the proposed major employment allocations on Alfreton Road/Common Road. The development of Mill Lane for housing would create the opportunity for employees to live close to their place of work, therefore reducing the need to travel. (More details ref.6145/1103).
- **Prologis Park, MARR** The area off the MARR running up towards Cauldwell has been suggested as an alternative as it has already been set aside for development.
- **Land at Nottingham Road/the Hucknall Bypass.** This area has been considered to be suitable and appropriate for development for many years due to its location directly adjacent to the main urban areas of both Bulwell and Hucknall, but its suitability is considered to have been enhanced in recent years by two particular developments. The first is a physical one - the tram has been introduced to link Hucknall to the City Centre since the Ashfield Local Plan Review was published in 2002. The emphasis in

achieving sustainability of development has heightened during the same period such that it now dominates planning policy at both the national and local level. The other is a development in policy terms whereby the increased housing requirement identified originally in the Regional Plan for the East Midlands, determined that sites currently outside of the urban framework and designated both as countryside and Green Belt would need to be released in order to meet these. It is questioned whether it is appropriate and realistic in broad development terms to only identify land within the Rolls Royce complex as appropriate, particularly as policy SPH2 states 'To achieve sustainable communities the site will require the following facilities and services to be provided'. These include a primary school, open space and the creation of new green infrastructure links, protection and enhancement of areas of biological importance, a new bus route to link between Hucknall Town Centre and the site, improvements to the surrounding road network and finally improvements to health facilities. Clearly therefore in respect of most of the necessary day to day facilities, especially as this list has not included elements such as shops, social and community facilities etc, which are also absent at this location, it will be necessary to 'achieve' a sustainable community here but that is not the basis of the approach to site identification which is also stated in the document in HG1. The development of this site immediately adjacent to the built up area of the City would be a suitable location to incorporate the necessary family housing required by Nottingham City. The suburbs of Bulwell and Bestwood within the City boundary have buoyant communities which the City Authority wishes to continue to thrive but are heavily developed at present such that there are very few opportunities to provide further housing development within them. Development on this site would serve the purposes of supporting services and facilities within both Bulwell and Hucknall because it is equally convenient to both centres. Accordingly, this proposal would assist the City Council's objectives as well as meeting housing requirements in Hucknall that need to accord with the RSS figures as they still form part of the Development Plan. Preliminary discussions with the City Council indicate that they would raise no objections to this development because a strategic gap can still be maintained and the development would provide support for services and facilities in Bulwell as well as Hucknall in line with the need to go outside of the City boundary to meet housing needs, as is proposed elsewhere around the main urban area and joint working between authorities advocated in the NPPF. The approach to site selection in HG1 claims to have selected housing sites in locations which are already sustainable but the text of the same document previously referred to recognises, that it will have to create and 'achieve' sustainability in relation to the Rolls Royce site. If the stated approach in the preface to Policy HG1 had actually been followed, then it would have identified the Objection site as a suitable housing allocation. (More details ref.2327/1309).

- **Site K27 Beacon Farm, Derby Road, Kirkby.** Site is over 50% Previously Developed Land (intensive poultry farm closed in 1988). Comprises a number of large, derelict and semi-derelict buildings.

Reclamation for any form of agriculture is uneconomic and a return to intensive poultry farming would be unacceptable in this location now it is surrounded by residential property. Beacon Farm has strong defensible boundaries such that any development upon it would be well contained, would not be intrusive into the Green Belt nor likely to lead to pressure for further losses of Green Belt. Site is immediately adjacent to the Settlement Framework Boundary, established housing on two sides and has robust defensible boundaries on the other two sides. No significant loss to agriculture. No areas of public open space within a 200 metre radius – can be included in the development to serve new and existing community. (More details ref.3034/1096).

- **North of the Mansfield Ashfield Regeneration Route (MARR).** Approximately 14 ha bounded by MARR to the south, ProLogis Park to the west, the boundary with Mansfield DC to the north and Cauldwell Brook to the east. Could accommodate between 420 and 700 dwellings. Sustainable option for housing growth in the District for the following reasons: It adjoins the urban boundary of Mansfield. (The recent Penniment Farm decision was in part based upon the MARR now forming the physical boundary between the urban area and open Countryside). Client also controls additional land to the north in Mansfield District which has the potential to allow for even greater integration with the existing urban area of Mansfield. It is an accessible location and linkages could be provided to Mansfield town via Bleak Hills Road, and also potentially via ProLogis Park and Lower Oakham Way. Close to employment opportunities, particularly Oakham Business Park / ProLogis Park and Hamilton Road / Coxmoor Road industrial estate. There are no significant conservation constraints, subject to appropriate landscaping and respecting the setting of Cauldwell Wood. (More details ref.5473/1111).
- **South of MARR.** Approximately 74 ha. Bounded by MARR to the north, Stonehills Plantation to the east, Derby Road to the south east, and Coxmoor Golf Course / agricultural land to the west. It is presently farmed and is bisected by Cauldwell Road which, following construction of the MARR, is stopped up at the east end of the site. Extant planning permission (ADC ref: V/1990/0472) exists for the development of a Golf and Country Club on that part of Site located to the south of Cauldwell Road. - Golf course, a hotel and conference facilities, and car parking. In this context site has the potential for housing development. Site has a number of constraints including a small lake, water courses and the Nature Conservation Site running across it. These will provide attractive foci and settings for development, but reduce development density. Development of a site this size will also require significant elements of infrastructure, potentially including school, local shops and services, health and social care, and other facilities; as well as play and recreational open space and landscaping. Assuming development at an average density of 30 dwellings per ha, the site has the potential to provide up to 2,220 new homes. Could achieve high standards of sustainability (potentially zero carbon); provision of new infrastructure, shops and

services that can be shared with the wider community (more details ref. 5473/1111).

- **Land north west of Hucknall- Whyburn.** Equidistant from Rolls-Royce employment site at Hucknall and Sherwood Park employment area east of M1, J27 and strategic highway connections to both are excellent, involving less than 10 minute drive-time. Hucknall Town Centre is readily accessible. This, mixed-use proposal requires the physical extension of the existing NET tram route into the development site. Development capacity is probably about 2,500-3,000 dwellings with land for more than 3,000 new jobs. Provides the opportunity for a major mixed-use urban extension which can help to meet the needs of the Greater Nottingham Housing Market Area in a sustainable way. The suitability and sustainability of the site has been recognised by independent consultants appointed by the Greater Nottingham Authorities, including Ashfield. The Appraisal of Sustainable Urban Extensions - Tribal 2008, concluded that the Whyburn site: "it is suitable for residential mixed-use development" (more details ref.1955/855).
- **A larger strategic allocation incorporating HG1Si & EV6sb.** EV6Sb is of a recreational and agricultural value as supported in a recent appeal decision for site HG1Sb. This case also accepted that this particular site would not undermine Rookery Park and that the open area would be contained within more logical boundaries. The combined allocation would be located near to local services and highway infrastructure, whilst suitably integrated into the settlement boundary of Huthwaite compared to alternative allocations, including HG1Sv, which is located outside the main built area. The combined sites offer a far more inclusive and sustainable location from a social, economic and environmental perspective. (Ref. 5077)
- **Former Miners Welfare sports ground, Stoneyford Road, Stanton Hill** (SHLAA site ref. S100). The site has been assessed via the strategic housing land availability assessment as being available within 5 years and viable/achievable for housing. Amendment should be made to the proposals map which shows the site designated as "open area" under policy EV6. The site has no topographical, agricultural land quality, neighbour issues, site apparatus, known contamination, access to utilities, built heritage, potential visual impact, statutory landscape/ biodiversity and strategic flood risk constraints. The site occupies a sustainable location. The northern part of the site is contained on two sides by residential development and on a third side by land within the enclosure of the settlement. Accordingly it is classified in the SHLAA as being of a combination of countryside/ residential character comprising part previously development land (PDL). The southern part of the site, i.e. that lying beyond the immediate enclosure of the settlement is identified as a site of importance for nature conservation (SINC) and of mature landscape area character - neither of these comprise statutory designations. NPPF requires any (potentially) adverse impacts to

significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the proposed development. In this case it is considered that the benefits of allocating the site in what is acknowledged to be a sustainable location (in accordance with strategic objective SO4 (para. 2.35) would outweigh any potential effects in relation to policies EV3 and EV4, especially since the site is large enough to accommodate appropriate mitigation if deemed necessary. The SHLAA suggests that the site suffers from highways access constraints, but evidence has been presented to the council throughout the SHLAA process to demonstrate that there is an acceptable form of access via the existing highway network. There also may be an alternative means of access via land to the north, subject to viability. (Ref. 5849/1169)

- **Land south of Forest Road.** - should not be in green belt but should be used for housing. The (SHLAA) identifies that there are insufficient sites within the existing Main Urban Area to meet the housing growth identified. Therefore it is inconsistent that with an identified need for housing land, (as supported by the Council's own evidence base), that there are insufficient sites within the urban area ' whilst a decision in the same document is taken to designate our Client's land to Green Belt. There are striking similarities between the characteristics of our Client's land and allocated residential sites within the Local Plan, that are on the edge of settlements and surrounded on all other sides by Green Belt. Four such allocated housing sites on the edge of Underwood for example. The decision to designate the land into the Green Belt is inconsistent with a number of other residential allocations that are made in the Plan. (2495/955)
- **West of M1 Motorway and north east of rural boundary.** (Site is to the east of Windsor Road) Reason - This site is shown in SHLAA survey as suitable ' it fits the sequential approach for access to services and transport . (ref. 3212)
- **Between Hanstubbin Road, Inkerman Road, Nottingham Rd and the land identified as a SINC 5/904.** Shown in SHLAA survey as suitable. This area suits the sequential approach when considering local services availability and transport availability. (ref. 3212)
- **TCG site at Unwin Road Sutton**
- **Land at Fackley Road, Teversal.** Sustainable location – Questions scoring of site in SA compared to other Teversal sites. (ref. 3463).
- **Land at West Street/Ogle Street, Hucknall.** 1.69 acres at 32/30 West Street, fronting Ogle Street is currently undeveloped (apart from disposable buildings) and could be used as infill. (ref 3369)
- **Land at the Common, Hucknall.** Land protected as public open space, but not used as playing field which it was originally CPO'd for by ADC 30

years ago. Contract excluded land from residential development etc, but the clause could be revoked by the trustees of the Houldsworth Trust should the land be required for infill development. (ref. 3369/1237)

- **The Ashfield triangle – land adjacent Rushley Farm.** Should be included in the land use and access proposals. (Ref 5480/1178)
- **Huthwaite.** A larger scale development in Huthwaite would be more beneficial for the village as the current sites allocated are small individual sites which wouldn't necessarily bring in any revenue from the developers of these sites. A developer of a larger site is more inclined to undertake major infrastructure works which Huthwaite requires, for instance sewers and roadworks. The current sites will possible consume all of the remaining sewer capacity. The current allocations will be using Huthwaite's amenities but the development of the sites will not be adding to the village infrastructure. There is currently a super surgery in construction and the school is due major reworking in a few years, making a larger development feasible. If you were to allocate sites S51, S61, S108 and S350 this would not affect the feel of the village, and also benefit the council who would be able to benefit from the huge amount of revenue realised from a currently underused and worthless piece of land. The current allocations are not necessarily economically viable, because of there small size possible leaving the village with no building. (ref. 5917/834).
- **Land to the west of Kirkby-in-Ashfield - Mowlands**

The respondent put forward a substantial mixed use allocation to the west of Kirkby-in-Ashfield (Mowlands). The plan accompanying the response identifies a housing development extending from close to the A38 to Bentinck Town and Pinxton Road. A new 'relief road running from Pinxton Road to the A38 is set out as part of the scheme as are extensive areas of green space. To the south of Pinxton Lane a substantial area of land is identified as a potential employment allocation.

The respondent sets out that the proposed site is well related to the existing urban area, to the Town Centre and to the strategic highway network. It possesses a unique set of attributes which combine to provide the basis for a highly sustainable mixed use development, one which can help meet the housing and employment needs of the area in a sustainable and environmentally sensitive manner. Importantly however the site provides the opportunity for significant betterment in terms of green space, high quality environments, services and facilities and crucially for the future social and economic success of the area, a new western relief road. The site lies outside the Green Belt. The land available is extensive and this will enable a scheme to be developed which balances the need for development with the need to protect existing landscape and ecological features. It will also allow significant areas of publicly accessible open space to be created, providing a new recreation asset for existing as well as future communities.

The issues relating to congestion at the A38/Sutton Road junction are well



documented, as referred to elsewhere in this submission. The problems are serious and clearly damaging to the local economy, as well as local quality of life. The Mowlands scheme can deliver a western bypass, relieving the congestion on Sutton Road. It can also provide a new access to Ashfield School addressing a serious peak hour congestion and safety problem. The bypass will also remove heavy goods traffic which currently blights exiting residential areas.

The benefits the relief road could bring will result in significant economic and growth potential to the area. These economic benefits can be furthered through the provision of high quality employment land on the Mowlands scheme.

The Mowlands site provides the opportunity for the creation of a high quality mixed use scheme, incorporating a wide range of housing types and sizes, including aspirational housing and affordable housing. The size of the site will enable a scheme to be developed which can establish its own identity and sense of place whilst integrating with, and relating to Kirkby.

The Mowlands scheme can also provide for high quality public transport services, and a range of local services and facilities to meet daily needs. This can include a new primary school, healthcare and other facilities.

- **Land to the north-east of Selston, Bourne Avenue**

The village of Selston occupies an undulating landform, with a complex framework of woodlands, copses and hedgerows providing an attractive setting. It is defined to its east by the M1, but elsewhere, where its boundaries are indistinct, a risk exists that through erosion of the 'soft' edges to the built form, the settlement character could be lost.

Unfortunately the Local Plan proposes to threaten this character by allocating land adjacent to the very 'soft' edges which are inherently vulnerable to change. It is a very two dimensional approach, which bears no detailed scrutiny. Indeed, the proposed allocation fails the environmental dimension of sustainable development as set out at paragraph 7 of the NPPF. An alternative, more appropriate, suitable and sustainable approach to land allocation in Selston is on land at Bourne Avenue, which is bounded by the M1 to its east and existing (mostly modern) housing to its west. It has good and ready access to services and facilities. It is available and deliverable to help to meet the immediate need for housing in the District.

- **Other sites suggested** as better alternatives than those proposed include the following: Lowmoor Public House site, Evans Halshaw site, former Budgens site; Sutton Pools, Brook Street

**Response:**

- The Housing Technical Paper sets out the Council's reasoned justification for the strategic approach to site selection. The Council has taken a

Localism approach to site selection whilst also seeking to ensure that the sites selected are sustainable and development is deliverable. It is clear from the Core Strategy consultation in 2010 that the option to develop two large urban extensions was not acceptable to local communities. An alternative option was to opt for dispersed growth on smaller sites. The sites the Council is proposing to take forward are considered to be more suitable and more deliverable in the shorter term. Recent research has recognised that developers are increasingly finding it difficult to deliver housing on larger urban extensions. Research undertaken by GVA 'Unlocking Garden Cities' (February 2013) highlights the challenges faced by developers in delivering large scale housing schemes. It acknowledges that such schemes do have a role to play in delivering housing. However, the current economic climate is severely affecting the delivery of housing on larger sites. The GVA report concludes by saying that the evidence shows the market will never deliver such large scale housing developments without Government and public sector support, given issues of infrastructure funding, land assembly, local politics, local market and value protection. The Council needs to deliver housing in the short term to meet the 5 year housing land supply and the sites chosen are considered to be more suitable and deliverable than those set out above. An early review of the Local Plan will be undertaken once the Local Plan is adopted and this will seek to allocate additional sites to meet at least the 15 year housing requirement. As such, the sites will be reconsidered through any subsequent review of the Local Plan.

- A significant proportion of the alternative sites put forward in response to the public consultation have already been assessed through the SHLAA and Sustainability Appraisal (SA), and where found suitable have also been considered by the Council Members. These were dismissed in favour of sites which met the identified housing need and have been assessed as more sustainably located and deliverable in the shorter term. These sites are listed below.

**Sites previously considered for housing allocations:-**

- Site s96, Mansfield Road, Skegby.
- Site s95, land off Stoneyford Road
- Land adjacent to Silverhill Lane, Teversal
- Land at Lowmoor Road, Kirkby in Ashfield/Sutton in Ashfield
- Land at Ashland Road Sutton
- Land at Mill Lane, Huthwaite.
- North of MARR. South of MARR.
- Former Miners Welfare sports ground, Stoneyford Road, Stanton Hill (SHLAA site ref. S100).
- Land at Fackley Road, Teversal.
- A larger strategic allocation incorporating HG1Si & EV6sb.
- Land to the west of Kirkby-in-Ashfield – Mowlands
- Adjacent the Gables, Kirkby Woodhouse
- Land off Millers Way, Kirkby

- Site K27 Beacon Farm, Derby Road, Kirkby.
  - Land south of Forest Road.
  - Extension to site at Winter Closes, Underwood
  - Land adjacent 282 Main Street, Westwood (SHLAA site V14),
  - Land adjacent to 149 Stoney Lane, Selston (SHLAA site V86).
  - Between Hanstubbin Road, Inkerman Road, Nottingham Rd and the land identified as a SINC 5/904. (PART).
  - West of M1 Motorway and north east of rural boundary. (Site is to the east of Windsor Road) / Land to the north-east of Selston, Bourne Avenue
  - Land north west of Hucknall- Whyburn.
  - Land at Nottingham Road/the Hucknall Bypass.
- Those sites which are new to the process have been assessed through the SA as part of the Local Plan process. However, this is only possible where the landowner has indicated that the site is available for housing development. Sites not already included in the SHLAA will be assessed through the SHLAA process following adoption of the Local Plan. The assessment of sites will feed in to the review of the Local Plan.

**New sites which have been put forward during the Preferred Approach Consultation (these have now been subject to the Sustainability Appraisal process):-**

- TCG site at Unwin Road Sutton
  - Prologis Park, MARR
  - Land at Carnarvon Cottage, off Silverhill Lane, Fackley.
  - The Ashfield triangle – land adjacent Rushley Farm
  - Land at the Former Annesley Miners Welfare, Derby Road, Annesley.
  - Between Hanstubbin Road, Inkerman Road, Nottingham Rd and the land identified as a SINC 5/904. (PART)
- Following the assessment of the sites through the SA process, no site has fared more favourably than those proposed to be taken forward as housing allocations by the Council. Consequently, no changes are proposed in relation to these sites.
  - Prologis Park, MARR has planning permission for employment uses and has been laid out as a site for economic development. The site is a high quality employment site, which has an excellent frontage onto MARR. It forms a natural extension to the well established Oakham Business Park providing opportunity for businesses to purchase either service plots or brings forward floorspace on a design and build basis. It has been assessed by independent chartered surveyors as one of the best site in Ashfield from a market perspective for this purpose. If allocated for other purposes the Council would be faced with finding an additional 20 ha of land (approximately) to meet the anticipated demand for economic development. From a housing aspect, there are a number of issues with the site in that: there is a potentially conflicting use to the north east of the site in the

Oakham Business Park, the site is isolated in terms of pedestrian access to the wider area and from local facilities.

- The Council have only allocated sites which can deliver housing development and this has been confirmed by landowners and agents of sites submitted to the Council for consideration as housing allocations. Where sites have been suggested by members of the public and the land owners have not agreed to the release of the site, there is no certainty that housing development can be delivered. Consequently, such sites cannot be taken forward as housing allocations in the Local Plan.

**New sites which have been put forward during the Preferred Approach Consultation where the landowner is unknown or has no intention of making the site available for housing development:-**

- Huthwaite – no specific site identified in this instance.
- Evans Halshaw site,
- Budgens site – unknown site
- Lowmoor Public House site
- Land at West Street/Ogle Street, Hucknall.
- Land at the Common, Hucknall.

**The following sites now have planning permission for residential development:-**

- Site off Gilcroft/St Andrews Street and Vere Avenue, Skegby. – This now has planning permission for housing development and will be included in the local plan Publications as a housing allocation.
- Existing employment allocation at Coxmoor Road – This now has planning permission for housing development and will be included in the local plan Publications as a housing allocation.
- Sutton Pools, Brook Street - This now has planning permission for housing development and will be included in the local plan Publications as a housing allocation.

**Changes to the Local Plan:**

- Add new housing allocations for Coxmoor Road, former Sutton Pools and Gilcroft Street/Vere Avenue sites to policy HG1.
- No other sites identified in the alternatives sites set out above are intended to be taken forward as part of the .

<b>Number of Comments</b>		<b>Number of Respondents</b>	
<b>36</b>		<b>21</b>	
<b>Objection to Policy</b>	<b>Support the Policy</b>		<b>Comment on the Policy</b>
<b>34</b>	<b>0</b>		<b>2</b>

**List of Respondents**

M. Spencer; Ms Jane Gardner, Marrons; Mr N Baseley, Ian Baseley Assocs; Guy Longley, Pegasus Planning Group/Hallam land Management; John Booth, Phoenix Planning; Mrs S Pollard; Mrs C Kemp; John Deakin, David Wilson Homes; Paul Stone, Signet Planning; Rob Hughes, Ian Baseley Assocs; Mr M Eagland, Peacock & Smith; Robert Fletcher, Ian Baseley Associates; John Collins, John D Collins & Associates; Emma Fawcett; John Kerry, KDCS; John Szejter, The Houldsworth Trust; David Rixson, Vincent & Goring; Felicity Pether; Jennifer Walters, Barton Wilmore Planning, Oxalis Planning on behalf of W Westerman Ltd, R Cameron, Selston Parish Council.

**Policy HG2: Provision for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople**

**Comments received relating to Policy**

- Environment Agency commented that part g) of policy HG2 should reflect NPPF technical guidance which sets out that caravans, mobile homes and park homes intended for permanent residential use are classified as highly vulnerable in flooding terms, and therefore should not be permitted in flood zone 3.
- Support is made for the protection of heritage assets, although some definition of 'important' would be helpful (HG2:3b).

- Objection to provision of any gypsy or traveller sites.
- The policy is contrary to national guidance and should not require a pre-requisite of need. Sites should be considered on their merits, irrespective of need, in the same way as all other applications.
- Part 3 of the policy is too restrictive, limiting consideration to 'unexpected demand or undersupply' and in particular should not require connection to the main sewerage system, or refer to providing and maintaining visual amenity. Alternative wording is suggested for the latter point, i.e., 'would not have a significant adverse effect on visual amenity'.

Comments received relating to Policy supporting text

- Para 11.64 - Amend reference to HSG:3 to read HG2:3.
- Para 11.67 – Considered to be too restrictive. If any of the criteria are necessary, these should be set out in policy HG2.

**Response:**

- Comment from EA acknowledged. This issue is addressed by Policy CC3:Flood Risk, which does not permit development if it does not meet the sequential approach as set out in the NPPF technical guidance. However, reference to flood risk particularly relating to caravans, mobile homes and park homes intended for permanent residential use will be included in the supporting text to policy HG2.
- Policy EV11 defines heritage assets. This can be cross referred in supporting text for clarification.
- National guidance requires Local Planning Authorities to use a robust evidence base to establish traveller accommodation needs, and to enable provision of suitable accommodation from which travellers can access education, health, welfare and employment infrastructure. This policy seeks to address identified need in the short term, whilst setting criteria for the determination of planning applications. An evidence base which will be used to identify need over a longer period of time is currently being worked on in partnership with the other Nottinghamshire Local Authorities.
- The policy, whilst setting out numerous criteria, is not considered to be too restrictive and in many instances re-iterates other policies in the Local Plan which apply across the board. In Policy HG2 many of these issues have been pulled together as a single point of reference for convenience.
- HG2:2b) and Paragraph 11.67 are based on advice set out in national Guidance 'Planning Policy for Traveller sites - Policy H' (PPTS). Para. 22 of the policy specifically refers to considering the existing level of provision and need for sites as a relevant matter. In addition, para 11.67 directly relates to advice in para 24 of the PPTS. This is a consideration, but not necessarily a pre-requisite, for instance, sites that are consistent with other Local Plan policies, in particular, ST2 and ST3 in terms of strategy for growth, location and sustainability will be assessed in the same way as all other applications.

However, should it be demonstrated that there is clearly an unmet need then consideration may need to be given to sites in locations outside of the main settlement boundaries and normally deemed to be less sustainable. HG2 is therefore not considered to be contrary to national policy. However, the first part of para 11.67 could be deleted as it can be seen to be unnecessary.

- HG2 Part 3 is not intended to limit consideration of applications to cases of 'unexpected demand or undersupply'. This part of the policy simply acknowledges that there may be instances of future demand that are unforeseen, or have yet to be met through allocations. It is therefore seen to be a useful tool to provide a basis for decisions in case applications come forward, and is consistent with PPTS para. 10.
- HG2 part 3 does not require connection to mains sewer, but does require adequate sewerage connections. Wording can be amended to read 'disposal' rather than 'connections' for clarity.
- HG2:3f). Agreed that reference to '...providing and maintaining visual amenity' would be better replaced with '....would not have a significant adverse effect on visual amenity'

#### **Changes to the Local Plan:**

- Add supporting text. Paragraph 11.66 'With reference to food risk, it should be noted that caravans, mobile homes and park homes intended for permanent residential use are classified as highly vulnerable in flooding terms, and therefore should not be permitted in flood zone 3. This approach is supported by policy CC3 which requires development to meet the sequential test set out in the NPPF Technical Guidance.
- Add supporting text. Paragraph 11.66 'Policies EV11, EV4 and EV10 refer to heritage assets, nature conservation and biodiversity, and high quality agricultural land, in more detail.
- Paragraph 11.64 - Amend reference to HSG:3 to read HG2:3. Add reference to ST2. and ST3
- Paragraph 11.67 – delete first part of sentence 'where applications meet criteria.....established'
- HG2 part 3c). Amend to read 'disposal methods' rather than 'connections' for clarity.
- HG2:3f). Amend to read '....would not have a significant adverse effect on visual amenity' rather than '...providing and maintaining visual amenity'.
- Include reference to updating evidence base in partnership with other local Authorities in order to establish need beyond 2016. PPTS requires a supply of deliverable sites for years 1-5, and developable sites or broad locations for years 6-10. – seek to secure any further allocations through a gypsy & traveller DPD if necessary.

<b>Number of Comments</b>		<b>Number of Respondents</b>	
6		4	
<b>Objection to Policy</b>	<b>Support the Policy</b>		<b>Comment on the Policy</b>
3	1		2

**List of Respondents**

AR Yarwood, Derbyshire Gypsy Liaison Group; Andrew Pitts, Environment Agency; Mr Tom Gilbert Woodridge, English Heritage; Mrs Kitching.

**Policy HG3: Affordable Housing**

**Comments received relating to Policy**

- Question the necessity of affordable housing in Hucknall.
- Support for the proposed level of affordable housing provision in general terms.
- The policy should have a reference to financial viability and needs to incorporate criteria permitting negotiation of targets if the applicant provides appropriate viability evidence.
- Not considered acceptable to stipulate a minimum affordable housing requirement without reference to site viability.
- Affordable housing provision should be expressed as an overall target and not on an area basis.
- Why is the level of affordable housing requirement different across the District?
- Viability evidence to support the policy does not take account of the future



CIL regime. Viability of targets should be re-assessed in the light of the Council's proposed CIL charges.

- Delivery of affordable housing needs to be managed differently to in recent years in terms of location.
- Should be for Ashfield residents, not those from the City.

**Response:**

- The local housing market is a key factor in determining the level at which market housing becomes unaffordable to those on lower incomes. Whilst Ashfield has traditionally been regarded as a cheap area to live the increase in house prices relative to incomes in recent years has been significant. Strategic Housing Market Assessments have identified an affordable housing need for the District in excess of those figures set out in the proposed policy and the current SPD. However, it has also been identified that this level of provision through new build would not be financially viable and would impede/prohibit the delivery of sites. (Affordable Housing Viability Assessment 2009 - Three Dragons consultants).
- The justification for the area based approach is derived from the Affordable Housing Viability Assessment 2009 (Three Dragons). The key findings of this study suggested a wide variation in the market and hence viability of delivering affordable housing across the District. This policy approach is locally distinctive and acknowledges the disparity across the District. It is considered to be more appropriate than a general policy applied to the administrative area of Ashfield, and will also assist in delivery of affordable housing in the 'Villages' area which has seen a significant under supply in recent years.
- With regard to viability on any specific site, this issue is addressed in para. 11.73. Whilst it is acknowledged that the current market conditions are challenging, the policy applies to the longer term and should make clear the stance of the Council. Planning applications /sites are judged on their own merits, and should these particular policy requirements prove to be financially prohibitive to the delivery of a site for housing, then this will be a material consideration in the determination. It is therefore considered unnecessary to amend the wording of policy itself.
- With regard to the distribution of affordable units on individual sites, paragraph 6.4 of the Affordable Housing SPD sets out the Council's approach. This aims to avoid over-concentration any part of a site, requiring units to be 'pepper-potted' throughout the development and be indistinguishable from the market housing. Whether the affordable housing is shared ownership (the person purchases a shared in the property) or social rent is determined in negotiation with the Council based upon identified affordable housing needs and the characteristics of the site.
- Ashfield Council have not yet taken steps to identify what any future CIL changes may be set at, or indeed if any would be viable without stifling development. The cost implications associated with the provision of

affordable housing will be taken into account when any CIL requirements are proposed.

**Changes to the Local Plan:**

- Add wording in supporting text after paragraph 11.77 with regard to the distribution of affordable housing units as follows: ‘Affordable dwellings should be distributed in an appropriate manner within any development and should avoid an over-concentration in one part of the site, i.e., it should be ‘pepper-potted’ throughout the development and be indistinguishable from the market housing.’
- Add wording in supporting text after paragraph 11.77 to require all affordable units to meet minimum quality and space standards as set out in the SPD (HQI Standards) in order to enable transfer of units to a Registered Provider, the Council, or any other organisation or body whose principle business is the provision of affordable housing.
- Update SPD to include quality and space standards.

<b>Number of Comments</b>		<b>Number of Respondents</b>	
<b>9</b>		<b>9</b>	
<b>Objection to Policy</b>	<b>Support the Policy</b>	<b>Comment on the Policy</b>	
<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>5</b>	

**List of Respondents**

Mr Ken Creed, John Deakin, David Wilson Homes; Guy Longley, Pegasus Planning Group; Mr M Eagland, Peacock & Smith; Gareth Jones, URS Infrastructure & Environment UK Ltd; Mr Andrew Gore, Pegasus Planning Group Ltd; Aaron Smith, Caldecotte Consultants; Sally Wyatt, reach Out Residents

## Policy HG4: Public Green Space in New Residential Developments

### Comments received relating to Policy

- Natural England supports the policy and draws attention to their ANGSt standards (Accessible Natural Greenspace Standard).
- It may not always be appropriate or necessary for a minimum of 10% of the gross housing area to be devoted as green space assets on sites of 2ha or more. E.g. if there is an existing over-provision of facilities.
- Providing green space within new residential developments should only be required where there is an identified need and/or shortfall in the immediate vicinity. Part c) should be removed as planning obligations must be necessary and directly related to the development to be legal. This is also supported in CIL regs 122.
- The policy should be amended to allow for proposals to demonstrate that there is not a need for green space within their development.

### Comments received relating to Policy supporting text

None.

### **Response:**

- The Council acknowledges Natural England's published ANGSt standards. The District currently has local standards set out in the Ashfield Green Space Strategy, to which the policy refers. This Strategy is likely to be subject to review within the coming year and will take account of the ANGSt standards at that time.
- Policy HG4 Criterion c) addresses the issue of open space provision where it is inappropriate or unnecessary to provide new green space assets within the site boundary. This does not diminish the need for quality open space to meet the needs of future occupants of a site, merely that the provision could be better met elsewhere, or that nearby existing provision can be improved. This is supported by para. 11.85. the words 'or unnecessary' will be deleted for clarity.
- The vast majority of residential developments will have occupants who require access to a certain quantity and quality of open space. This fundamental for well-being and key to delivering the Council's Vision and objectives, in particular, for promoting healthy lifestyles and reducing the need to travel by car. Paragraph 11.87 sets out exclusions to the requirements. ( e.g. sheltered housing for the elderly, residential care facilities).

- The Ashfield Green Space Strategy applies standards and identifies any shortfalls in provision and quality of open space.

**Changes to the Local Plan:**

- Policy HG4 criterion (c) - Delete the words ‘or unnecessary’
- Add text to para. 11.87 ‘...such as elderly sheltered accommodation and residential care facilities **where residents are unlikely to benefit from local open space provision**, have different...’

<b>Number of Comments</b>		<b>Number of Respondents</b>	
<b>3</b>		<b>3</b>	
<b>Objection to Policy</b>	<b>Support the Policy</b>		<b>Comment on the Policy</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>		<b>1</b>

**List of Respondents**

Aaron Smith, Caldecotte Consultants; Natural England; Matthew Stafford, the Co-operative Group.

## Policy HG5: Housing Mix and Density

### Comments received relating to Policy

#### Support

- Support for Policy HG5 but with comment that neither Policy HG3 or Policy HG5 identifies that the affordable housing stock should be dispersed throughout a site, rather than being clustered in one place.

#### Objection

- The requirement that 'all new residential development will contain adequate internal living space based upon recognised national guidelines is poorly defined and unsound. There are presently a variety of guidelines operated across the country and the Government is presently conducting a review of standards applied to constructing new dwellings. There are no 'recognised national guidelines' and to refer to this in the policy is misleading. Paragraph 58 of the NPPF advises any policies to prescribe the quality of development should be set locally. If it is the approach to identify design standards locally then this should be developed as part of the plan-making process and referred to in the policy to give developers clarity on the requirements.
- ACCESS raised a concern that the Council will seek to implement a two-tier policy of housing density in which a higher density will be sought and implemented by both the developer and the Council. ACCESS maintained that the Council reappraise the dwelling figures within the proposed allocations to ensure that the correct potential numbers of dwellings, at 30 per hectare are used in any calculations in respect to housing requirements and road density.

### Comments received relating to Policy supporting text

Para. 11.90 – support is given for the approach to develop the right mix of housing

### **Response:**

- The approach to distribution of affordable units on any site is addressed in the Affordable Housing SPD para. 6.4. This SPD is referred to in both Policy HG3 and its supporting text. However, for the purpose of clarity, this will be included in supporting text at the next Local Plan stage.
- It is acknowledged that a raft of guidance currently exists with regard to internal space standards. However, CLG announced a review of housing standards in September 2012, with a view to providing a simpler set of standards to be applied nationwide. In the interim, a set of locally agreed standards will be incorporated into the Council's Design SPD. This will help inform potential developers, and allow flexibility in that it enables

responsiveness to any future national guidance. HG5 part 2 will be amended to reflect this approach.

- The Policy allows flexibility on housing densities while identifying that for most development a density of 30 or more dwellings will be anticipated. In some circumstances lower density may be supported as specified in the Policy. In most cases the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment assumes that sites will be developed at approximately 30 dwellings per hectare. However, this will vary depending on location and the physical nature of the site.

**Changes to the Local Plan:**

- Amend HG5 part 2 to read ‘All new residential Developments will contain adequate internal living space, based upon local guidelines.’
- Include reference to distribution of affordable housing units in policy HG3.
- Para 11.90 – Amend to read ‘...10 years’, and include additional wording ‘The housing market is dynamic so it is not possible to establish static targets for the mix of dwelling size and type that needs to be provided’.

Number of Comments		Number of Respondents	
50		50	
Objection to Policy	Support the Policy	Comment on the Policy	
2	48	-	

**List of Respondents**

Annesley Community Committed to Ensuring Sustainable Settlements (ACCESS); Mr & Mrs Stewart; Mr Aaron Smith, Caldecotte Consultants for Scottish & Newcastle PLC,; Mr Robert Collier, Mrs Julia Collier, Mr Peter Olko, Mrs Joan Olko, Miss Deberah Olko, Mr William Cooper, Ms Ann Cooper, Mr & Mrs M & P Dear, Mrs Margaret Lathall, Mr John Shaw, Mrs Micaela Stanley, Mrs Anne Chalkley, Mr Stewart Chalkley, Mr Stephen Jacksdale, Mrs Alison Jackson, Mrs Pauline Cumberland, Mr Mark Raynor, Mr Philip Wood, Mrs Margaret Johnson, Mrs Thompson, Mr John Lowe, Miss Becky Chaukley, Mr David Connah, Mrs Patricia Starling, Mrs Valerie Alcock, Mr David Alcock, Mr & Mrs R & M Hufton, Ms Julie Craft, Mrs Madeline Allsop, Mr Dick Bend, Mrs Margaret Bend, Mrs Pauline Hodson, Mr Peter Ward, Mrs Elizabeth Ward, Mr Roger Dean, Mr George Cordy, Mr Russell Lathall, Mrs Patricia Shaw, Ms Kathryn Shaw, Mr John Bolger, Mr Richard Shaw, Mrs Kirsty Cohen, Mr & Mrs M & M Lowe, Miss Angela Smith, Mrs Haydee Lafferty, Mr David Simpson, Mr Adam Heathcote.

## Contributing to Successful Development

### Policy SD1: Design Considerations for Development

#### Responses received relating to Policy

##### Support

- National Trust support the Policy.
- Natural England welcomes the inclusion at paragraph 12.15 that landscaping schemes should, wherever possible, use native species of plants and shrubs.
- Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust support the overall principle of the need for good design, however it is advised specific mention should be made regarding the integration of good design for biodiversity into new build development, which can help to bring wildlife into urban areas and be of benefit for quality of life, health and wellbeing as well as contribute to achieving BAP targets.
- English Heritage welcomes this policy and its supporting text. Taking different approaches to existing, mixed and fragmented character areas seems logical, but it may be difficult to define whether an area's character is existing, mixed or fragmented. Without clearer guidance, possibly using maps, there may be disagreement on which part of the policy applies to specific locations.

#### Responses received relating to Policy

- 3 tier approach to character areas is difficult to define without the district being zoned as such.
- Section 2 (d). Not sure how this translates into design.
- Section 2 (e). Is there opportunity here to refer to the appropriateness of infill and back-land development.
- Section 2 (f), (g) and (h) Can these be combined as they touch on the same thing?
- Section 2 (h). This can be interpreted differently when an area is very mixed. The policy needs to be worded to allow use of modern materials where deemed appropriate, otherwise it could stifle modern and innovative design as the NPPF says.
- Section (a) and (h). Could these be combined into one?
- Section 2 (h) Use the word boundaries instead of mean of enclosure.
- New development should create a harmonious and attractive appearance through use of architectural detailing and materials. Rather than a mishmash of styles and materials.
- Under 'Movement' do you need to refer to waste collection/ recycling?

#### Responses received relating to Policy supporting text

- Proposals must ensure the impact of any new developments on the character of existing and adjacent areas is taken account of and managed



and controlled. The developer 'trend' to build three storey dwellings and the impact these have on existing dwellings in terms of proximity, views, vistas, skylines etc is of concern. As such policy proposals here are welcomed but must be vigorously pursued in practice.

- Our clients note other policies which aim to engender safe and attractive environments which individually and collectively seek to improve the image of local communities.
- OPUN advises there is a lot of steer in this policy which will be useful in development discussions. Advises the policy should be referred to at the outset of the Local Plan so that all other policies are seen within its context. Also, Design Review would be a useful addition to include as the methodology to test schemes, given NPPF paragraph 62.
- The Highways Agency would like to see reference to the need for new development to be subject to Transport Assessments and Travel Plans where appropriate. The HA notes this is referred to in Policy SD8 – Traffic Management and Highway Safety but considers that the Movement section to this policy could better complement Policy SD8, clarifying the approach to sustainable transport and how residual traffic impacts will be mitigated.

**Response:**

- The supporting text to Policy EV4 – Green Infrastructure, Biodiversity and Geological Conservation already refers to the need for development proposals to consider the protection and enhancement of biodiversity and geodiversity. It is therefore not considered necessary to include an additional reference in Policy SD1, but an additional reference will be made to the supporting text of Policy EV4 to refer to the benefits of bringing wildlife into urban areas can have on quality of life etc.
- It is acknowledged that it may be difficult to define whether an area's character is existing, mixed or fragmented, therefore it is proposed that these references will be removed from the policy. As such, all development proposals will be assessed against criteria 1 (criteria 2 and 3 will be deleted from the policy). The reference will remain in the support text to existing, mixed and fragmented areas.
- It is agreed to delete criteria 2 (d) from Policy SD1.
- It is recognised that infill and back-land development should be of a comparable scale, character and size to surrounding properties and this will be included in the supporting text to policy SD1.
- It is not considered necessary to combine criteria 2 (f), (g) and (h).
- Policy SD1 is not intended to restrict the use of modern and innovative design and as such the term 'where deemed appropriate' will be added to criteria 2 (h) of the Policy. This will allow for a more flexible approach.
- It is agreed to use the word 'boundaries' instead of 'mean of enclosure' in criteria 2 (h).
- It is considered that Policy SD1 already requires development proposals to demonstrate that account has been taken of various factors which would

ensure that architectural detailing and materials are considered as part of any application.

- It is not considered necessary to refer to waste collection/ recycling in Policy SD1 as this is covered by a separate policy in the Local Plan – Policy SD3.
- The importance of design is already included at the onset of the Local Plan. Strategic Objectives SO13 and SO14 specifically refer to the high quality sustainable design and that a high priority will be given to design not only in terms of the aesthetics but also, function, energy efficiency, risk of crime etc. The Strategic Objectives support both the Vision of the Plan and the Policies, in this case policy SD1. It is not considered that an additional reference is necessary.
- It is not considered necessary to repeat National Guidance from the NPPF and therefore a reference to the ‘Design Review’ will not be made within the Local Plan.
- It is considered unnecessary to include a reference to the need for new development to be subject to Transport Assessments and Travel Plans in Policy SD1. These are referred to in Policy SD8 – Traffic Management and Highway Safety. All policies contained in the Local Plan are interdependent – they must be read together in relation to their combined effect upon any development proposal (see paragraph 1.5 of the Local Plan).

#### **Changes to the Local Plan:**

- Policy EV4, add at the end of paragraph 8.60 the following text, “Good design for biodiversity can help bring wildlife into urban areas and be of benefit for quality of life, health and wellbeing as well as contribute to achieving Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) targets.”
- Amend criteria 1 of Policy SD1 to read:  
‘Development proposals should demonstrate that account has been taken of the following factors:
  - a) The historical development of the area, including local materials (where deemed appropriate), architectural style and detailing, landscape features and boundaries
  - b) Existing uses and activities
  - c) Existing land forms, orientation, natural and historic landscape features
  - d) The local pattern and grain of development, with respect to the arrangement of street layout and open spaces, block size, plots and building patterns.
  - e) The scale, shape, form and proportion of existing buildings, building lines and heights within the street scene and
  - f) The scale in relation to the surrounding topography, views, vistas and skylines
  - g) Local landmarks, focal buildings and features, particularly heritage assets
  - h) Important views into, out of and through the area.
- Delete criteria 2 and 3 of Policy SD1.

<b>Number of Comments</b>		<b>Number of Respondents</b>	
<b>9</b>		<b>9</b>	
<b>Objection to Policy</b>	<b>Support the Policy</b>		<b>Comment on the Policy</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>6</b>		<b>1</b>

**List of Respondents**  
 OPUN, The Highways Agency, National Trust, English Heritage, Natural England, Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust, URS Infrastructure & Environment UK Ltd, Mr and Mrs Norris, Simon Britt

**Policy SD2: Amenity**

Comments relating to Policy  
 No comments were received.

Comments received relating to Policy supporting text  
 No comments were received.

**Response:**

-

**Changes to the Local Plan:**

-

<b>Number of Comments</b>		<b>Number of Respondents</b>	
0		0	
<b>Objection to Policy</b>	<b>Support the Policy</b>		<b>Comment on the Policy</b>
-	-		-

**List of Respondents**

-

**Policy SD3: Recycling and Refuse Provision in New Development**

Responses received relating to Policy

Support

- Environment Agency Support a Policy which addresses recycling and refuse provision in relation to new development.

Responses received relating to Policy supporting text

None.

**Responses:**

- The Environment Agency's support is noted.

**Changes to the Local Plan:**

- No changes proposed to the Local Plan arising out of the consultation responses.

Number of Comments		Number of Respondents	
1		1	
Objection to Policy	Support the Policy	Comment on the Policy	
0	1	0	

**List of Respondents**

Mr A Pitts, Environment Agency

## Policy SD4: Infrastructure Provision and Developer Contributions

### Comments received relating to Policy

#### Support

- Support from Network Rail for Policy SD4 as it provides a mechanism for developer contributions towards rail facilities where growth areas or significant housing allocations are identified close to existing rail infrastructure. Many stations and routes are already operating close to capacity and a significant increase in patronage may create the need for upgrades to the existing infrastructure including improved signalling, passing loops, car parking, improved access arrangements or platform extensions. The likely impact and level of improvements required will be specific to each station (Kirkby in Ashfield, Sutton Parkway and Hucknall) and any level crossings or bridges. In these circumstances, it is appropriate to require developer contributions.
- Support from the County Council for the use of planning obligations to meet infrastructure need generated by a proposed development. However, the Policy places an emphasis on 'local skills enhancement' without identifying how this might happen in terms of developer contributions?
- Policy SD4 is welcomed by the Highway Agency through its emphasis on mitigating the impact of development on existing infrastructure through the encouragement of a modal shift to increased use of sustainable transport and making effective use of existing infrastructure. The Agency would expect :
  - to see an Infrastructure Schedule included within the Local Plan document itself, and
  - critical infrastructure to be referred to elsewhere within Local Plan policies, for example with a policy for transport/traffic management.

The Agency considers that the anticipated need for improvements to M1 junctions equated to 'Strategic Infrastructure'. The Agency welcomes the Council's intention to develop a Community Infrastructure Levy as a means of securing funding to support infrastructure delivery.

- Support for the Policy including cultural facilities.

#### Object

- ACCESS raised that the A611 through Annesley is one of the country's most congested roads with a number of sites within a 2km corridor of the A611 already having planning permission or yet to be fully occupied. Substantial concerns were raised regarding the transport infrastructure as:
  - The Ashfield Transport Study, Nov 2010 concentrated on 3 major 1,000 dwelling developments around Ashfield and failed to

investigate the road capacity and junction capacity through Annesley Woodhouse stopping at the A611/B6139 Coxmoor Junction;

- Newark and Sherwood District Council's study on the traffic impact of the proposed mixed use Lindhurst development is out of date as a result of the proposed developments of HG1Sv (Rushley Farm - Residential development) and HG1MUa (South of West Notts College Mixed Use);
- Developments within Gedling Borough Council namely Top Wighay (1000 dwellings) and Papplewick North (600 dwellings) as well as Ashfield District Council mixed development site at Rolls Royce Hucknall site (900 dwellings) will also further impact on the A611.

Consequently, the transport evidence is "unsound".

- Westerman's responded that the Plan does not take account of the need to improve infrastructure.

#### Comment

- Selston Parish Council identified that Parish residents are concerned about the quality of the public transport services serving the settlements of Selston, Jacksdale and Underwood. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan needs to review the effectiveness of existing public transport provision within the Parish and consider how this may potentially be enhanced through the Local Plan process to serve the needs of both existing and proposed residents. Developer contributions do offer some potential for development led contribution towards improved public transport, and this option should be explored when planning applications are submitted.
- Gedling Borough Council acknowledges that the Policy requires contributions towards infrastructure that crosses administrative boundaries and that it requires plans to be aligned. The Borough Council stresses there have been a series of meeting between Gedling BC and Ashfield DC to discuss the impact of proposed development within Gedling Borough on Hucknall.
- Nottinghamshire County Council commented:
  - The Policy should make clear what the Council's priorities are for developer contributions. This is particularly importance in the context of issues of viability. They suggest that where a third party has a statutory responsibility for the provision of a service, the planning contributions to mitigate for the impact of a development on that service (e.g. provision of education places), should take precedence over non-statutory and/or more flexible requirements such as the provision of affordable housing, or open space. Overcrowding of schools will exacerbate the current education under-performance in Ashfield.
  - Proposed amendments to the wording of Policy Criteria 1 as by referencing the Local Plan it does not take into account departures from the Plan.
  - Criteria 5 of the Policy should be given greater emphasis by moving

to Criteria 2.

- Clarity should be provided on how “Local skills enhancement through developer contributions might be achieved?”

Comments received relating to Policy supporting text

- Nottinghamshire County Council identified that Para 12.43 refers to the relaxing of a requirement to meet contributions in “exceptional circumstances” A clear view of the District Council’s priorities within the Policy would provide a helpful framework for how this process might take place?

**Response:**

- The Council’s welcomes support for the Policy. However, a key aspect identified by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is viability. The NPPF, in paragraph 173, stresses that development should not be subject to a scale of obligations and policy burdens that the ability to develop viably is threatened. The implication is that S106 contributions and CIL will need to reflect viability issues and difficult decisions will have to be made in relation to infrastructure priorities in taking development forward.
- Officers in the Council’s Regeneration Section are exploring how the skills and training needs of local people can be improved through developer contributions/CIL.
- The Council acknowledges the concerns regarding transport infrastructure along the A611. Additional work is being undertaken in relation to the Transport Study to take account of the additional housing sites proposed and sites in neighbouring authorities.

**Changes to the Local Plan:**

- For clarification to the Policy it is recommended that it is amended to include the following:

Amend Policy Criteria 1 “The Council will work with partners, neighbouring councils, infrastructure providers, ‘developers’ and stakeholders .....

Amend Policy Criteria 1 to change emphasis of the last sentence to take account of departures from the Local Plan. Policy amended to reflect proposed development rather than Local Plan.

Amend Policy Criteria 5 “Where new or improved infrastructure, local skills enhancement, facilities or services are necessary for planning permission to be granted the Council will require the on-site or off site provision through site specific land or buildings, planning obligations.....



<b>Number of Comments</b>		<b>Number of Respondents</b>	
7		7	
<b>Objection to Policy</b>	<b>Support the Policy</b>		<b>Comment on the Policy</b>
-	5		2

**List of Respondents**

Mr Owen Walters for The Highways Agency; Ms A Gibson for Gedling Borough Council; Sally Gill for Nottinghamshire County Council; Ms S Ball for Selston Parish Council; Mrs M Lake for Network Rail; and Rose Freeman for The Theatre's Trust; Annesley Community Committed to Ensuring Sustainable Settlements (ACCESS)

**Policy SD5: Telecommunications**

Comments received relating to Policy

Support

- English Heritage supports the reference to minimising the impact of telecommunication development on buildings and the surrounding area, as well as the stricter controls for heritage assets.

Object

- The Mobile Operators Association Ltd support the principle of a telecommunications policy but considers that elements of the Policy need to be amended:

Criteria 1 d) includes the wording in relation to consultation ". .and their views have been taken into account in the development proposal." The wording is considered to be overly restrictive in comparison to the wording included in NPPF paragraph 45.

Criteria 1 F) relating to communications equipment not causing interference, is considered unnecessary as it form part of the conditions in the operators licence.

Criteria 2 is considered to be unsound as it does not comply with the National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 46.

Comments received relating to Policy supporting text

None.

**Response:**

- The Council does not consider there is a conflict between the wording of the Policy Criteria 1 d) and the NPPF paragraph 45, bullet point one. Both the Policy and the NPPF stress the need to take into account consultations with organisations neither, in the Council's view, mean that they have to be automatically followed if there is evidence to justify the development.
- The comment on Criteria 1 f) is noted but it is not proposed to amend the Policy. This should not be an issue if the requirement is already being met as part of the operators licence.

**Changes to the Local Plan:**

- The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) paragraph 46 emphasises that "Local Planning authorities must determine applications on planning ground. They should not seek to.....question the need for the telecommunications system". The intention of the policies is not to question the need for telecommunications equipment but identifies that in planning terms environmentally area and heritage asset are sensitive locations which are afforded greater protection in both national and local planning policies. It is proposed to amend the Policy to deleted "they meet an essential need (for example by providing an essential link to national services." The amended section 2 of the Policy would be worded as follows: "In environmentally sensitive areas or areas with heritage assets more stringent controls will be exercised. Proposals will be permitted only where they meet the above criteria and are supported by evidence to demonstrate that there are no suitable alternative locations available in less sensitive locations."

<b>Number of Comments</b>		<b>Number of Respondents</b>	
4		2	
<b>Objection to Policy</b>	<b>Support the Policy</b>		<b>Comment on the Policy</b>
1	1		2

<p><b><u>List of Respondents</u></b></p> <p>Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge, English Heritage; Ms Ginny Hall, MONO Consultants Ltd (3 responses)</p>
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**Policy SD6: Contaminated Land and Unstable Land**

<p><u>Comments received relating to Policy</u></p> <p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Coal Authority support the Policy and its approach to unstable land emphasising that potential land instability arising from mining legacy is a locally distinctive issue within Ashfield. The Policy and accompanying text sets out an effective approach for ensuring that the issue is taken into account and that remediation or mitigation measures are incorporated where necessary.</li> <li>• The Environment Agency supports the Policy. However, the EA stressed that there needs to be more emphasis in the Local Plan on the protection of controlled waters. Groundwater in particular, is not a boundary issue and ensuring an area wide holistic approach when considering such a valuable resource is much more effective at strategic 'design' stage. The EA also stressed that the revised approach to planning guidance is for local authorities to include key issues within the Local Development Plan.</li> </ul>
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

These key issues can then be used to influence and guide decisions on a site specific basis at application stage. The Environment Agency recommend that an objective be included within the Local Plan to 'Protect and enhance the wider environment' giving particular attention to dealing with controlled waters and land contamination.

Comments received relating to Policy supporting text

None

**Response:**

- Recommended that changes are made to policies to reflect the comment received.

**Changes to the Local Plan:**

- Changes are made to Policy SP2 and supporting text, and to Policy CC2, to reflect the Environment Agency recommend that an objective be included within the Local Plan to protecting and enhance the wider water environment.
- A new paragraph is added after paragraph 12.57 setting out the following - "Groundwater is a key resources. Consequently, the prevention of pollution and reversal of environmentally significant and sustained deteriorating trends in groundwater quality is a requirement of the Water Framework Directive and it associative legislations/regulations, as well as good practice. The Council will work closely with the Environment Agency utilising best practice documents such as "Groundwater Protection: Policy and Practice (GP3) Part 1-5. Prospective developers should:
  - Assessing the area of influence of their activities and to take account of groundwater uses and dependent ecosystems within this area during planning, construction and operation;
  - Provide adequate information to statutory bodies such as the Environment Agency when submitting their proposals so that the potential impact on groundwater resources and quality can be adequately assessed.

Proposed development should follow the procedures set out in the in CLR11 ' Model Procedures for the Management of Contamination (or any update or replacement). This includes assessing the suitability of sites for redevelopment based on their environmental setting as well as previous site history and potential for contamination to be present and the best ways to mitigate any risks to Controlled Waters shown."

- While not specifically identified it is considered that the objective to protecting and enhance the wider water environment will be covered within

the Environmental strategic objectives set out in Section 2 of the Local Plan Preferred Approach.

Number of Comments		Number of Respondents	
2		2	
Objection to Policy	Support the Policy	Comment on the Policy	
-	2	-	

**List of Respondents**

Mr Andrew Pitts for the Environment Agency and Miss Rachael A Bust for the Coal Authority.

**Policy SD7: Environmental Protection**

Comments received relating to Policy

Support

- The Environment Agency supports the Policy.
- Support for the Policy and particularly the light pollution aspects from Natural England and the National Trust.
- Support for the Policy from English Heritage but with a request that a reference to the historic environment is made in the first paragraph of the Policy.
- Notts Wildlife Trust supports the overall principles of this Policy. However they comment that specific reference is required to the need for assessing the likely significant effects of any development that falls within the buffer zone identified by Natural England for the prospective Special Protection

Area, in accordance with their guidance on undertaking a risk-based assessment of the effects on nightjar and woodlark.

Comments received relating to Policy supporting text

None.

**Response:**

- The Council is undertaking a Habitats Regulation Assessment which will include examining the implications of the potential designation of a Special Protection Area.

**Changes to the Local Plan:**

- Recommend that Policy Criteria 1 is amended to insert “and historical” so it will read as the natural and historic environment.

Number of Comments		Number of Respondents	
5		5	
Objection to Policy	Support the Policy	Comment on the Policy	
	5		
<b><u>List of Respondents</u></b>			
Mr Andrew Pitts for the Environment Agency; Andrew Lowe for Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust; Natural England; Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge for English Heritage and Alan Hubbard for the National Trust.			

## Policy SD8: Traffic Management and Highway Safety

### Responses received relating to Policy

#### Object

- Nottinghamshire County Council are concerned that the transport background evidence is out of date. They consider that the Local Plan is unsound on this basis. They will review their position at the next stage in the Local Plan process if a revised transport study is in place.
- NCC had some concerns about the robustness of the text in Policy SD8. It was suggested that this could be improved.

#### Comment

- Concerns have been raised about the safety of the A38 due to the amount of development proposed.
- Concerns have been raised about the capacity of the A38 due to the proposed allocations in Kirkby in Ashfield and Sutton in Ashfield.
- Concerns raised by Bolsover District Council regarding traffic congestion on the A38 and junction 28 of the M1. BDC acknowledges ongoing discussions with ADC and the Highway Agency and seeks to resolve any issues through this process.
- NCC recommended that the transport schemes identified in the Nottinghamshire Local Transport Plan should also be included in the Local Plan.
- The Highway Agency is concerned that there has been limited utilisation of the 2010 Transport Study in this Policy with regard to traffic management.
- The Highway Agency are concerned that development will impact on the M1 and its junctions, and although development sites are strategically placed to take advantage of public transport there will inevitably be some residual traffic impacts. The HA are concerned that these have not been considered fully.
- Derbyshire County Council is concerned about the amount of traffic which will be generated in the rural area due to the proposed number of dwellings/two strategic sites (Winter Close and Alfreton Road). They have no objection at this stage but would like to be consulted on any future transport assessments for each site.
- Concern has been raised regarding congestion in Kirkby town centre. It has been suggested that the bus stops on Station Street should be relocated to allow the traffic to flow more freely.
- There is concern regarding the lack of public transport provision in the West of Hucknall.
- The B6021 should be upgraded (Sutton Road, Kirkby in Ashfield) and speed cameras installed near to Ashfield Comprehensive School.
- It was suggested that the tram should be extended to Hucknall West.
- Network Rail would like it set out in policy that they should be consulted on

planning applications where traffic may impact on the railway network, in particular level crossings and weak bridges. They have stated that any planning application which may increase the level of pedestrian and/or vehicular usage at a level crossing should be supported by a full Transport Assessment assessing such impact: and the developer should be required to fund any required qualitative improvements to the level crossing as a direct result of the development proposed.

- The policy advises that new sustainable transport infrastructure will be provided and a hierarchical approach to sustainable transport networks will be adopted. This is good but stronger links to cross reference additional detail in the Local Transport Plan would be beneficial.
- ACCESS raised that the A611 through Annesley is one of the country's most congested roads with a number of sites within a 2km corridor of the A611 already having planning permission or yet to be fully occupied. Concerns were raised regarding the transport infrastructure as ACCESS consider that:
  - The Ashfield Transport Study, Nov 2010 concentrated on 3 major 1000 dwelling developments around Ashfield and failed to investigate the road capacity and junction capacity through Annesley Woodhouse stopping at the A611/B6139 Coxmoor Junction;
  - Newark and Sherwood Council study on the traffic impact of the proposed mixed use Lindhurst development is out of date as a result of the proposed developments of HG1Sv (Rushley Farm - Residential development) and HG1MUa (South of West Notts College Mixed Use);
  - Developments within Gedling Borough Council namely Top Wighay (1000 dwellings) and Papplewick North (600 dwellings) as well as Ashfield District Council mixed development site at Rolls Royce Hucknall site (900 dwellings) will also further impact on the A611.

Consequently, ACCESS considers the transport evidence to be "unsound".

#### Responses received relating to Policy supporting text

- Paragraphs 12.75 and 12.76 refer to Nottinghamshire County Council (NCC) as the Highway Authority for Ashfield District. The Highway Agency is the highway authority for Ashfield District in terms of the M1 motorway and this should be acknowledged within the document.

#### **Response:**

- MVA Consultancy has been commissioned by the Council to undertake a review of the 2010 Ashfield Transport Study. Following the completion of the transport study the Council will identify and address issues relating to the impact of the proposed allocations on the highway network. The



Transport Study update will be used to inform and, where necessary, strengthen Policy SD8.

- The Council will continue to work with neighbouring local authorities, the Highway Agency and Nottinghamshire County Council to address highway issues. In terms of highway infrastructure, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan will set out the measures that will be taken to resolve the highway constraints identified in the Transport Study.
- The supporting text will be amended to acknowledge the Highway Agency as the Highway Authority for the Strategic Road Network in Ashfield District;
- The Policy text will be reviewed in light of the comments received and it will be strengthened where areas of weakness have been identified. The supporting text will link in better with the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Transport Plan both of which set out the package of mitigation measures required to deliver sustainable development.
- Nottinghamshire County Council plan to undertake improvements to the road network in Kirkby town centre. There are plans to change Ellis Street from one way traffic to a two way system. This will improve the flow of traffic in the town centre.
- The Council will continue to protect the safeguarded land to the north of Hucknall for any future NET extension plans.
- The Council will continue to consult Network Rail on planning applications where a development may have an impact on a level crossing. This is standard practice and it is not considered necessary to incorporate this into Policy SD8.
- With regard to the policy specifying that a transport assessment would be required for developments near a level crossing, the Council considered that this is a matter which requires a development management approach. It is not considered good practice to set out the parameters for a transport assessment in relation to a level crossing as each case should be looked at on its own merit. There is a danger in doing this as by drawing a boundary line or setting a threshold for development something may be missed. As such, a common sense, development management approach is considered the best way forward. The Council will ensure that this is sufficiently incorporated into the validation stage of a planning application.
- The Council acknowledge the concerns raised regarding traffic congestion along the A611. The Transport Study will identify any necessary highway improvement works which need to be undertaken as a result of the proposed site allocations.
- The Transport Study is a strategic assessment of the District and the wider area; it also takes account of the potential impact of sites in neighbouring local authority areas.
- Within the policy and supporting text more emphasis will be placed on the need to promote 'smarter choices' (walking cycling, public transport etc) and the reasons why it is important to reduce private car journeys and manage traffic i.e. to help to reduce CO2 emissions, thereby minimising climate change and the effects of climate change (e.g. increases in extreme weather patterns which could lead to more flooding, negative impact on biodiversity/ecosystem etc); to improve opportunities of accessing

employment, education or other essential facilities and services through the use of more efficient transportation; to improve air quality etc.

**Changes to the Local Plan:**

- The supporting text will be amended to include a reference to the Highway Agency being the Highway Authority for the Strategic Road Network.
- The introductory section of the policy will be amended to emphasise the importance of reducing the need to travel by private car and to clearly set out the reasons why it is important e.g. to reduce CO2/climate change;
- The policy will include a reference to the need for new development to incorporate 'smarter choices' in line with NCC guidance and this will be linked to the supporting text.
- Better links to the Nottinghamshire Local Transport Plan will be made within the policy.
- Include a reference to the Ellis Street highway improvement scheme within Policy SPKS3.

Number of Comments		Number of Respondents
		8
Objection to Policy	Support the Policy	Comment on the Policy
7	0	2

**List of Respondents**

Mr Ian Collis, Bolsover District Council, Hugh Nicoll, Mr Owen Walters, The Highways Agency, Sally Gill, Nottinghamshire County Council, Mr Ian Goldstraw, Derbyshire Environmental Services, Mr S. Barkes, Mr Martin Bee, Mrs M Lake, Network Rail, Annesley Community Committed to Ensuring Sustainable Settlements (ACCESS).

## Policy SD9: Parking

Comments relating to Policy

- No comments were received.

Comments received relating to Policy supporting text

- No comments were received.

**Responses:**

-

**Changes to the Local Plan:**

-

Number of Comments		Number of Respondents	
0		0	
Objection to Policy	Support the Policy	Comment on the Policy	
-	-	-	

**List of Respondents**

-

## Policy SD10: Advertisements

### Responses received relating to Policy

#### Support

- English Heritage welcomes the references to heritage assets (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) within the Policy.

#### Object

- The National Trust supports the general principle of the policy (i.e. preventing a negative impact on heritage assets) but object to the fact that there is no reference to Scheduled Monuments and Historic Parks & Gardens.

### Response:

- The policy will be amended to include a reference to scheduled ancient monuments and historic parks and gardens with regard to ensuring that advertisements do not negatively impact on heritage assets.

### Changes to the Local Plan:

- Include a reference to Scheduled Ancient Monuments and historic parks and gardens.

Number of Comments		Number of Respondents	
2		2	
Objection to Policy	Support the Policy	Comment on the Policy	
1	1	0	

**List of Respondents**

Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge, English Heritage;  
Alan Hubbard, National Trust

## Appendices

### Responses received relating to Policy

#### Appendix 3: SSSI's, LNR & SINCS

- Little Oak Plantation has been granted Local Wildlife Status (SINC) and this should be entered into the Appendix 3 list and the definition of this be changed on the Proposals Map.

#### Appendix 5: List of Ancient Woodland Sites

- Little Oak Plantation has been identified as an Ancient Woodland and this should be reflected in Appendix 5 and the Proposals Map.

#### Appendix 6: Allotments

- The Proposals Map and Local Plan 2010-2023, fail to include and show the allotments within Annesley Colliery Village & Forest Road

### Response:

- The change in the status of the Little Oak Plantation was identified in a footnote to Appendix 3 and Appendix 5. It is anticipated that they will be designated by the next consultation stage in which case they will be included in the relevant Appendix.
- The private allotments at Forest Road have not been used for allotments for a number of years. The site of the allotments forms part of a wider area which the Local Plan Preferred Approach proposed should be included within the Green Belt. As the Green Belt gives substantial protection to the land in question it is not proposed to amend the Proposals Map or Appendix to include the land formerly used for allotments.

### Changes to the Local Plan:

- Change Appendix 3 and Appendix 5 to include Little Oak Plantation once it is formally designated.
- Amend Appendix 6 to include Annesley & Felley Parish Council allotments.

<b>Number of Comments</b>		<b>Number of Respondents</b>
		<b>48</b>
<b>Objection to Policy</b>	<b>Support the Policy</b>	<b>Comment on the Policy</b>

**List of Respondents**

Mr Robert Collier, Mrs Julia Collier, Mr Peter Olko, Mrs Joan Olko, Miss Deberah Olko, Mr William Cooper, Ms Ann Cooper, Mr & Mrs M & P Dear, Mrs Margaret Lathall, Mr John Shaw, Mrs Micaela Stanley, Mrs Anne Chalkley, Mr Stewart Chalkley, Mr Stephen Jacksdale, Mrs Alison Jackson, Mrs Pauline Cumberland, Mr Donald Bailey, Mr Mark Raynor, Mr Philip Wood, Mrs Margaret Johnson, Mrs Thompson, Mr John Lowe, Miss Becky Chalkley, Mr David Connah, Mrs Patricia Starling, Mrs Valerie Alcock, Mr David Alcock, Mr & Mrs R & M Hufton, Ms Julie Craft, Mrs Madeline Allsop, Mr Dick Bend, Mrs Margaret Bend, Mrs Pauline Hodson, Mr Peter Ward, Mrs Elizabeth Ward, Mr Roger Dean, Mr George Cordy, Mr Russell Lathall, Mrs Patricia Shaw, Ms Kathryn Shaw, Mr John Bolger, Mr Richard Shaw, Mrs Kirsty Cohen, Mr & Mrs M & M Lowe, Miss Angela Smith, Mrs Haydee Lafferty, Mr David Simpson, Mr Adam Heathcote

## Sustainability Appraisal

### Responses received relating to the Sustainability Appraisal :

#### Object:

- The assessments of sites are inconsistent and in some instances appear to conflict with the findings of the SHLAA.
- The Sustainability Appraisal, upon which the decision to allocate housing was based, is fundamentally erroneous, inconsistent and flawed and is therefore open to challenge.
- It is disappointing to find that apart from the scores allocated to housing numbers on page 135, there is no other uniform, annotated or visible scoring scheme for the other sustainability objectives.
- The justifications for housing allocations normally praise the benefits of an allocation site near a high value ecological site. In this case they do not, or it appears they do not, consider the human aspect of intervention and the possible loss of the features(s) that made the ecological site unique in the first instance.
- A scoring matrix could be devised to look at the aspect of dwellings in a new location based on size and distance from local amenities. Alternatively the descriptive justification narrative could be marked. Any of the examples provided, if adopted by the Council in production of such a document, would show further clarity and consistency in officer's approach to the selection of sites and remove any doubt of bias.
- The Sustainability Appraisal, upon which decisions should be based, has clearly been prepared "after the event" to retrofit the Appraisal to justify the decisions. This is apparent both by comparing the appraisal of different sites with similar attributes and by comparing this Sustainability Appraisal with that undertaken to support the 2010 Core Strategy Preferred Options. The 2010 Core Strategy Preferred Options included two new Sustainable Urban Extensions (SUEs). The options for SUEs had gained the most support during the Spatial Growth Options Consultation process. The Sustainability Appraisal which informed the draft Core Strategy stated that larger sites provide the opportunity for a greater mix of unit and affordable homes, and are more likely to be viable. It also stated that SUEs provided the opportunity for better access to health and other services because these can be provided on site. It also acknowledged that the SUEs could help to develop a better transport network, and will probably have better design standards for designing out crime. This directly contradicts the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal for the Local Plan Preferred Options which scores the Mowlands site negatively in relation to crime, negatively in terms of transport (despite its ability to address the A38/Sutton Road capacity issues referred to above), and only plus 1 (of 5) in relation to health.
- Clearly such an appraisal is necessary, but it should be objective and consistently applied to each site. Here the exercise appears to be highly



subjective and haphazard. For example, the bullet points listed as “Justification for the Scoring of Allocated Sites” shows a wide variation of criteria considered across the sites rather than a consistent approach.

- Policy scoring states that, particularly for larger sites, financial contributions can be leveraged to both enhance existing facilities and provide new opportunities in relation to public transport, health, community infrastructure and open space. This conflicts with Policy HG1 as the approach should have been to select sites that are already sustainable in these terms. Obviously such contributions are welcomed but should not be necessary in order to provide sustainability of these sites in the first place.
- The approach which has been adopted to assessing the sustainability of sites is not reliable. The approach which appears to have been followed has been to identify the preferred sites and adjust the sustainability appraisal of them to suit the purpose of ensuring that they score highly and the exercise needs to be undertaken again properly. This results in the situation whereby this aspect of the preparation of the new Local Plan is not sound as it is not in accordance with national and regional planning objectives and policies and therefore leaves it vulnerable to challenge in this respect at a later stage.
- The Sustainability Appraisal as a whole, is considered to be flawed. Site assessments needs to be revisited, establishing a scheme of moderation to ensure a consistency of approach throughout, in order to independently but realistically assess the sustainability credentials of all of the sites which have been put forward as suitable for development through the SHLAA exercise.
- The apparently favourable scoring of the larger sites renders any assessment meaningless.
- Within the justification text, the existence of a site within the Green Belt has been used to justify the Council’s decision not to allocate. However, where the Council’s proposed allocation requires release from the Green Belt, the fact that the site presently falls within the Green Belt is simply noted, rather than being considered to count against it.
- The Sustainability Appraisal explains that a number of Officers and Council Members were drafted in to separately assess sites against the sustainability criteria as a deliberate ploy to ensure robustness. However, it is clear that the entire exercise has lacked any form of meaningful moderation and this has resulted in one Officer’s view on any given issue being completely different to another’s. This makes it impossible for readers of the Sustainability Appraisal to make any sense of its findings.
- The task of identifying the sites which were not allocated is difficult because they are only referred to by name rather than the references that they were given for the SHLAA exercise.
- It seems that the site shave not been properly or fairly assessed with the results of the exercise skewed - this inconsistent approach is at odds with national and regional policies and leaves the plan open to challenge.
- The strategy proposed is inadequately justified and cannot be shown to be the most appropriate strategy when properly considered against the available evidence.
- The document refers to an appraisal exercise undertaken by members as

part of the process but there is no record of this assessment, the conclusions reached or how this process has informed the final assessment and selection of sites.

- There is no evidence or explanation given in the Preferred Approach or the Sustainability Appraisal of how the Council has given proper weight to the essential characteristics of the Green Belt or how the release of Green Belt land proposed by this policy demonstrates exceptional circumstances.
  - The Sustainability Appraisal lacks objectivity.
  - If independent scrutiny had been undertaken, flaws and inconsistencies would have been highlighted.
  - There is no reference to the evidence that has been used to inform critical assessments of impacts in relation to the various factors.
- ★ It should be noted that as part of the objections to the Sustainability Appraisal, numerous site specific comparisons have been drawn between the scoring of allocated and non-allocated sites, identifying how non-allocated sites are deemed to be more sustainable than a number of the allocated sites. The council has retained a record of all such responses and whilst care has been taken to ensure the overarching objections relating to soundness have been covered above, site specific comparisons are not relevant to the context of the Sustainability Appraisal.

**General Comments:**

- The Highways Agency welcomes the Sustainability Appraisal for the Local Plan and its focus on the prioritisation of lower-cost, softer traffic mitigation measures as opposed to capital intensive, major highway infrastructure. Whilst it is pleasing to see that the Appraisal has been referenced to in the Local Plan, the Highways Agency would expect to see reference to the measures required to manage the implications of an increase in private car journeys.
- The Environment Agency are pleased to see the document reflects the importance of sustainable waste management in its policies, whilst recognising within the Sustainability Appraisal that some policies will have a negative impact which should be mitigated as far as possible by appropriate measures.

**Response:**

- The Council has received and noted the objections to the Sustainability Appraisal Report for the Local Plan Preferred Approach, with particular reference to the appraisal of individual housing site allocations.
- The methodology and assessment scheme adopted for the Sustainability Appraisal Report of the Local Plan Publication has been revised to ensure a transparent, robust and justifiable approach. This will provide greater clarity in terms of the objective basis for the assessment of all the potential housing and employment sites and will outline the criterion and thresholds used to

assess each site in relation to the sustainability objectives. The report will also detail the assumptions of the assessment and any difficulties or conflicts encountered during this process.

- In addition, since the publication of the Sustainability Appraisal for the Local Plan Preferred Approach the Council has sought an independent review of this document to ensure its robustness and soundness.

<b>Number of Comments</b>		<b>Number of Respondents</b>	
<b>21</b>		<b>12</b>	
<b>Objection to Policy</b>	<b>Support the Policy</b>		<b>Comment on the Policy</b>
<b>19</b>	<b>0</b>		<b>2</b>

**List of Respondents**

Ms Christina White, Mr Rob Hughes & Mr Robert Fletcher of Ian Baseley Associates on behalf of various clients (recorded as separate objections), Phoenix Planning on behalf of Keepmoat and the Land Owners of Land to the South West of Winter Closes (recorded as separate objections), ACCESS, Bob Cameron Locheil Homes and Dev Ltd, Mr Hugh Nicoll, Pegasus Planning Group on behalf of Clowes Developments and Hallam Land Management (recorded as separate objections), Mrs and Mrs John & Michaela Collins, The Highways Agency, Oxalis Planning on behalf of W Westerman Ltd, The Environment Agency, John Deakin on behalf of David Wilson Homes.

## Meetings with Groups

The Council held a series of meeting with various groups within the District. The following reflects the questions and answers that were noted at the meetings.

### **Developers, Landowners and Infrastructure Providers Monday 8th October 2012.**

Question - For Sutton in Ashfield and Kirkby in Ashfield, are there sufficient allocated sites to meet housing requirements?

Answer - Advised that there were sufficient sites to meet the needs required to anticipated housing requirements. At this stage worked on an average of 30 houses per ha but as the Local Plan moves forward development briefs will be required which provide more specific information on the individual sites and specific housing numbers that could be brought forward for that site

Question - Does the Council have a 5 year land supply and is it likely that sites outside those set out in the Local Plan Preferred Approach will come forward?

Answer - The Council was looking to work with landowners and developers in terms of the sites set out in the Local Plan Preferred Approach (LPPA) . However, there was nothing to prevent other sites being submitted as a planning application and it would be determined under the provision of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and Local Plan Review. The NPPF does give weight to emerging plans but at this stage there is a question on how much regard a Planning inspector on any appeal would give to the emerging Local Plan.

Question - Allocation of Travellers Sites in the Local Plan Preferred Approach

Answer – There was one site allocated in the LPPA which has planning permission. The Council was currently undertaking an additional assessment of Traveller requirements.

Question – Would there be sufficient leisure facilities/infrastructure facilities given the proposed amount of new housing.

Answer - Developers are required to provide open space on larger developments as part of the infrastructure requirements. Schools will be required in the case of a number of sites and in other cases will need to contribute towards existing schools. The Council has been advised that there are no requirements for additional secondary schools in the District. In terms of Leisure Centres there are a number of existing leisure centres which are anticipate to be able to accommodate any increases from new housing.

Question – A question was raised on the impact of the Gedling strategic sites on Hucknall.

Answer – Advised that this was not the meeting to go into detail but the Council's had made representations to Gedling over the issue.

Question – Issue raised over the scoring of the sustainable appraisal of 5 sites in Huthwaite relating to health, in that person felt they should all score the same. He was having difficulty understanding the scoring system in relation to specific sites.

Answer – The SA process has been done outside of the officers in the Policy Team drafting the policies so that it was independent. It was suggested that this meeting was not the time to looking at specific queries of this nature and if he submit his concerns to the Council would we look to give him a response to his concerns.

Question – Concerns regarding the scoring in the SA of the three sites located off the MARR. These were not adjacent to the urban area of Sutton and therefore could not been seen as sustainable?

Answer – The sites need to be seen in the context of their relationship to Mansfield and sites being brought forward in Mansfield such as the Lindhurst Scheme.

Comment - Party came back with the sites at top of Kings Mill Hospital and at Beck Lane encroaches onto the District boundary and will result in the coalescence of Sutton in Ashfield with Mansfield, which should be avoided.

Response – This issue would be addressed through master planning of the sites.

Comment - Welcomed the Council taking forward a Local Plan consisting of a single document rather than the separate document in the LDF

Question – Why are we preparing a 10 year Local Plan when the NPPF recommends a 15 year plan?

Answer – We have asked CLG about this and they did not have any objections.

Question - The Council is bringing forward three sites in the Green Belt but they do not form part of the Green Belt Review. How does the Council justify this?

Answer – These Green Belt Sites have been considered as part of the how Local Plan process including SHLAA the SA etc.

Question – The Stakeholders Meeting in 2009 there was a majority support for the two Sustainable Urban Extensions. Why had this changed in the LPPA?

Answer – Identified that there was a clear concerns from local people in response to the consultation in the Core Strategy Preferred Option 2010. A substantial number of local people consider that large sites were not appropriate. The LPPA also reflected the economic conditions as viability was a substantial issue in relation to the larger sites and it currently was consider that smaller sites are deliverable.

Follow-up Question – Could this change over time?

Answer – The Local Plan will be reviewed after about five years and if the economic climate was different them this may well give rise to a different approach. The Local Plan has to reflect on the economic climate which may

change in the future and there may be a case for sustainable urban extensions in the future.

Question – Residential sites along the MARR are going to have difficulties access the M1 junctions. Residential sites should be located close to M1 Junctions.

Answer – Additional work was being undertaken in relation to Transport Modelling. Further housing sites proposed are well connect to support local services.

Question - Issue over the MARR sites impacting on Mansfield and whether this was any different from Gedling's proposals at Hucknall?

Answer – Advised that Ashfield has been working and consulting with Mansfield DC over these proposals.

Question - The Council's intentions regarding a CIL.

Answer – Advised for non planners present what CIL stands for and briefly how it works referring to Gedling's CIL proposals and a Zone 3 rate of £95.00. At present no decision had been made and a number of authorities such as Worcester had determined not to take forward a CIL. Land values may not be sufficient in parts of the District to justify a CIL payment. There were also current questions over the Government proposals in relation to S106 agreement and viability and the ability to re-open the Agreements.

### **Meeting with Hucknall Community Groups, Wednesday 10<sup>th</sup> October 2012.**

Question - Many Hucknall residents work in Nottingham and get the tram at NET and shop at Tesco. Generally, people travel out of Hucknall to go to work as there's not the industry here to support work and play in Hucknall

Answer - We are looking at apprenticeship programmes and policies to address this, ensuring that we up skill the population and provide the opportunities for new business investment.

Question - But it's not just about the young, we need to up skill older people to who may want a career change!

Answer - In agreement and clarified we seek to address this too.

Question - They can't sell houses at Papplewick because of the social housing in the centre. The housing mix of new development really needs addressing, deprived areas of housing strictly correlate with the people who live there. The Papplewick Green development has changed the composition of the area. In addition, within the Garden Road development, over 50% of what's already been built is affordable housing because so many of the properties can't be sold.

Answer - When we talk about affordable homes people often don't have a true understanding of what the term really means and emphasised the importance of distinguishing between affordable housing and social housing. Also asserted that affordable housing provision is something we liaise closely with developers

over, however because of viability issues it is likely that there will be less provision in future.

Question - Is this really the right time to be implementing a plan when people can't afford houses in the first place?

Answer - There are lots of new initiatives being introduced to aid the position of buyers such as the New Homes Bonus and shared ownership schemes. The alternative to not providing new homes and social housing is that ultimately this will lead to an increase in rental process due to increased demand.

Asserted that the government requires a five year supply of deliverable sites, without this in place developers may come along and build elsewhere.

Question - Can we stipulate that developments such as Papplewick Lane should be completed before commencing development on new sites?

Answer – Not answer recorded

Question - With regards to Rolls Royce, weren't MUSE meant to be doing consultations with local groups?

Answer- Advised that the Groups were provided with the date this event took place and confirmed that ADC approached groups to ask if we could pass on their details as we were unable to give these out without permission due to data protection issues, however not many responded.

Question - When Gedling went out to consultation on their Core Strategy it was so complex that the public couldn't understand it. How will you ask for people to comment on this plan?

Answer - Formal reps could be placed via email, electronic comment form, or handwritten letter/comment form (stated the electronic methods are easier for us to assimilate but we will accept all reps so long as they're in some form of written format). It was also acknowledged that all comments will be made publicly available following the end of the consultation period. Attendees were informed that at the examination stage, the inspector will accept reps in both writing and verbally.

Question - Why have MUSE been bought in to do a consultation, it's a waste of money when Ashfield do it anyway!

Answer - Developers are expected to undertake their own consultation which ADC strongly advocates. Rolls Royce bought MUSE in as development partners who carried out the consultation on their behalf and they have experience in this field.

Question - In that case we would like to see the planners at Ashfield put the onus on developer to consult with the surrounding properties which will be most affected by the Rolls Royce development and make sure there's a clear dialogue.

Answer - Engagement on behalf of the developer is voluntary, we can promote but not enforce this.

Question - Do you anticipate that the Rolls Royce development will bring shoppers into the centre?

Answer - Yes that's the plan! Obviously transport and infrastructure needs improving to facilitate this but early talks are encouraging.

Question - What is the timetable for the plan and how are we meant to know about it?

Answer - Showed the timetable slide again and explained the key dates in more detail.

### **Kirkby & Sutton Community Groups Consultation, Monday 15<sup>th</sup> October 2012.**

Question - Raised concerns over the difficulty of travelling at certain times of the day particularly New Cross, Sutton Junction and the traffic lights at the A38 Kirkby Rd Sutton Rd (Fire Station). Suggested that instead of locating housing around urban areas it should be off the MARR?

Answer – Advised that the Plan included proposals for housing off the MARR. The Council was talking to Mansfield DC regarding this proposal opposite Lindhurst development as we need to consider the impact on Mansfield.

Question – Are there any jobs proposed for the future?

Answer – Employment generation has been static over the last few years. Some development is proposed for Castlewood, 100,000sq ft unit for the motor trade and another unit was being refitted for aviation related space. The Council was looking to work with companies to promote opportunities for younger people including possible training scheme related to the building of houses for local people.

Outlined that:

- The Council's approach had changed from a emphasis on large sites to small sites to reduce pressure points. Stressed the need for a planned approach to development as this gives greater contributions for the local community and infrastructure. If it was unplanned development taken forward by developers contributions are likely to be much more limited.
- In terms of the local economy there was a need to create an attractive environment for businesses to come to Ashfield. Also we were not only looking to provide land for employment to up-skill local people. Quality housing is also an important factor in attracting business to an area.

Question– Concerned about the Proposals Map in relation to whether it was correct in terms of being an up to date map. He stressed the importance of up to date mapping as a basis for any future Policy Map. Raised concerns about primary shopping area in Kirkby.

Answer –Advised that the Council would look at the map to identify any issues. However, there was a question at this stage of balance the cost of the consultation when the Proposals Map is likely to see some changes following on from the consultation.



Follow up comments from the questioner:

- Need for a 'Mashfield' approach with Ashfield and Mansfield working closely together if necessary as one large urban area.
- Environmentally the Council should take forward solar panels rather than unsightly, subsidised windmills
- Concerns over the emphasis many organisations place on electronic means of distributing and responding to consultations. The older generation very often do not use computers.

Answer - The Council was happy to receive responses to the consultation by any means provided it was in writing.

Question concerns about:

- over traffic issues and complained about the County Council's (NCC) schemes which hinder traffic flows rather than improve them. Suggested that Sutton should have a one way system to improve traffic flows.
- Rather than identifying land for retail purposes the Council should be filling existing shops. These shops also had empty flats above them.
- Complained about the bus services which did not run on the right routes or at appropriate times.

Answer - In the current climate there were not large sums available for infrastructure. The Council needs to look very carefully at any proposals and work with NCC, neighbouring authorities and other agencies. However, there is a problem in that until the Council knows what sites are coming forward it is difficult to look at the specific implications from sites.

Stressed that development on the edge of urban areas was to encourage other means of travelling rather than relying solely on the car.

Question – What was happening on the Pretty Polly site at Sutton (Unwin Road)

Answer - Currently building housing on this former employment site. Another part of the site is identified for employment which is being looked at "in the round".

Question – Raised that the MARR and employment sites are not on public transport routes.

Answer - Advised that for large planning applications a Travel Plan was required which looked at these issues. Also the Council looks to work with NCC to try and ensure that bus routes reflected changes.

Question – Housing should be built on the MARR route rather than employment sites. The Council should have a policy to fill existing empty employment units.

Answer - Stressed that the Council is planning into the future and not simply at today's date. Chartered Surveyors have identified the MARR sites as being a good employment sites and this reflects the Council's evidence base. A

number of other employment sites such as Summit Close and Unwin Road have been identified as being appropriate to be potential developed for housing. The Council cannot compel employers into specific units and the Government is reducing planning powers over in this area identifying that Councils need to have land and units to encourage growth.

Advised that Ashfield and Mansfield are working together with an economic masterplan. The Regeneration Section will look at any employers potential requirements and identify appropriate units which are available at a local level. However, sometime the employer's requirements are for new units on allocated employment site. Further the Prologis site off the MARR has been laid out with the infrastructure put in for employment units. There is interest being expressed in this site.

Emphasis that it was important for the Council to have a Plan in place as soon as possible. Currently, Ashfield does not have a 5 years housing supply and under National Planning Policy there is an assumption on granting planning permission for houses under these circumstances. The Local Plan enables plan development rather than unplanned development by developers.

Question - why were certain areas of greenspace not protected by the Plan and there are important to local people.

Answer - Stressed the council looks to protect important areas of green space and this is reflected in the Green Infrastructure Strategy.

Question - Raised an issue relating to reduction in possible affordable homes and the size of rooms in new houses.

Answer - Advised that there were design policies in the Local Plan Preferred Approach which included looking at Buildings for Life. The Council was undertaking additional work on design which includes room sizes.

Stressed the Local Plan Preferred Approach includes a number of policies relating to the management of development. He encouraged people to look at these policies and if it was considered that there are gaps or issues to please respond accordingly.

Advised that her understanding of what the Government would say in relation to viability and affordable homes if that it is better to build some homes due to the housing shortage in this country with reduced elements of affordable homes rather than not building any houses at all.

### **Meeting with Selston Parish Council, Wednesday 17th October 2012.**

Question – Raised what number of dwellings are proposed for each site

Answer – Advised that at this stage worked on an average of 30 houses per ha but as the Local Plan moves forward development briefs will be required which provide more specific information on the individual sites and specific housing numbers that could be brought forward for that site. Stressed the point that this

need to take these in very broad terms due to the additional work necessary relating to the sites. The councillor was insistent that she needed to know figures now as otherwise she had a number of other questions arising from this. Based on additional information provided by JC, CS provided the approx dwellings for the rural sites based on 30 per ha together with the nature of the site from the SHLAA.

Question – Councillor raised the problems experienced at the local school through the infill site at Winters Close in terms of precautionary measures?  
Answer - Another Parish Councillor (Councillor Sears-Piccavey advised that further investigations of the infill site had revealed no issues, (inert site).

Question – Emphasis of the Plan is on Economic Growth but in relation to the rural areas there are no retail allocations and there is only one vacant shop in the rural area?

Answer – Advised that a convenience retail development could be part of the larger sites. The proposals would not allow for an allocated retail shopping centre. Stressed that the policy framework in the Local Plan Preferred Approach will allow retail units to come forward within the settlements.

Question – Raised from specific knowledge that new infants school are full. Therefore, to accommodate the new housing, will a new school (s) be required?  
Answer – Advised that the Council has been working with NCC education. The Council is waiting additional information from NCC Education on projected school spaces to determine requirements.

Question – Asked if there were any plans to increase medical facilities in the area? Plans are welcomed as long as the necessary infrastructure is in place.  
Answer – Advised that along side the Local Plan the Council are working on an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) and as part of this process we are engaging with the PCT to find out what the health requirements are.

Comment – Bungalows would be welcomed in Underwood on Winter Closes.

Question – Raised that no employment allocations for the rural areas?  
Answer – The nature of employment was changing it was no longer simply seen in large employers occupying large sheds. Typically it was small business working from home. Therefore, large sheds were being directed to areas where they could be reasonably regarded as being attractive to potential occupiers. Identified that small units were proposed at the Bentinck site although she acknowledged this was not in the rural area (part of Kirkby). Raised that the only new units brought forward in the rural area, as far as he was aware, were through grant funding. Given the current economic climate it was highly unlikely that funding is likely to be available in the foreseeable future. Invited the Parish Council to make representations on this aspect and suggested that this could include where they anticipate the location of any employment allocation may be. Advised that we needed to look at employment issues in the rural areas and possibly look at permissive policies rather than allocations.

### **Meeting with Rural Community Groups, Wednesday 31<sup>st</sup> October 2012.**

Question – Raised two worrying aspects education requirement with around 700 spaces required and sewerage there are problems with sewerage in part of the area with 50 homes needing special tanks.

Answer – Advised that Council was looking at infrastructure requirements including Severn Trent and the Education Authority and at the next stage we would be looking at more detailed requirements for the sites. Advised:

- The Council had undertaken a Watercycle Study which was not site specific but at a more strategic level. However, it did not raised any issues other than a problem at Huthwaite regarding the capacity of the sewerage works.
- Council had a number of meets with Education Authority. In terms of education the requirements was approximately 21 pupils per 100 dwellings primary and 16 pupils per 100 secondary. However, this was based on 2001 census which may change with the 2011 census

Question –raised what was happening with neighbouring authorities?

Answer – Advised that the Council had had meetings with neighbouring council's including Amber Valley in Derbyshire. Also working with Greater Nottm Authorities through JPAB and had meet with Broxtowe BC. Currently Broxtowe was bringing forward a Core Strategy and was as yet allocating housing site unless they were large strategic sites.

Question – Criticism of the presentation of the information in the Library as no inset map for Selston.

Answer – Something the Council will look into.

Question – The Bull and Butcher site was inappropriate. It was valued by local people as a green break between Selston and Selston Green. Suggested that land adjacent to Pinfold Farm off the road to Jubilee was far more appropriate as from a visibility aspect it was a more obscure site and was only visible from Pinxton. Stressed that he made similar comments on the previous consultation in terms of maintaining the rural character of Selston. Not opposed to housing as such, as he recognises that there is a need for rural housing which people can afford.

Answer – Advised that the Council could only take land forward that had been submitted by land owners. Advised that it was not in the sites put forward as part of the current SHLAA. However, sites should not be hidden away. The question was how to integrate development into the existing community with access and improvements to local services.

Portfolio Holder stressed that central government is putting a substantial emphasis on viability as part of the planning process. Viability can reduce the affordable housing element.

A District and Parish Councillor pointed out that the land at Pinfold Farm was Grade 2. However, the Bull and Butcher site was also Grade 2 agricultural land

and this may well have a substantial impact on the productivity of the farm and therefore the business viability for the farmer current utilising the land.

Question – Complaint about the difficulty obtaining planning permission?

Answer – Stressed that there had been 400 dwellings built last year. However, cannot comment on specific applications.

Question – Suggested that if more planning permissions were granted the value of land would be halved?

Answer – Set out the advantages of a plan led system

Portfolio Holder outlined the problem of family sized dwellings occupied by individuals. Need to get developers to build 2 bed bungalows. Development is also needed to support facilities in villages including education, health and an employment land allocation.

Question – Raised concerns over the numbers present at the meeting and how many responses have we had to the consultation?

Answer – CS stressed the consultation is being undertaken in accordance with the consultation strategy agreed by the Council. She had no information on the number of responses at this time.

Question – Raised whether we could raise the number of affordable homes to 30 to 40%?

Answer – Explained that affordable housing requirements are based on a viability assessment. If necessary we will take independent advice on viability issues. However, a developer will not build houses unless he/she achieves a certain level of profit. If the Council acts unreasonably it will go to appeal and the Planning Inspector will reduce the affordable homes and possibly award costs.

Stressed the importance of a plan led system, which identifies the affordable housing requirements. By being explicit in a Plan about affordable housing requirements, this feedback to landowners in terms of what they can ask for land. Problem is with land bought prior to the financial crisis which the Council needs to take into account.

Question - Raised concerns regard public transport and in particular the Titan Project proposals. Also in terms of health services the PCT was about to disappear and therefore it was going to be very difficult in terms of ascertaining future health requirements.

Answer – Stressed that there are not substantial funds out there to deal with infrastructure issues.

Questioner responded that transport and health need to be inspirational policies which can be used proactively to support increased service provision.

Comment – Selston parish is short of services, for example last bus is 7.00pm, lack of doctors and shops etc. Raised about there being no post office (Councillor Wilson advised this had reopened on Lindley Street).

Comment – as Notts County Council own about 30% of the land in the villages for development can we obtain a greater contribution to services.

Comment – District Councillor stressed at the end of the meeting that originally 1,300 houses had been proposed for the villages and the rural councillors had managed to get this down to 700 houses with approximately 580 allocated plus windfalls.

### **Group Meetings, 26<sup>th</sup> September 2012 to 9<sup>th</sup> November 2012.**

The following is summary of the comments arising from meetings with the various groups as part of the consultation processes. It is an officer interpretation of the matters raised in relation to the policies identified below.

#### **Developers, Landowners and Infrastructure Providers Meeting, 8th October 2012**

##### General

Support was raised for bring forward the Local Plan as a single document.

##### Policy SP2

Concern was expressed from specific parties over the change from two Sustainable Urban Extensions, which had been set out for Sutton-in-Ashfield and Kirkby-in-Ashfield as part of the Core Strategy.

Concern was expressed whether there would be sufficient leisure facilities and infrastructure facilities given the proposed amount of new housing.

##### Policy SD4

Concern was expressed whether there would be sufficient leisure facilities and infrastructure facilities given the proposed amount of new housing.

##### Policy HG1

Concern was raised that the Council was bringing forward sites in the Green Belt but they do not form part of the Green Belt Review.

Concern was expressed whether there would be sufficient leisure facilities and infrastructure facilities given the proposed amount of new housing.

A specific party suggested that residential sites should be located close to M1 Junctions rather than on the MARR.

##### Sustainable Appraisal

Concern was expressed from specific parties over the sustainable appraisal of particular residential sites in Huthwaite and off the MARR.

## **Hucknall Community Groups Meeting, 10th October 2012**

### **Policy SP2**

Concern was expressed that many shoppers are lost to neighbouring districts and cities, particularly Nottingham as this is a large number of people from Hucknall work. Wanted to know how development such as Rolls Royce may stimulate more shoppers to utilise Hucknall's retail offer. People also tend to utilise out of centre shops such as Tesco on Ashgate Road due to its convenient location in relation to the NET link.

### **Policy SP3**

Concern was expressed that many shoppers are lost to neighbouring districts and cities, particularly Nottingham as this is a large number of people from Hucknall work. Wanted to know how development such as Rolls Royce may stimulate more shoppers to utilise Hucknall's retail offer. People also tend to utilise out of centre shops such as Tesco on Ashgate Road due to its convenient location in relation to the NET link.

### **Policy SPH4**

Concern was expressed that many shoppers are lost to neighbouring districts and cities, particularly Nottingham as this is a large number of people from Hucknall work. Wanted to know how development such as Rolls Royce may stimulate more shoppers to utilise Hucknall's retail offer. People also tend to utilise out of centre shops such as Tesco on Ashgate Road due to its convenient location in relation to the NET link.

### **Policy PJ5**

Although it was acknowledged as beneficial to up skill the population, concern was raised that these opportunities need to be available to all, not just the young.

### **Policy SH1**

Concern was expressed that many shoppers are lost to neighbouring districts and cities, particularly Nottingham as this is a large number of people from Hucknall work. Wanted to know how development such as Rolls Royce may stimulate more shoppers to utilise Hucknall's retail offer. People also tend to utilise out of centre shops such as Tesco on Ashgate Road due to its convenient location in relation to the NET link.

### **Policy HG3**

Concern was raised regarding the social implications that poorly considered affordable housing can have.

### **Policy HG5**

Concern was raised regarding the social implications that poorly considered affordable housing can have.

### **Kirkby & Sutton Community Groups Meeting, 15<sup>th</sup> October 2012**

#### Policy SP2

Concern was raised regarding the level of traffic at certain times of the day and the use of traffic lights, which it was felt hinder traffic movement.

Housing should be built along the MARR route rather than on the edge of the urban area.

#### Policy SP2

Concern was expressed regarding the bus services which did not run on the right routes or at appropriate times.

#### Policy SH1

The Council should be concerned with getting current empty shops occupied rather than allocating land for retail space.

#### Policy HG1

Concern was raised regarding the level of traffic at certain times of the day and the use of traffic lights, which it was felt hinder traffic movement.

Housing should be built along the MARR route rather than on the edge of the urban area.

#### Policy SD1

Concern was expressed regarding the size of rooms in new houses.

### **Selston Parish Council Meeting, 17th October 2012**

#### Policy SP2

Concern was expressed regarding the need for infrastructure to support housing development including health and education.

#### Policy SH2

Emphasis of the Plan is on Economic Growth but in relation to the rural areas there are no retail allocations and there to be consideration of additional retail facilities which possible could be incorporated as part of a larger housing development.

#### Policy SPV3

Emphasis of the Plan is on Economic Growth but in relation to the rural areas there are no retail allocations and there to be consideration of additional retail facilities which possible could be incorporated as part of a larger housing development.

#### Policy PJ2

Employment allocations should be considered for the rural area or look to include a permissive policy rather than an allocation.



Policy HG1

Concern was expressed regarding the need for infrastructure to support housing development including health and education.

Emphasis of the Plan is on Economic Growth but in relation to the rural areas there are no retail allocations and there to be consideration of additional retail facilities which possible could be incorporated as part of a larger housing development.

Policy HG5

Bungalows would be welcomed in Underwood.

Policy SD4

Concern was expressed regarding the need for infrastructure to support housing development including health and education.

**Rural Community Groups Meeting, 31<sup>st</sup> October 2012**

Policy SP2

Concern was expressed regarding the need for infrastructure to support housing development including health, education, sewerage systems and affordable housing.

Considered that there should be 'inspiration' policies in relation to health and transport which provide a basis to proactively support increased service provision.

Policy HG1

Concern was expressed regarding the need for infrastructure to support housing development including health, education, sewerage systems and affordable housing.

Policy SD4

Concern was expressed regarding the need for infrastructure to support housing development including health, education, sewerage systems and affordable housing.

## Appendix Two

### List of Bodies and Persons invited to make representations

Name	Organisation	Town
Ms Nicky Taylor	A Division Nottinghamshire Police	Mansfield
Chris Thompson	A Division Nottinghamshire Police	Mansfield
Mr P Olko	ACCESS	Kirkby in Ashfield
Kevin Waters	Adlington Planning Team	Congleton
Mr Neil Jones	Alfreton Road Tenants and Residents Association	Sutton in Ashfield
David Mills	All Saints Centre Huthwaite Ltd	Sutton in Ashfield
Mark Faulkner	Anderson & Co	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr Robert Woollard	Andrew Martin Associates	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr Steve Simms	Andrew Martin Associates	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mike Downes	Antony Aspbury Associates	Basford
Mr John Barlow	Annesley & Felley Parish Council	Mansfield
	Armstrong Burton Planning	Sutton Coldfield
Mr John Sewell	Ashfield Community Radio	Nottingham
Mr Richard Bacon	Ashfield Development Project	Sutton in Ashfield
M Kirk	Ashfield District Council	Kirkby in Ashfield
Kathy Hallam	Ashfield Links Forum	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr D J Sewell	Ashfield Seniors	Nottingham
Margaret Alsop	Ashfield Volunteering - Sutton	Sutton in Ashfield
Bill Bailey	Ashfield Watch	
Mr Jason Savage	Avant Garde Management Ltd	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr James Parry	BADJER	Nottingham
Mr. R. Smith	Bagshaws LLP	Bakewell
Judith Dawson-Payne	Barbara Square/Ward Avenue TRA	Hucknall
Claudia Bird	Birds Butchers	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr Paul Foreshaw	BNP Paribas Real Estate	Sheffield
	Bolsover District Council	Bolsover, Derbyshire
Mr B Herrod	Bovis Homes Ltd.	Coleshill
Mr Bob Pick	BPS	Ripley
Samantha Borley	BRE	Garston
Lily & Eric Smith	Breakaways/Ramblers Leisure Club	Nottingham
Stephen Coult	Browne Jacobson	Nottingham
	Broxtowe Borough Council	Beeston, Nottingham
Gemma Grimes	BWEA	London
Mr Aaron Smith	Caldecotte Consultants	Buckingham
Claire Cain	Campaign for Real Ale	St Albans
Mr Robert L Law	Campfields Farms Ltd	Ravenshead
Mr Sean Lammiman	Carlton Design	Winkburn
Christine Whitehead	Carsic Tenants & Residents Association	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr Alan Bowbanks	Chamber of Trade	Hucknall
K Riensema	Civil Aviation Authority	West Sussex
Mr Andrew Marshall	Clerk to the Council	Newthorpe
Mr Colin Rae	Colin Rae Associates	Nottingham
Mr George Slack	Coxmoor Tenants and Residents Association	Kirkby in Ashfield

**Ashfield District Council - Statement of Consultation**

Pat Simms	Coxmoor Tenants and Residents Association	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr Dave Logan	Cyden Homes Ltd	Laceby
Matthew Wheatley	D2N2 Local Enterprise Partnership Coordinator	Nottingham
Enid Lindsay	Dale Club (Jacksdale Miners Welfare)	Nottingham
	David Tyldesley and Associates	Hucknall
Peter Hilldrup	DDP LLP	Leeds
Mr Ian Goldstraw	Derbyshire Environmental Services	Matlock
Soibhan Spencer	Derbyshire Gypsy Liaison Group	Matlock
Mr Neil Farmer	Derwent Living	Derby
Claire Whittaker	Development Planning Partnership	Leeds
Rachel Ford	Development Planning Partnership	Leeds
Ms Diane Bowyer	DPDS Consulting	Swindon
Purnima Wilkinson	East Midlands Housing Association	Coalville
Ms Marie Wilson	Eastern Shires Housing Association	Oadby
	Ellis Riley and Son	Warsop
Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge	English Heritage	Northampton
Mr Andrew Pitts	Environment Agency	West Bridgford
J Smith	Europalite Ltd	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr Andrew Hamilton	F.J. Bamkin & Son Limited	Hucknall
Max Goode	Fairhurst	Newcastle upon Tyne
Julie Davies	FLP	Congleton
	Forest Enterprise Sherwood and Lincs Forest	Mansfield
Alex Hales	Framptons	Banbury
Mr P J Frampton	Framptons Planning Consultants	Banbury
Philip Rawle	Freeth Cartwright	Nottingham
Mr Paul Brailsford	Freeth Cartwright	Nottingham
Mr Chris Waumsley	Freeth Cartwright	Nottingham
Mr Chris Waumsley	Freeth Cartwright	Nottingham
Mr Mike Kelly	Friends of Cromford Canal	Alfreton
Mr Dennis Dixon	Friends of Cromford Canal	Ironville
H Wint	Friends of Sutton Lawn	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr Trevor Locke	Friends of Titchfield Park	Hucknall
Mr S G Gadsby	Gadsby Orridge	Derby
Mr Fred Bramley	George Street Area Tenants & Residents Association	Hucknall
Grace Tang	Georgie Porgies	Kirkby in Ashfield
Catriona Fraser	GL Hearn	
Mr Twigg	Gladedale (Lincoln) Ltd	Kingsley Road
Nick Grace	Gracemachin Planning	Long Eaton
Mr Paul Burton	Hallam Land Management	Sheffield
Cheryl Corfield	Happy Feet Chiropodist	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr Geoff Gilbert	Hardwick Legal	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr Adam Murray	Harworth Estates	Harworth
Mr D Foster	Haslam Homes	
Ann Patrick	Healdswood Tenants & Residents Association	Sutton in Ashfield
Ms J Conway	Heaton Planning	Keyworth
Christian Smith (MRTPI)	Heaton Planning	Keyworth
Mr J Bishop	HEB Chartered Surveyors	Nottingham
Mr Justin Sheldon	HEB Chartered Surveyors	Nottingham

**Ashfield District Council - Statement of Consultation**

Sandra Walters	Hill Crescent Tenants & Residents Association	Sutton in Ashfield
Sue Boswell	Hillbanks	Nottingham
Alison Lane	Holly Hill Estate Tenants Association	Nottingham
Amalia McGrath	Holmes Anthill	Loughborough
Mr B Rivers	Home Builders Federation	Gorse Lane
R Buckwell	Housing Strategy	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr Denis Robinson	Hucknall & Bulwell Dispatch	Hucknall
Brenda Shelbourne	Hucknall Area Partnership Group	Hucknall
Mr Dave Parker	Hucknall Area Partnership Group (NCC)	Hucknall
Mr Martin Leach	Hucknall Business Voice	Hucknall
Mr Cyril Thomas	Hucknall Seniors Forum	Hucknall
Josie Rogers	Hucknall Seniors Forum	Hucknall
Mr Les Berridge	Hucknall Seniors Forum	Hucknall
Mr & Mrs K & S Robinson	Hucknall Tourism and Regeneration	Hucknall
Sheila Robinson	Hucknall Tourism and Regeneration	Hucknall
Mr Eric Bone	Huthwaite Community Action Group	Sutton in Ashfield
Hilary Haynes	Huthwaite Community Action Group	Sutton in Ashfield
Helen Hayes	Huthwaite Community Action Group	Sutton in Ashfield
Cllr Glenis Maxwell	Huthwaite Tenants & Residents Association	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr N Baseley	Ian Baseley Associates	Edwinstowe
Mr Rob Hughes	Ian Baseley Associates	Edwinstowe
Mr Robert Fletcher	Ian Baseley Associates	Edwinstowe
Michael Jones	J H Walters	Lincoln
Carol Taylor-Cockayne	Jacksdale Area Culture and Heritage	Nottingham
Pastor Carol Vincent	Jacksdale Christian Centre	Nottingham
Mr Martyn Taylor-Cockayne	Jacksdale Heritage Group	Nottingham
Mr S Barlow	Jacksdale Institute Ltd	Nottingham
Mr Alan Cockayne	Jacksdale Miners Welfare Bowls Club	Nottingham
Mr Paul Shipley	Jacksdale Miners Welfare Youth Football	Nottingham
Edward & Hilda Holmes	Jacksdale OAP's Luncheon Club	Nottingham
Jane Harpham	Jacksdale Youth Club	Nottingham
Mr Julian Burns-Smith	Jacksdale/Westwood Tenants & Residents Association	Nottingham
Robert Harrison	Januarys	Cambridge
Mr John Booth	JMB Developments	Brinsley
	John Church Planning Consultancy Ltd	Clay Cross
John Collins	John D Collins & Associates	Matlock
Mr Martin Bagshaw	John Martin and Associates	Godmanchester
Mr Anthony Salata	Jorden Salata	Mayfair
Mr David Gibbons	K & M Hauliers Ltd	Hucknall
	KARA	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mrs P Lewis	KDAG	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr John Cudworth	KDCS	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr John Kerry	KDCS	Kirkby in Ashfield
Cllr R Sears-Piccavey	Keep Underwood Green Committee	Nottingham
Mr Harold Greasley	Kirkby Seniors	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr Darren Allcock	Kirkby West Ward Tenants & Residents Association	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr Adrian Arum	Kirkby Woodhouse Community Association	Kirkby in Ashfield

**Ashfield District Council - Statement of Consultation**

Mr Michael Wellock	Kirkwells	Burnley
Cllr Steven Carroll	Labour Group, Nottinghamshire County Council	Nottingham
	Lacuna Design Ltd	Nottingham
Stan and Hazel Smith	Landowners	Nottingham
Pauline Coupe	Lawnside Tenants & Residents Association	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr Liam Doherty	Liam Doherty Architects	Bramcote
Mr Cameron	Locheil Homes	Sutton in Ashfield
Barbera Storer	Lunching Club, Community, Over 60's, Friendly Club	Nottingham
	M. B. Property	Southwell
Mandy Revel	Manager of the youth club	Kirkby in Ashfield
	Mansfield District Council	
	Merriman Limited	Cossington
Mr Dennis Pope	Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners	London
Alan Hubbard	National Trust	Worksop
	Natural England	Bakewell
	Natural England Consultation Service	Crewe
Miss Katya Samokhvalova	NJL Consulting	Manchester
Mr Paul Smith	NJL Consulting LLP	Manchester
Kate Proctor	Nottingham City Council	Nottingham
Mr Matt Gregory	Nottingham City Council	Nottingham
Matthew Lockley	Nottinghamshire County Council	Nottingham
Sally Gill	Nottinghamshire County Council	Nottingham
Mr J Wood	Nottinghamshire Police	Nottingham
Andrew Lowe	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust	Nottingham
Karen Bullen	Notts County Council	West Bridgford
Ms Anne Parr	other owners: Edward Clarke Elliott, Mary Parr	Sutton in Ashfield
Mrs Y. Cliff	Over 60's	Nottingham
	Oxalis Planning Ltd	Edwalton
Ms Joan Bates	P & C Draught Services	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr Lilley	P.J. Lilley Limited	Hucknall
Mr Peter Wood	Peacock and Smith Ltd	Hanover Walk
Miss Helen Wallis	Pegasus Planning Group	Lockington
Peter Wigglesworth	Peter Wigglesworth Planning Ltd	Matlock
	Peveril Homes Ltd	Belper
Charlotte Boyes	Planning Potential	Harrogate
Mr Robert Sphinks	Pye Hill Methodist Church	Nottingham
	Quantum Clothing	Sutton in Ashfield
Sally Wyatt	Reach Out Residents	Hucknall
Edward Irving	Redrow Homes (Midlands) Ltd	Tamworth
Mr Richard Savidge	Richard Savidge 2010 Ltd	Alfreton
	Riley Rep Services	Mansfield Woodhouse
Mr M Wade	Robert Clarke Chartered Surveyors	Nottingham
Mr Adam Holloway	Robert Clarke Chartered Surveyors	Nottingham
Mr Robert Orgill	Rolls-Royce Power Engineering plc	Derby
Mr Bob Kelly	Royal British Legion	Nottingham
Mr Christopher Dwan	RPS Newark	Newark
Mr Mark Sackett	RPS Planning and Development	Birmingham

**Ashfield District Council - Statement of Consultation**

Mick Leivers	Rural Community Action Nottinghamshire	Newstead Village
Councillor Gail Turner	S.A.R.A.	Nottingham
Tony & Glenis Robinson	S.A.R.A.	Nottingham
Mrs Angela Gregory	Safer Neighbourhood Committee - Central & North	Hucknall
Mr Roger Freeston	Savills	Nottingham
Andrew Chandler	Savills	Nottingham
Mr Michael Burrows	Savills	Birmingham
Rebecca Housam	Savills	Leeds
E Stead	Savills	Lincoln
Peter Davies	Severn Trent Water	Nottingham
Teena Needham	SHARP (Stanton Hill/Healdswood Area Rec Project)	Sutton in Ashfield
	Sherwood Forest Hospitals NHS Trust	Sutton in Ashfield
Ian Calverley	Shuldhams Calverley	Retford
Simon Chadwick	Signet Planning	Harrogate
Mr Paul Stone	Signet Planning	Nottingham
Mr R Smith	Smith and Roper	Bakewell
Mr Edmund Fox	Smith Stuart Reynolds	Northampton
Laura Anne Tilston	SSR Planning	Northamptonshire
Teresa McGrath	St John's Ambulance	Nottingham
Reverend F Shouler	St Mary's Church, Westwood	Nottingham
Mr J Hill	Standard Motor Products Europe	Hucknall
Fiona Asbury	Stanton Hill & Teversal Tenants & Residents Assoc	Sutton in Ashfield
Olive Parks	Stanton Hill Development Project/Stanton Hill Community Development Group	Sutton in Ashfield
Chris Hopkinson	Stanton Hill Safer Neighbourhood	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr Richard Foxon	Strutt And Parker	Market Harborough
Mr Stuart Knowles	Stuart Knowles Properties	Thorny Wood
Mrs Pugh	Summit Residents Association	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mrs S J Peters	Sutton Heritage Society	Sutton in Ashfield
Mrs Marg Thorne	Sutton Heritage Society	Sutton in Ashfield
	Sutton in Ashfield Youth Forum	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr John Mattison	Sutton Junction Residents Association	Sutton in Ashfield
Kevin & Tracey Sutton	Sutton Junction Residents Association	Sutton in Ashfield
Shirley Fidler	Sutton Seniors	Sutton in Ashfield
Eileen Morley	Sutton Seniors	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr Andrew Wraight	Sutton Town Centre Business Voice	Sutton in Ashfield
	Sutton-Ashfield Women's Institute	Beastmarket Hill
Jayne Craft	Tapping into Young Peoples Aspirations & Perspectives	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr Eric Turner	Tarmac Building Products LTD	Buxton
Mr Keith Oliver	Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd	Hook
Mr Ken Carnell	Tenants Voices: New Cross	Sutton in Ashfield
	The Ashfield Circuit of the Methodist Church	Sutton in Ashfield
	The Church of Jesus Christ and the Latter Day Sain	Sutton Coldfield
Miss Rachael A Bust	The Coal Authority	Mansfield
Emily Wentworth	The Co-operative Group	Manchester
Ms Rebecca Mitchell	The Co-operative Group	Hanover Street

**Ashfield District Council - Statement of Consultation**

Mr Kamaljit Khokhar	The Highways Agency	Birmingham
Mr J G H Sztejer	The Houldsworth Trust	Burton Joyce
Mark Fisher	The Lawn Tennis Association	Roehampton
A Yarwood	The National Federation of Gypsy Liason Groups	Matlock
Mr Matthew Shellum	The Planning Bureau Limited	Bournemouth
Mr T Clinton	The Planning Inspectorate	
Mr Ian Bunting	The Skegby Appreciation Society	Sutton in Ashfield
Rose Freeman	The Theatre's Trust	London
Helen Winkler	The Tyler-Parkes Partnership	Hall Green
Mr Stuart Angus	Tiga Hair & Beauty	Kirkby in Ashfield
Brian Tonks	Tonks4x4	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr J Armstrong	Top Coxmoor Farm	Kirkby in Ashfield
Kate Butler	Transport Strategy NCC	West Bridgford
Steve Louth	TURLEYASSOCIATES	Birmingham
Mr Adam Bunn	Tym And Partners	Leicester
Mr Daniel Elvin	UK Coal	Harworth
Mr Matthew Bingham	Under One Roof Project	Hucknall
Cllr R Sears-Piccavey	Underwood Action Group	Nottingham
Penny & Andy Fell	Underwood Community Action Network	Nottingham
Victor Hamsley	Van Elle Ltd	Pinxton
Mr David Rixson	Vincent and Gorbing	Stevenage
Mr Nigel Carnall	W A Barnes	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr Robert Westerman	W Westerman Ltd	Chilwell
Vicki Richardson	Walton & Co	Leeds
Mr G Cropley	Washdyke Properties	Hucknall
Mr Rod Dewsbury	Watch and Clock	Hucknall
	Wealforce Ltd	Underwood
Mr Peter Webster	Webster Associates	Stow Longa
Mr Colin Bailey	West Hucknall Safer Neighbourhoods	Hucknall
Mr Robert Westerman	Westerman Homes	Chilwell
Shirley Houseman	Westwood United Reform Church	Nottingham
Mr Mark Wheatley	Wheatley Group Ltd	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mrs Ethne Hannaford	Women's Institute-Underwood and Bagthorpe	Nottingham
Nick Sanford	Woodland Trust	

Name	Town
Ms L	Selston
Jeanne Brierley & M Leete	Sutton in Ashfield
Poppie Abbott	Mansfield Woodhouse
Dennis Adams	Mansfield
Alison Adcock	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr Adkins	Sutton in Ashfield
Thomas & Christina Ainscough	Sutton in Ashfield
Dorothy Aitkin	Kirkby in Ashfield
Fere & Nick Akbari	Nottingham
Mr Peter Albone	Kirkby in Ashfield
Carole Aldreed	Mansfield
Mr Anthony Allcock	Kirkby in Ashfield

**Ashfield District Council - Statement of Consultation**

Mrs M A Allcock	Sutton in Ashfield
Steven & Vanessa Allen	Sutton in Ashfield
G & A Allen	Sutton in Ashfield
J & G Allen	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr R Allen	Sutton in Ashfield
Mrs Madeline Allsop	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr Amos	Kirkby in Ashfield
R Anderson	Sutton in Ashfield
Paul Anderton	Sutton in Ashfield
Sarah Bottomore & Andrew Crafts	Kirkby in Ashfield
Elaine Andrews	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr Philip C Anthony	Mickleover
Father J Antony	Nottingham
Kay Appleby	Mansfield
Mr P Archer	Sutton in Ashfield
Mrs Lauren Armstrong	Hucknall
Russell & Karen Ashford	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr Ian & Janice Ashley	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr N Ashurst	Hucknall
Mrs J Askew	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr J Askew	Nottingham
A Astle	Nottingham
Kenneth & Sylvia Bacon	Sutton in Ashfield
Mrs Mrs D & Mr J Bacon	Sutton in Ashfield
G Bacon	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr Terence Bacon	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr Ian Bailey	
Mr & Mrs Bailey	Nottingham
Mr & Mrs J Baker	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr A & M Baker	Sutton in Ashfield
Carla Baker	Sutton in Ashfield
P & J Ball	Kirkby in Ashfield
S D Ball	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mrs K Ball	Nottingham
Melanie Ball	Sutton in Ashfield
D, E & L Ball	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs E H Ball	Sutton in Ashfield
J Banham	Kirkby in Ashfield
Debbie Banks	Mansfield
Mr & Mrs Banks	Nottingham
Mr J M Barker	Nottingham
V & M Barker	Sutton in Ashfield
L Barker	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr S. Barks	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs B W Barks	Sutton in Ashfield
D Barksby	Sutton in Ashfield
Mrs J M Barlow	Hucknall
Mr Alan Barlow	Sutton in Ashfield



**Ashfield District Council - Statement of Consultation**

Mr & Mrs A Barnes	Kirkby in Ashfield
Shirley Barns	Sutton in Ashfield
Chris Baron	Hucknall
C Barron	Mansfield
Martyn & Caroline Barsby	Giltbrook
Robert Barsby	Sutton in Ashfield
Ian Baseley	Edwinstowe
Richard & Tracey Baston	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr Sean Bates	Nottingham
P, M & M Baumanis	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr R A Bayes	Kirkby in Ashfield
Jennifer Beal	Mansfield
C & K Bear	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr M & C Bearder	Nottingham
Mrs P Beardsley	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr John Beastall	Matlock
Stuart Beaver	Kirkby in Ashfield
Philip Beavis	Arnold
Mr Beazley	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr Martin Bee	Hucknall
Mr Jason Beet	Mansfield
Maria & Leigh Beeton	Nottingham
Gisela Beighton	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr A Belcher	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs Bell	Brinsley
E Bell	Sutton in Ashfield
Samuel & Neila Bell	Sutton in Ashfield
F & M Bennet	Kirkby in Ashfield
Simon Bennett	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr Paul Bennett	Kirkby in Ashfield
Donna Bennett	Kirkby in Ashfield
N Bennett	Nottingham
Mr Matthew Bennett	Sutton in Ashfield
C Bentley	Nottingham
P & C Berridge	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs Berrisford	Nottingham
Mr P Berry	Hucknall
Mr June & Keith Berry	Sutton in Ashfield
S & C Berry	Sutton in Ashfield
Paul & Laura Best	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs S Best	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr D Bettison	Sutton in Ashfield
Mrs Winifred Betts	Kirkby in Ashfield
Rachael Betts	Mansfield
Mr & Mrs Betts	Sutton in Ashfield
Miss N Betts	Sutton in Ashfield
M Bexon	Sutton in Ashfield
M & K Bexson	Nottingham
Mrs J Bilcliff	Sutton in Ashfield

**Ashfield District Council - Statement of Consultation**

Roger Billau	Nuthall
Mr Stuart & Irene Binch	Sutton in Ashfield
E & D Bingham	Sutton in Ashfield
M & JH Bingham	Sutton in Ashfield
M Bingley	Sutton in Ashfield
Ray & Susan Birch	Sutton in Ashfield
N Bircumshaw	Sutton in Ashfield
Mrs Deborah Bird	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr Simon Blackburn	Kirkby in Ashfield
R & J Blackburn	Sutton in Ashfield
Danielle & Robert Blackstone	Kirkby in Ashfield
L & P Blowers	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr R Bluff	Kirkby in Ashfield
Douglas & Una Blurs	Brinsley
David & Julie Boden	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr Donald Bodin	Kirkby in Ashfield
Elaine Bonham	Alfreton
Mr D, R & J Bonnert	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs W Bonsall	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr A Booker	Sutton in Ashfield
Mrs A Booth	Kirkby in Ashfield
Paul & Sarah Booth	Kirkby in Ashfield
Ian Boulton	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mrs P Bowler	Sutton in Ashfield
Anna Bowling	Sutton in Ashfield
Y & T Bowmar	Nottingham
Mr & Mrs E Bowskill	Sutton in Ashfield
Mrs Phyllis Boyfield	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs Emma Bradley	Kirkby in Ashfield
Sarah Bradley	Nottingham
Rachel Bradley	Sutton in Ashfield
G Bradshaw	Kirkby in Ashfield
S Bradshaw	Rainworth
Mr & Mrs Bradshaw	Sutton in Ashfield
D, N & A Bradshaw	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs Bramley	Hucknall
Mr. and Mrs James Stuart Bramwell	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs Pete & Sarah Brand	Nottingham
David Branston	Sutton in Ashfield
Karen Breedon	Sutton in Ashfield
S Breitschadel	Sutton in Ashfield
A & P Brelsford	Sutton in Ashfield
Leanne Brentnall	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs P M Briggs	Nottingham
Mr Bernard Briggs	Nottingham
Mrs M Briggs	Skebgy
M A & K Brimble	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs Bristol	Sutton in Ashfield

**Ashfield District Council - Statement of Consultation**

Kathleen M Brittain	Sutton in Ashfield
Justin & Linda Britten	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr Broadhurst	Sutton in Ashfield
B & E Brooks	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs P. J. Brooks	Sutton on Sea
H M Broughton	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr Mark Brown	Brinsley
Councillor Nina Brown	Brinsley
Frank & Mary Brown	Brinsley
June Brown	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr V & Mr J Brown	Mansfield
Wilhelmina Brown	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs Brown	Sutton in Ashfield
M G Browne	Nottingham
Mr John Bull	Sutton in Ashfield
Mrs S Bullock	Sutton in Ashfield
Roger Bunting	Pinxton
P Burbanks	Eastwood
Mrs K Burman	Kirkby in Ashfield
J Burnham	Sutton in Ashfield
Helen & Gary Burnham	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr B Burnham	Sutton in Ashfield
Pauline Burton	Sutton in Ashfield
Michelle & Mark Burton	Sutton in Ashfield
Helen Jane Burton	Brinsley
Clive and Tracy Butcher	Mansfield
Amy Butler	Kirkby in Ashfield
Duncan & Cheryl Butler	Kirkby in Ashfield
Rob & Amber Butler	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr Julian Butler	Kirkby in Ashfield
Rodger Butler	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr Colin & Yvonne Butler	Sutton in Ashfield
Mrs A Butt	Sutton in Ashfield
B Buxton	Kirkby in Ashfield
N S Buxton	Kirkby in Ashfield
N Byrne	Sutton in Ashfield
Shirley Cain	Hucknall
Mr Ray Calder	Nuthall
Mr Martin Carey	Kirkby in Ashfield
Jayne & Shaun Carlin	Sutton in Ashfield
Mrs J Carr	Kirkby in Ashfield
Kelly Carroll	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs Carter	Mansfield
Mr & Mrs Carter	Nottingham
Bekki Carter	Sutton in Ashfield
Theo & Harold Carter	Sutton in Ashfield
Mrs Tracy Casstles	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr Gerald Castledine	Nottingham
Ms Emma Caswell	Riddings

**Ashfield District Council - Statement of Consultation**

Mr Alan Cater	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr L Cater	Sutton in Ashfield
Bev & Pete Catlow	Chesterfield
Mr Cattermer	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr Jason Caunt	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr Gordon Caunt	Kirkby in Ashfield
Chris & Tina Cawar	Mansfield
Julie Cawthorne	Mansfield
Mr & Mrs Ceney	Sutton in Ashfield
Mrs Susan Chalkley	Kirkby in Ashfield
Sarah Chalkley	Kirkby in Ashfield
T Channer	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs Channer	Nottingham
Karen Chapman	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr Joseph Chappell	Mansfield
Mr Chatfield	Hucknall
K Chatterton	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr G Cheese	
Ann & Dennis Cheetham	Sutton in Ashfield
S Cherry	Sutton in Ashfield
Jonathan Chesterton	Sutton in Ashfield
Ms Caron Clare	
Mrs Irene Clark	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr A Clarke	Kirkby in Ashfield
C Clarke	Kirkby in Ashfield
J & S Clarke	Kirkby in Ashfield
Wayne Clarke	Mansfield
Mr Ian Clarke	Sutton in Ashfield
Alan & Maureen Clarke	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs Clarke	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr S Clarke	Sutton in Ashfield
V & M Clarke	Sutton in Ashfield
J & S Clarke	Sutton in Ashfield
Michael Clarke	Rainworth
Ms Christine Clay	Kirkby in Ashfield
Rev & Mrs H R Claydon	Sutton in Ashfield
K & A Cleever	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mrs D Cockayne	Hucknall
Mrs D Cockeram	Nottingham
Elizabeth Colclough	Nottingham
Mr Len R Coleman	Kirkby in Ashfield
R & S Coleman	Sutton in Ashfield
Sue Colley	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs Colley	Sutton in Ashfield
D & L Collins	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr P Comery	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs Conway	Sutton in Ashfield
Stuart Cook	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr J Cooke	Sutton in Ashfield

**Ashfield District Council - Statement of Consultation**

W & A Cooper	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr George Cooper	Nottingham
Lee Cooper	Sutton in Ashfield
Christine & Christopher Cooper	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr A J Cope	Sutton in Ashfield
H Cornwell	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs B Cornwell	Sutton in Ashfield
June Cotterill	Kirkby in Ashfield
Caroline Cotterill	Nottingham
Mr John Coulson	Kirkby in Ashfield
Ms Anne Coupe	Halloughton
Ms Glenys Coupe	Sutton in Ashfield
Geoff Coupe	Sutton in Ashfield
David & Josephine Crampton	Sutton in Ashfield
Angela Crane	Nottingham
J & P Crawford	Sutton in Ashfield
Simon & Joanne Creak	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr Ken Creed	Hucknall
Miss M Cresswell	Kirkby in Ashfield
Colin Crisp	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mrs Cheryl Crowe	Sutton in Ashfield
Steven Csehi	Farnsfield
D, D, J & J Csehi	Mansfield
Jill Csehi-Leszczyński	Farnsfield
Daisy Cumberland	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mrs A S Cundy	Papplewick
Mr & Mrs P Curtis	Nottingham
Mr & Mrs Dakin	Sutton in Ashfield
Mrs Lynn Dakin	Sutton in Ashfield
Imogen Daniels	Mansfield
Mrs R Daniels	Hucknall
Mr & Mrs G Darrington	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs Darrington	Sutton in Ashfield
Matthew Daukinas	Nottingham
Mrs B Davies	Kirkby in Ashfield
Chris Davies	Kirkby in Ashfield
Joan & Keith Davies	Mansfield
Emma Davies	Mansfield
J Davies	Sutton in Ashfield
P Davies	Sutton in Ashfield
Andrew & Helen Davies	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr Adrian Davis	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr R Davis	Sutton in Ashfield
Ms I Davison	Sutton in Ashfield
Rob & Lynne Dawes	Arnold
Kendle Dawes	Arnold
B & R Dawson	Sutton in Ashfield
Jackie & Chris De Jong	Nottingham

**Ashfield District Council - Statement of Consultation**

Gloria de Piero	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mrs L Deakin	
Ms S Deakin	Kirkby in Ashfield
C & M Deller	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mrs D M Dellow	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mrs Carol Dempster	Hucknall
T & P Denton	Sutton in Ashfield
Ian & Mary Dick	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mrs Digby	Sutton in Ashfield
Rev'd Amanda Digman	Sutton in Ashfield
Melanie Dixon	Sutton in Ashfield
Roy & Rosamond Dobb	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr Chris Dobb	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr Gary Dobbs	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mrs Deborah Dodds	Sutton in Ashfield
Marie Dove	Sutton in Ashfield
John Dove	Sutton in Ashfield
Mrs A Dowell	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr Downs	Kirkby in Ashfield
Claire Downs	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs Neil Drabble	Sutton in Ashfield
E & S Drabble	Sutton in Ashfield
David Draper	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs Draper	Kirkby in Ashfield
Sue Draper-Todkill	Kirkby in Ashfield
A, P, R & C Draycott	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr. James kenneth Draycott	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs T Draycott	Sutton in Ashfield
D Dudley	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr Keith Dudley	Sutton in Ashfield
Matthew Dudley	Westwood Westwood
Michael Dumelow	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs L J Dunn	Hucknall
Mr & Mrs Dutton	Sutton in Ashfield
Ron & Jo Dyson	Sutton in Ashfield
Kelly Eames	Sutton in Ashfield
Mrs D Eansworth	Chesterfiled
C Eaton	Kirkby in Ashfield
J & E Edge	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr Edson	Kirkby in Ashfield
Sally Edwards	Kirkby in Ashfield
Colin & Pamela Edwards	Sutton in Ashfield
Christine Edwards	Huthwaite, Sutton in Ashfield
Andrew Eley	Ripley
Mr D Ellis	Nottingham
Mr & Mrs John Ellis	Sutton in Ashfield
Mrs Jenna Ellis	Sutton in Ashfield

**Ashfield District Council - Statement of Consultation**

---

Mrs Josephine M Ellis	Sutton in Ashfield
John & Wendy Ellison	Sutton in Ashfield
M & J Ellson	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs Ellson	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs Else	Sutton in Ashfield
Colin Else	Sutton in Ashfield
Alan Eminson	Hucknall
Mrs J Ensor	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr P Evans	Hemel Hempstead
Mrs Evans	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mrs A Evans	Sutton in Ashfield
John Evans	Sutton in Ashfield
J & G Evans	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr W I Evans	Sutton in Ashfield
M & L Everley	Sutton in Ashfield
Abiodun Falana	Sutton in Ashfield
Carol Farmer	Sutton in Ashfield
Graham Farndsworth	Breadsall
Mr B Farnsworth	Nottingham
Mr & Mrs T Faulkner	Kirkby in Ashfield
J & J Faulkner	Sutton in Ashfield
Denise & Paul Fell	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr Terence Fenning	Eastwood
Mr Terry Fensome	Sutton in Ashfield
Peter & Mary Fenton	Sutton in Ashfield
Iain Fielding	Nottingham
Mr A Firman	Kirky-in-Ashfield
Mrs F Fish	Kirkby in Ashfield
A Fish	Kirkby in Ashfield
Christine Fisher	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr T, S, P & B Fisher	Sutton in Ashfield
Mark Fisher	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs Fisher	Sutton in Ashfield
Mrs P Fleet	Sutton in Ashfield
Glennys Fletcher	Nottingham
J Flint	Sutton in Ashfield
Richard Flint	Sutton in Ashfield
J & G Flint	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr P Ford	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs Rex Foster	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr J Fotherby	Nottingham
Ms Lily Fowkes	Sutton in Ashfield
Mrs V Fowler	Forest Town
Mrs Kay Fowler	Kirkby in Ashfield
Sarah Fox	Mansfield
Malcolm Fox	Sutton in Ashfield
Zoe Francis	Alfreton
B S Francis	Kirkby in Ashfield
Miss Dawn Francis	Kirkby in Ashfield

**Ashfield District Council - Statement of Consultation**

Brett Freeman	Kirkby in Ashfield
I Fritchley	Sutton in Ashfield
Betty Frogall	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr R Frogg	Sutton in Ashfield
E G Frost	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr Vaughan Gallagher	Hucknall
Thomas Gamble	Sutton in Ashfield
Mrs Wendy Garner	Hucknall
Mr Ian Garratt	Kirkby in Ashfield
Carol Garrett	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr Ian & Sandra Garthwaite	Sutton in Ashfield
J & B Gascgoine	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs Gascoyne	Nottingham
Mr J Gateley	Sutton in Ashfield
Ian Gaunts	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs Geeves	Sutton in Ashfield
Nicholas Gensler	Nuthall
D, M & T Gent	Sutton in Ashfield
Ferdynand George	Sutton in Ashfield
David & Ann George	Sutton in Ashfield
Mrs I M Gibbons	Sutton in Ashfield
A Gibson	Kirkby in Ashfield
Madeline Gibson	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr Alan Gilbert	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs Gildea	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs M M Gillott	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs G Goacher	Nottingham
Phyllis Goan	Sutton in Ashfield
Mrs Ann Godber	Sileby
Joanne Goodall	Newark
Martyn, Gill & Jade Goodfellow	Nottingham
Mrs J Goodwin	Nottingham
Malcolm Goodwin	Sutton in Ashfield
Mrs M Goucherof	Nottingham
John Graham Shaw	Kirkby in Ashfield
G O Grainger	Kirkby in Ashfield
S Graney	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mrs Helen Graney	Kirkby in Ashfield
R J Grattage	Sutton in Ashfield
J Graves	Sutton in Ashfield
L & N Greasley	Sutton in Ashfield
Mrs Trudy Green	Hucknall
Mr Barry Green	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mrs V Green	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs Green	Nottingham
Mr Richard Green	Stanton by Bridge
R & M Green	Sutton in Ashfield
M A Green	Sutton in Ashfield



**Ashfield District Council - Statement of Consultation**

M & J Green	Sutton in Ashfield
Rebecca & Shane Green	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr B R Greenaway	Kirkby in Ashfield
B Greenaway	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs Greenfield	Kirkby in Ashfield
Barbara Greenwood	Nottingham
Nicola Green-Wright	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr Jonathan Gregory	Kirkby in Ashfield
L & M Gregory	Nottingham
Mrs Gregory	Sutton in Ashfield
Giles Gregory	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs Gregory	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs Grundy	Nottingham
J Grundy	Nottingham
Trevor Hadley	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr A.T Hague	Nottingham
Mr Nigel Hainsworth	Leicester
David Hainsworth	Mansfield
Adam Hall	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs H Hall	Kirkby in Ashfield
Linda Hall	Mansfield
K & J Hall	Sutton in Ashfield
Derek Hall	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs Hall	Sutton in Ashfield
Freda & Roger Hallsworth	Nottingham
Charles Hammersley	Mansfield
Paul Hammersley	Mansfield
Mark Hammersley	Rainworth
G Hancock	Sutton in Ashfield
Ms Christine Hancock	Sutton- in-Ashfield
Mrs Hand	Nottingham
Mr Tim Hankin	Nottingham
Mr & Mrs Anthony and Mary Hanman	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr Darren Harding	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr Philip Hardstaff	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr Brian Hardy	Hucknall
J & E Hardy	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs W Hardy	Sutton in Ashfield
E & P Hardy	Sutton in Ashfield
Mrs A C Harland	Hucknall
Mr Philip Joseph Harris	Sutton in Ashfield
K & A Harris	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs L Harris	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs G Harrison	Nottingham
Richard Harrison	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs J L Harrison	York
Mrs L W Harrison	Sutton in Ashfield
Helen Hart	Kirkby in Ashfield

**Ashfield District Council - Statement of Consultation**

---

Mrs Susan Hastings	Sutton in Ashfield
Mrs Sherida Hatton	Nottingham
John & Jill Hawksley	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr D J Hayes	Kirkby in Ashfield
Philip Hayes	Sutton in Ashfield
Mrs Doreen Hayfield	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr A Hayward	Sutton in Ashfield
Katrina Haywood	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr Geoffrey Hazelwood	The Oval
H Heal	Nottingham
C & K Heath	Kirkby in Ashfield
John Heath	Kirkby in Ashfield
Pamela Hedgecock	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs P Hemstock	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr Laurie Hemstock	Ravenshead
Robert Hemstock	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs Hemstock	Sutton in Ashfield
Mrs M Hepworth	Kirkby in Ashfield
Rebecca Herward	Mansfield
Mrs B Higginson	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs Trevor & Joyce Higginson	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr Simon Higginson	Loughborough
Rose & James Higginson	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr Alan Higginson	Sutton in Ashfield
Nikki Hill	Kirkby in Ashfield
Jane & Donald Hill	Sutton in Ashfield
John Hill	Sutton in Ashfield
Elsie Hill	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mrs Mandy Hinson	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr Trevor Hiscox	Sutton in Ashfield
Rita Hobson	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr Roy Hodgkinson	Kirkby in Ashfield
L M Holden	Nottingham
Mr & Mrs Holdstock	Kirkby in Ashfield
K Holland	Sutton in Ashfield
David Holland	Sutherland
Audrey B Holliday	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs G Holmes	Hucknall
Deborah & Paul Holmes	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr Robert Holt	Kirkby in Ashfield
Martin Hook	Nottingham
Christopher Hook	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr Kevin Hooton	Kirkby in Ashfield
Sean Hopkins	Hucknall
Janet Hopkins	Ravenshead
Daniel & Patricia Hopkinson	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr Chris Hopkinson	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs Horan	Sutton in Ashfield

**Ashfield District Council - Statement of Consultation**

Julie Horrobin	Sutton in Ashfield
Janet Horsley	Nottingham
Dr & Mrs D Hosking	Nottingham
A Howard	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr Alan Howlett	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mrs Clare Howlett	Kirkby in Ashfield
J Hudson	Sutton-in-Ashfield
Moira & Robert Hufton	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs Hughes	Sutton in Ashfield
Robert Hughs	Edwinstowe
A Humphries	Mansfield
Thomas Jennings Hunt	Kirkby in Ashfield
Robert Hunt	Mansfield
T, M & S Hunt	Sutton in Ashfield
J M Hurst	Loughborough
Jennifer & Andrew Hurst	Sutton in Ashfield
Albert Hutchinson	
Paul Hutchinson	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs R Hutchinson	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs Hutchison	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr Colin Hutson	Hucknall
Mrs Audrey Hynd	Kirkby in Ashfield
Patrick Iliffe	Kirkby in Ashfield
Jane Iliffe	Kirkby in Ashfield
M A & R Ironside	Cropwell Bishop
Rev T Irvine	Hucknall
Mr D & Mrs B Isaksen	Nottingham
Betty & Harry Jacks	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs R Jackson	Sutton in Ashfield
Kelly Jackson	
Julie James	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs Ian James	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mrs Janet Jeanes	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs Jeffs	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs Jelonek	Sutton in Ashfield
Mrs Jean Johnson	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs N Jones	Brinsley
Ian Jones	Kirkby in Ashfield
Helen & Anthony Jones	Nottingham
Christopher Jones	Sutton in Ashfield
Thomas & Jean Jones	Sutton in Ashfield
Ashley & Diane Jones	Sutton in Ashfield
Jason Jones	Sutton in Ashfield
Peter Jones	Kirkby in Ashfield
S M Jordan	Sutton in Ashfield
Ms Dawn Justice	Nottingham
Mr Philip Justice	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr Reg Justice	Winter Closes
Mrs Gurnam Kaur Gill	Sutton in Ashfield

**Ashfield District Council - Statement of Consultation**

Mrs K Keeling	Kirkby in Ashfield
Kelly Maycock and Thomas Taylor	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mrs Jacqueline Kemp	Nottingham
Mr Richard Kemp	Watnall
Alastair Kent	Kirkby in Ashfield
Natalie Kettle	Newark
Ms Sarah Kiddy	Northampton
Chris King	Kirkby-in-Ashfield
Mrs Linda King	South Normanton
Andrew & Paula King	Sutton in Ashfield
Jane & Luc Kirchin	Sutton in Ashfield
T Kirk	Nottingham
Mrs Ellen Elizabeth Kitching	Kirkby in Ashfield
Carol Knight	Kirkby in Ashfield
Ms Jacqueline Knowles	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs Knowles	Nottingham
Mr A J Knowles	Sutton in Ashfield
Evangelos Kourentzis	Bestwood Village
Mrs Susan Kozluk	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr Krishman	Sutton in Ashfield
Rob Lace	
Mr & Mrs T W Lake	Sutton in Ashfield
Sarah Lambert	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mrs M A Lander	Kirkby in Ashfield
Muriel Lander	Kirkby in Ashfield
Denise Langridge	
Steve Laughton	Arnold
Mrs A J Laughton	Arnold
Ms K Laughton	Kirkby in Ashfield
A M Law	Sutton in Ashfield
E M Lawrence	Kirkby in Ashfield
S & A Lawrence-Gough	Nottingham
Jane Lawrinson	Rainworth
Ms K Lawton	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr Martyn Leafe	Hucknall
Ernest & Joyce Ledger	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr Roy Lee	Hucknall
Mr Frank Lee	Kirkby in Ashfield
Melanie Lee	Sutton in Ashfield
Mrs Z Lee	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs Lee	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr Alan Geoffrey Leivers	Nottingham
Mr James Lepley	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr Stanley Leslie	Hucknall
Mr Frank lester	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs P A and A S Leverton	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr S Lewis	Kirkby in Ashfield

**Ashfield District Council - Statement of Consultation**

C & J Lewis	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs Lewis	Sutton in Ashfield
Paul & Gail Lightly	Nottingham
Mr & Mrs Linacre	Sutton in Ashfield
Jeanette Lindley	Sutton in Ashfield
David Lindley	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr Shaun Lindsley	
Miss Jo Lloyd	Selston Selston
Mr & Mrs R & G Louth	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mrs Jean Low	Kirkby in Ashfield
David & Norma Lowe	
Jen Lowe	Sutton in Ashfield
Jenny & Paul Loxton	Kirkby in Ashfield
Christopher Loydall	Nottingham
Mr L Lynk	Kirkby in Ashfield
M Heath, D Peel & S Fearn	Kirkby in Ashfield
Ms Sue Maiden	Sutton in Ashfield
Mrs C Malbon-Clarke	Sutton in Ashfield
Malcolm Beresford & Rosalind Dobb	Sutton in Ashfield
Harry Maltby	Nottingham
Mr & Mrs Kenneth and Elaine Maltby	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr Ernest Mann	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mrs P Mann	Sutton in Ashfield
J & G Mansfield	Sutton in Ashfield
R & V March	Nottingham
I Markham	Kirkby in Ashfield
Amy Marriott	Alfreton
Mrs M Marriott	Kirkby in Ashfield
Helen Marriott	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mrs F K Marriott	Nottingham
Mr J Marriott	Sutton in Ashfield
Mrs D Marriott	Sutton in Ashfield
Robert & Diane Marriott	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs B Marriott	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs Marsh	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mrs Marian Marsh	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mrs J Marsh	Sutton in Ashfield
E Marsh	Sutton in Ashfield
Mrs P Marshall	
Jayne Marshall	Sutton in Ashfield
D & M N Marshall	Sutton in Ashfield
D & M Marshall	Sutton in Ashfield
Pauline Marshall	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr Glynn Martin	Nottingham
Mr D Martin	Nottingham
Gareth Martin	Sutton in Ashfield
H, S & H Martin	Sutton in Ashfield

**Ashfield District Council - Statement of Consultation**

---

Sally-Anne Martin	Sutton in Ashfield
Faye Martin	Nottingham
Jackie Mason	Hucknall
Neil & Rachel Mason	Sutton in Ashfield
Mrs Diane Massey	Kirkby in Ashfield
Matthew Shirley & Janine Bedder	Forest Town
Rob Matthews	
Mrs J Matthews	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr Stephen Matthews	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs Matthews	Sutton in Ashfield
C & A Matthews	Sutton in Ashfield
M Matthews	Sutton in Ashfield
D & M Matthews	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs Matthews	Sutton in Ashfield
F, D, J & A Matthews	Sutton in Ashfield
C & R Mattinson	Sutton in Ashfield
G Maxim	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr Kevin Mayfield	Nottingham
Cllr L Mays	Brinsley
Rev Ian McLeod	Nottingham
Mr Oliver McNeill	Sutton in Ashfield
Sean McParland	Mansfield
Pamela & Brian Meakin	Sutton in Ashfield
Mrs S Mellor	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr Peter Mephram	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs Merry	Sutton in Ashfield
Justin Miller	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr John Mills	Kirkby in Ashfield
Kath Mills	Kirkby in Ashfield
P Mills	Sutton in Ashfield
A, L & J Mills	Sutton in Ashfield
Francis Mills	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr Ralph Millward	Brackenfield
Martin & Maureen Minogue	Sutton in Ashfield
Miss C Parfoot & Mr S Malby	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs Mitchell	Sutton in Ashfield
Mrs C A Monk	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr A Monk	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr Steven Monk	Kirkby in Ashfield
Neil Moore	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr S R & Mrs A M Moore	Kirkby in Ashfield
B & T Moore	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs J A Moore	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs Moore	Sutton in Ashfield
Carol Moore	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr Stephen Morely	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mike Morgan	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mrs A Morgan	Kirkby in Ashfield

**Ashfield District Council - Statement of Consultation**

M Morley	Kirkby in Ashfield
Deborah & Keith Morley	Sutton in Ashfield
Raymond & Clare Morley	Sutton in Ashfield
Lisa Morrell	Sutton in Ashfield
Christine & Alan Morrell	Sutton in Ashfield
Jade Morrissey	Mansfield
Mr Andrew Morton	Kirkby in Ashfield
Beryl Mountjoy	Kirkby in Ashfield
Jeff Moxon	Sutton in Ashfield
David Moxon	Sutton in Ashfield
Mrs Janet Moxon	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr Grahame & Mrs Jeanette White	Sutton in Ashfield
Dan Mutch-Mathieson	Kimberley
Ronnie Needham	Kirkby in Ashfield
Jeff Needham	South Normanton
Mr Brian Nelson	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr Andrew Nelson	Sutton in Ashfield
J Neville	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr Andrew Newbury	Mansfield
Mr & Mrs W E & P M Newby	Kirkby in Ashfield
Simon Newman	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr H Newstead	Sutton in Ashfield
Paul Newton	Kirkby in Ashfield
Andy Nixon	Sutton in Ashfield
R Nixon	Sutton in Ashfield
Mrs Karen Noke	Sutton in Ashfield
Pamela Nunn	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs Nunn	Sutton in Ashfield
Miss B Nuttall	Kirkby in Ashfield
Matt Oakes	Nottingham
Wendy and Stephen Oakley	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs O'Connell	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr John Oldfield	Bestwood Village
Mr Graham Oliver	Hucknall
V Olivero	Sutton in Ashfield
June & Peter Orridge	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr Patrick Orton	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr Orton	Sutton in Ashfield
Mrs Sheila Orton	Sutton in Ashfield
K Orton	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs David & Anne Orwin	Kirkby in Ashfield
D & S Osbourne	Sutton in Ashfield
Audrey & Terry Oscroft	Sutton in Ashfield
Dale & Julie Oscroft	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr Michael O'Sullivan	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs Owen	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr John Page	Nottingham
Tara Palmer	Mansfield Woodhouse

**Ashfield District Council - Statement of Consultation**

Mrs Lyndsey Park	Mansfield
Mrs S Parker	Kirkby in Ashfield
June Parker	Kirkby in Ashfield
P & G Parker	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs Geoffrey & Norma Parkin	Kirkby in Ashfield
Philip Parkin	Sutton in Ashfield
Ms Olive Parks	Sutton in Ashfield
Mrs G.C Parmenter	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs Parnell	Nottingham
Mr Andrew Parnell	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs Parr	Sutton in Ashfield
Mrs Barbara Parrett	Hucknall
Philip Parry	Daybrook
Margaret Parry	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr C B & M Pascoe	Hucknall
Hemant Patel	Sutton in Ashfield
J F Pattison	Sutton in Ashfield
Stephanie Paulson	Hucknall
Nicholas, Irene & Aaron Payne	Sutton in Ashfield
Joseph & Audery Peake	Sutton in Ashfield
Mrs M Pearson	Kirkby in Ashfield
Colin Peat-Bailey	Hucknall
Judith & James Peet	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr P Peet	Sutton in Ashfield
Charlotte Pell	Alfreton
Mr E Pemberton	Sutton in Ashfield
Mrs P H Pennington	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr Michael Pennington	Kirkby in Ashfield
Miss Pepperday	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mrs D Perry	Kirkby in Ashfield
Patrick Philbin	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr Steve Phillips	Kirkby in Ashfield
Steve & Ruth Phillips	Mansfield
Vera Phillips	Sutton in Ashfield
F Phillips	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr N K Piggott	Nottingham
Helen Pike	Kirkby in Ashfield
Sandra Playford	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr Plith	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mrs M Poiser	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr S Pollard	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mrs P Pollard	Sutton in Ashfield
Derek Poole	Nottingham
Mr & Mrs Poole	Sutton in Ashfield
Donald Pope	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mrs M E Portas	Sutton in Ashfield
S & J Porter	Nottingham



**Ashfield District Council - Statement of Consultation**

Adele Postlethwaite	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mrs Maureen Povey	Nottingham
Mr Keith Poxon	Kirkby in Ashfield
Angela & David Preston	Sutton in Ashfield
Lesley & Keith Price	Kirkby in Ashfield
B & N Price	Sutton in Ashfield
Stuart & Chris Pridden	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs M J Pugh	Sutton in Ashfield
Mrs M Pursglove	Kirkby in Ashfield
M Racil	Sutton in Ashfield
Lynne, Trevor, Joanne & Gemma Raisin	Kirkby in Ashfield
Fred Ramsley	Hucknall
Alan & Marie Randall	Sutton in Ashfield
S Rathbone	Sutton in Ashfield
J B & E M Rawding	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr B Rawson	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs Read	Kirkby in Ashfield
Dave Redfern	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mrs J Redfern	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr A Reeves	
Mr Frank Reid	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs Reid	Sutton in Ashfield
Leysa & Matthew Relf	Sutton in Ashfield
Dawn Renshaw	Nottingham
J Restorick	Nottingham
Rev George and Mrs Helen Newell	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs Revel	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr Phil Revill	Kirkby in Ashfield
E & J Revill	Nottingham
Mrs C Revill	Sutton in Ashfield
D Revill	Sutton in Ashfield
J A Revill	Sutton in Ashfield
Mike Reynolds	Mansfield
R U Reynolds	Nottingham
J Reynolds	Sutton in Ashfield
A & H Rhodes	Sutton in Ashfield
Miss Kathryn Rhodes	Sutton in Ashfield
A & S Richards	Sutton in Ashfield
Ms D Richardson	Hucknall
Mr Michael Anthony Richardson	Sutton in Ashfield
Mrs J C Richardson	Sutton in Ashfield
Jean Richmond	Nottingham
Mr R Riley	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mrs G Roberts	Hucknall
Mr Nigel Roberts	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mrs Tracey, Daniel & Christopher Roberts	Sutton in Ashfield

**Ashfield District Council - Statement of Consultation**

---

Mr & Mrs Robinson	Sutton in Ashfield
S & M Robinson	Sutton in Ashfield
J & L Robinson	Sutton in Ashfield
David Roe	Kirkby in Ashfield
Julie Roe	
Malcolm Roebuck	Sutton in Ashfield
M & A Roper	Sutton in Ashfield
Jane Row	Watnall
Miss Carol Rowe	Pleasley
B Rowe	Sutton in Ashfield
Mark & Alison Rowson	Sutton in Ashfield
Martyn & Nikki Rushin	Sutton in Ashfield
Liam Russell	Nottingham
Mrs M Rutland	Forest Town
Mrs Mary Rutter	Nottingham
Sandra & John Ryl	Sutton in Ashfield
David Sacmon	Brinsley
Mr & Mrs D & R Sanderson	Mansfield
Mr Tim Sang Sum	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr Roland Sansom	Clayton West
Sylvia & Brian Saunders	Sutton in Ashfield
Stephen Saxton	Hucknall
Mr J T Scanlon	Hucknall
Tam Schrijver	Nottingham
Mr & Mrs Norman & Patricia Scothern	Hucknall
Mrs D M Scothern	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr K & G Scothern	Sutton in Ashfield
Sarah Scott	Kirkby in Ashfield
David & Carole Scott	Sutton in Ashfield
Dorrienne Scotter	Nottingham
Mrs Mary Scrimshaw	
Mrs L Scrimshaw	Kirkby in Ashfield
V & D Searson	Sutton in Ashfield
Phillip & Cynthia Selby	Sutton in Ashfield
Angie Seppard	Kirkby in Ashfield
P & D Sewell	Sutton in Ashfield
H & S Shacklock	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr John Shannon	Kirkby in Ashfield
Richard Shardlow	Kingston on Soar
A K Sharma	Kirkby in Ashfield
Miss A K Sharman	Kirkby in Ashfield
Andrew Sharman	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr M Shaw	Kirkby in Ashfield
Susan & Alan Shaw	Kirkby in Ashfield
James Shaw	Nottingham
David Shaw	Sutton in Ashfield
Mrs Betty Shaw	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs Sheehan	Sutton in Ashfield

**Ashfield District Council - Statement of Consultation**

Terrence & Mrs B A Sheen	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mrs A Sheen	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mrs B A Sheen	Kirkby in Ashfield
Ms Brenda Shelbourne	Hucknall
Carl Sheldon	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr Simon Sheppard	Kirkby in Ashfield
M Shilladay	Mansfield
Mrs M A Shilling	Nottingham
Mr David Shipley	Kirkby in Ashfield
Liz & Steve Shirley	Kirkby in Ashfield
Malcolm Short	Sutton in Ashfield
A M Shorthose	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr T B Simmonds	Sutton in Ashfield
Gary Simms	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs G A Simms	Kirkby in Ashfield
Ricki Simms	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr Simms	Hucknall
Mrs Helen Simpson	Hucknall
Mr & Mrs P Simpson	Kirkby in Ashfield
M & S Simpson-Eyre	Nottingham
Sarah Simpson-Eyre	Awsworth
Mr W Sims	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mrs S Sinfield	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs Singleton	Hucknall
Deborah Sissons	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs Skrzypkowski	Sutton in Ashfield
J D Slack	Kirkby in Ashfield
R & G Slack	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr Mike Slack	Kirkby in Ashfield
John Slaney	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mrs A Smalley	Nottingham
Mr & Mrs Stephen Smith	Edingley
Mr & Mrs C Smith	Hucknall
D Smith	Kirkby in Ashfield
Michelle Smith	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mrs R Smith	Kirkby in Ashfield
M & K Smith	Nottingham
Mr Ian Smith	Nottingham
Reg Smith	Nottingham
Mrs Susan Smith	Nottingham
Mr Peter Smith	Sutton in Ashfield
Miss Esther Smith	Sutton in Ashfield
Mrs S Smith	Sutton in Ashfield
Richard I Smith	Sutton in Ashfield
Michelle & Andrew Smith	Sutton in Ashfield
Kerry Smith	Sutton in Ashfield
Ellis Smith-Matthews	Pinxton
John & Pat Snelson	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs Snowden	Sutton in Ashfield

**Ashfield District Council - Statement of Consultation**

Mr & Mrs Sommerfield	Sutton in Ashfield
Ms Carol Southall	Sutton in Ashfield
Louise Sowter	Kirkby in Ashfield
Eileen Sowter	Sutton in Ashfield
Sarah Spencer	Mansfield
Aleisha Spencer	Sutton in Ashfield
K & C Spencer	Sutton in Ashfield
M Spotswood	Nottingham
Mrs M Springthorpe	Nottingham
Charlotte Sprusen	Alfreton
Dr M Srinivasan	Sutton in Ashfield
Pat Stafford	Kirkby in Ashfield
Peter Stafford	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr John Stain	Sutton in Ashfield
Melvyn Stanley	Hucknall
Sue Staples	Kirkby in Ashfield
D & E Staples	Sutton in Ashfield
S & D Starr	Nottingham
Mr & Mrs L State	Pleasley
Mr Carl Stevenson	Kirkby in Ashfield
G Stevenson	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr D Stevenson	Sutton in Ashfield
Ken & June Stimpson	Kirkby in Ashfield
Paul Stocks	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mrs J Stones	Kirkby in Ashfield
David Stopps	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr Mr C & Mrs E Stopps	Sutton in Ashfield
Mrs B Strange	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs K. Straw	Brinsley
Mrs J Stringfellow	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr Keith Stringfellow	Sutton in Ashfield
Christopher Sumpter	
Chris Sumpter	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr Alan Sutton	Nottingham
Laura Swain	Alfreton
Mr's J & D Swain	Nottingham
Vicky & Peter Swaisland	Sutton in Ashfield
Joanne & David Swales	
Rita Swales	Mansfield
Linda Swann	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs P Swift	Sutton in Ashfield
Stewart Swigg	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs Swindell	Sutton in Ashfield
Hugh Symonds	Sutton in Ashfield
Julie, Ian & Michael Tagg	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs Tagg	Sutton in Ashfield
Rachel Tatham	Alfreton
Glenys Taylor	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mrs Taylor	Kirkby in Ashfield

**Ashfield District Council - Statement of Consultation**

A & M Taylor	Sutton in Ashfield
W Taylor	Sutton in Ashfield
Mrs M Taylor	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr John T Taylor	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr John Tedstone	Hucknall
Mrs NJ Temple	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr E A Temple	Sutton in Ashfield
Mrs J Thickett	Mansfield
Jill Thomas	Nottingham
P A Thomas	Ravenshead
Mr Dennis Thompson	
Mr John Thompson	Blackwell
Garry Thompson	Mapperley
Mrs Sharon Thompson	Ravenshead
B & J Thorley	Sutton in Ashfield
Mrs N L Thorpe	Kirkby in Ashfield
M & A Thorpe	Sutton in Ashfield
Tracy Thursfield	
C Titherley	Bestwood Village
Mr & Mrs Tolly	Sutton in Ashfield
Mrs P Tomlinson	Kirkby in Ashfield
Peter Tomlinson	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr Lesley Tomlinson	Nottingham
S Tomlinson	Nottingham
C, K & P Tomlinson	Sutton in Ashfield
Melanie & Stephen Tomlinson	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs B Tooby	Hucknall
Sarah Toon	Mansfield
Allan Toon	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs Toon	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr Mike Topham	Kirkby in Ashfield
Michael Topping	Mansfield
Mr & Mrs Townsend	Nottingham
Mr R Townsend	Nottingham
Mrs Stephanie Townsend	Sutton in Ashfield
Sean Townsley	
Mr Brian Trigg	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs Truman	Kirkby in Ashfield
Louise Truman	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs Tryne	Sutton in Ashfield
Dorothy Tuft	Sutton in Ashfield
Fiona Tujj	Sutton in Ashfield
D & P Tully	Sutton in Ashfield
Mrs Sharon Turner	Hucknall
Mr Brian Turner	Kirkby in Ashfield
Alan & Pat Turner	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr B Turner	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mrs A Turner	Sutton in Ashfield
Marilyn & Peter Turner	Sutton in Ashfield

**Ashfield District Council - Statement of Consultation**

---

Mr J F Turner	Sutton in Ashfield
Ann-marie Turner	Sutton in Ashfield
D & B Turner	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr B Turner	Sutton in Ashfield
Freda Turner	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr Malcolm Turner	Hucknall
Julie Twells	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr Frederick Twiss	Kirkby in Ashfield
Patricia Twiss	Kirkby in Ashfield
E & N Twort	Sutton in Ashfield
R Tyrell	Watnall
Mark Underwood	Hucknall
Mrs C Upton	Hucknall
Frank Valance	Kirkby in Ashfield
Kerry Vardy	Chesterfield
Mr Neil Vardy	Huthwaite, Sutton in Ashfield
Mr B Vardy	Kirkby in Ashfield
C & J Vardy	Kirkby in Ashfield
K M Vardy	Sutton in Ashfield
Miss Claire Varley	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr James Vauguan	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs B Vernon	Sutton in Ashfield
Mrs Christine Vernon	Sutton in Ashfield
Jane Vernon	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs S Vessey	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr Neil Vickers	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs Vincent	Sutton in Ashfield
A & G Wade	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr F Waldram	Hucknall
Mr Bob, Eileen & Robert Wale	Nottingham
Mrs M Walker	Bestwood Village
Mrs Meryl Walker	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mrs Cheryl Walker	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr K A Walker	Sutton in Ashfield
Katie Walker	Sutton in Ashfield
Antonia Walker	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr Barry Walker	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs Walker	Sutton-on-Ashfield
Mrs M Wallis	Nottingham
P & D Walmsley	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs Walsh	Sutton in Ashfield
Stephen & Sue Walters	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mrs B Walters	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr Richard Walters	Nottingham
B Walters	Sutton in Ashfield
R & H Walters	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr Simon Walters and N. Allen	Kirkby in Ashfield

**Ashfield District Council - Statement of Consultation**

Mr John Walton	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr James Ward	Nottingham
Mr & Mrs M Ward	Nottingham
Mr & Mrs Ward	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr R Ward	Sutton in Ashfield
Michele Ward	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr John Wardle	Kirkby in Ashfield
L & M Wardle	Nottingham
Mr & Mrs Wardle	Sutton in Ashfield
F Warner	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr Peter Warren	Hucknall
D & J Warren	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs I Warren	Kirkby in Ashfield
K, A, J & S Warren	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr Ian Warriner	
C A Waterfield	Sutton in Ashfield
C R Waterfield	Sutton in Ashfield
B & K Waterhouse	Sutton in Ashfield
Ann & Colin Waterhouse	Sutton in Ashfield
Mrs M Watson	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mrs V Watson	Nottingham
Grahame Watson	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs Watson	Sutton in Ashfield
Mrs Helen Webster	Hucknall
R Webster	Sutton in Ashfield
Alice, Paulette, Sally & Caroline Webster	Sutton in Ashfield
Ms Wendy Wells	Hucknall
Mr Keith Lenthall Wells	Nuncargate
Laura Wells	South Normanton
Mr & Mrs M D Welsh	Hucknall
Mr & Mrs Ian & Julie Weremczuk	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mrs E Westhead	Sutton in Ashfield
M Westmoreland	Nottingham
A F & E Weston	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr E G Whalley	Wollaton
Peter Wharmby	Kirkby in Ashfield
J, R & FR Wheatcroft	Sutton in Ashfield
Ian Whetton	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr H Whetton	Kirkby in Ashfield
Stephen & Susan Whetton	Sutton in Ashfield
A & C Whetton	Sutton in Ashfield
John & Joyce Whetton	Sutton in Ashfield
Ms Christina White	Sutton in Ashfield
Dr & Mrs White	Sutton in Ashfield
Mrs J Wilkes	Kirkby in Ashfield
Miss V Wilkins	Nottingham
Steve Wilkinson	Kirkby in Ashfield

## Ashfield District Council - Statement of Consultation

Glenice Wilkinson	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mrs S Wilkinson	Sutton in Ashfield
D & D Wilkinson	Sutton in Ashfield
P G & J Willbraham	Sutton in Ashfield
David Williams	Kirkby in Ashfield
Andrea & Mark Williams	Kirkby in Ashfield
Miranda & Andrew Williams	Sutton in Ashfield
Peter Williams	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs Paul Williamson	Kirkby in Ashfield
Miss Linda Williamson	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs B V Willoughby	Nottingham
Anita & Peter Willows	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr William Arthur Wilson	Nottingham
Mr Richard Wilson	Nottingham
Mr Godfrey Wilson Limb	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr Philip Wilson-Barney	Nottingham
P G Wimbleton	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr Simon Winston	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr M Winterton	Sutton in Ashfield
C Winterton	Sutton in Ashfield
Mrs Sue Wood	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs Wood	Sutton in Ashfield
Andrea Wood	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs Woodfield	Huthwaite
Mrs S Woodhouse	Kirkby in Ashfield
Alison Woofinden	Kirkby in Ashfield
S P & M P Woollam	Nottingham
Mr John Woolley	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mrs Adina Worboys	Kirkby in Ashfield
Royston Worstencroft	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr Kenneth Wray	Sutton in Ashfield
Christine Wright	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr Peter Wright	Kirkby in Ashfield
J & N Wright	Kirkby in Ashfield
James Wright	Sutton in Ashfield
Yvonne & John Wright	Sutton in Ashfield
Gary & Anne Wright	Nottingham
A R Yarwood	Matlock
Mr Philip Yates	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mrs Gladys Yates	Kirkby in Ashfield
Hollie Yearwood	Nottingham
Margaret & Joan Yeoman	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr T Young	Sutton in Ashfield
T & D Young	Sutton in Ashfield
D & M Young	Sutton in Ashfield
Andrew & Jane Young	Sutton in Ashfield



## Appendix Three

### List of Respondents

Organisation	Name	Town
Access	Mr P Olko	Kirkby in Ashfield
Annesley & Felley Parish Council	Mr John Barlow	Mansfield
Barton Willmore Planning	Jennifer Walters	Solihull
BNP Paribas Real Estate	Mr Paul Foreshaw	Sheffield
Bolsover District Council	Mr Ian Collis	Bolsover
Broxtowe Borough Council	Mr S J Dance	Beeston
Caldecotte Consultants	Mr Aaron Smith	Buckingham
Clowes Development (Midlands) Limited	Mr P Shanley	Derby
David Wilson Homes BDW	John Deakin	Bardon Hill, Coalville
Derbyshire Environmental Services	Mr Ian Goldstraw	Matlock
English Heritage	Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge	Northampton
Environment Agency	Mr Andrew Pitts	West Bridgford
Framptons	Mrs Louisa Cusdin	Banbury
Gedling Borough Council	Ms A Gibson	Arnold
Gladedale (Lincoln) Ltd	Mr Twigg	Kingsley Road
Gracemachin Planning	Nick Grace	Long Eaton
Greasley Parish Council	Mr A Marshall	Brinsley
Hucknall Safer Neighbourhoods Committee - North & Central Ward	Mr R N Gow	Hucknall
Ian Baseley Associates		Edwinstowe
Indigo Planning Ltd	Kate Girling	Leeds
John D Collins & Associates	John Collins	Matlock
KDAG	Mrs P Lewis	Kirkby in Ashfield
KDCS	Mr John Kerry	Kirkby in Ashfield
Kirkby & District Conservation Society	Mrs Christine Kidger	Kirkby in Ashfield
Kirkby and District Archaeological Group	Mr & Mrs Trevor & Pamela Lewis	Kirkby in Ashfield
Kirkby Residents Green Belt Associaton	Mr Nicholas Gear	Kirkby in Ashfield
Long Reign Allotment Gardens	Ms Teena Needhan	Sutton in Ashfield
Mansfield District Council	Mr R Routledge	Mansfield
Marrons	Ms Jane Gardner	Meridian Business Park
MONO Consultants Ltd	Ms Ginny Hall	Glasgow
Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners	Mr Dennis Pope	London
National Farmers' Union	Mr P Tame	Uppingham
National Trust	Alan Hubbard	Worksop
Natural England		Bakewell
Network Rail	Mrs M Lake	York
NJL Consulting LLP	Mr Paul Smith	Manchester
Nottingham City Council	Mr Matt Gregory	Nottingham
Nottinghamshire County Council	Sally Gill	Nottingham
Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust	Andrew Lowe	Nottingham
OPUN	Julie Tanner	Melton
Oxalis Planning Ltd	Mr B Holmes	Edwalton
Peacock and Smith	Mr M Eagland	Hanover Walk

**Ashfield District Council - Statement of Consultation**

Pegasus Planning Group	Guy Longley	Lockington
Pegasus Planning Group Ltd	Mr Andrew Gore	Lockington
Phoenix Planning (UK) Ltd	John Booth	Eastwood
Reach Out Residents	Sally Wyatt	Hucknall
RPS Newark	Mr Christopher Dwan	Newark
Savills (L&P) Ltd	Mr Roger Freeston	Nottingham
Selston Parish Council	Ms S Ball	Nottingham
Severn Trent Water	Peter Davies	Nottingham
Signet Planning	Mr Paul Stone	Nottingham
Sport England		Loughborough
Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd	Mr Keith Oliver	Hook
The Coal Authority	Miss Rachael A Bust	Mansfield
The Co-operative Group	Matthew Stafford	Manchester
The Highways Agency	Mr Kamaljit Khokhar	Birmingham
The Houldsworth Trust	Mr J G H Sztejer	Burton Joyce
The Theatre's Trust	Rose Freeman	London
The Tyler-Parkes Partnership	Helen Winkler Bsc (Hon), DipTP, MRTPI	Hall Green
URS Infrastructure & Environment UK Ltd	Gareth Jones BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI	Basingstoke
Vincent and Gorbing	Mr David Rixson	Stevenage

Name	Town
Mr Baqar Abbas	Kirkby in Ashfield
Dr Samra Abbas	Kirkby in Ashfield
Miss Elaine Abbott	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs M.K Adams	Sutton in Ashfield
David & Valerie Alcock	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mrs Kathleen Allatt	Sutton in Ashfield
Jenny Allen	Mansfield
Wayne & Ann Allen	Sutton in Ashfield
MC Allen	Mansfield
Mrs Mavis Allen	Mansfield
Mrs Madeline Allsop	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mrs Pauline Alsop	Sutton in Ashfield
Carl Alton	Sutton in Ashfield
Annalisa Pellicciari & Stephen Sellars	Nottingham
Mr Ansell	Sutton in Ashfield
Mrs Beryl Anthony	Sutton in Ashfield
Russ Aram	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr David Archer	Kirkby in Ashfield
D Askew	Nottingham
Mr John Asling	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr J Bacon	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr Victor Bagshore	Bulwell
D & S Bailey	Kirkby in Ashfield
C & S Bailey	Kirkby in Ashfield
Claire Bailey	Sutton in Ashfield

**Ashfield District Council - Statement of Consultation**

Rajinder Bains	Kirkby in Ashfield
John & Jackie Barker	Nottingham
Mr G Barkes	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr S. Barkes	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs Barnes	Sutton in Ashfield
Denise Barraclough	Mansfield
J Barratt	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr John Barrow	Mansfield
Robert Barsby	Sutton in Ashfield
Mrs C Bartle	Sutton in Ashfield
R & A Bealby	Nottingham
Mr Martin Bee	Hucknall
D & M Bend	Kirkby in Ashfield
Carol & Adrian Bennett	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs Berry	Sutton in Ashfield
Mrs Winifred Betts	Kirkby in Ashfield
M & K Bexson	Nottingham
M Bingley	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr and Mrs G Bircumshaw	Sutton in Ashfield
Caroline Bird	
Elaine Bird	
Mrs Lindsay Biro-Moore	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr and Mrs L Blower	Kirkby in Ashfield
Helen Boddice	Mansfield
John & Margaret Bolger	Kirkby in Ashfield
M Boswell	Nottingham
Paul Bough	Sutton in Ashfield
Miss Natasha Bowe	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr William Bowker	Sutton in Ashfield
Mrs Vera Bowler	Kirkby in Ashfield
Y & T Bowmar	Nottingham
Ms Jean Bowyer	Kirkby in Ashfield
Nicola Boxton	Bulwell
Mrs Lisa Brabury	Kirkby In Ashfield
Mr R Bradley	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs Robert Bradley	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr Harold & Christopher Bradshaw	Kirkby in Ashfield
D Bramley	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs Pete & Sarah Brand	Nottingham
Ms Karen Brearley	
K Brennan	Colwick
Mr & Mrs J R Brewster	Sutton in Ashfield
Miss Helen, Jill & Alexander Brewster	Sutton in Ashfield
James Briggs	Mansfield
Mrs Betty Britton	Kirkby-in Ashfield
Miss Jacqui Britton	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr, Mrs & Adam Brown	Sutton in Ashfield

**Ashfield District Council - Statement of Consultation**

Mr Ivan & Carolyn Brown	Sutton in Ashfield
Lisa Brown	Kirkby in Ashfield
MR Ross Brown	Sutton in Ashfield
Lisa Brown	Kirkby in Ashfield
P Brown	Nottingham
Mr John Brunt	Sutton in Ashfield
Margaret Brunt	Sutton in Ashfield
N & S Buckle	Kirkby in Ashfield
R & B Bull	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs J.E & S.E Bunting	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs A Burton	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mark Busler	Nottingham
Mr & Mrs Bustin	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr P Bustin	Skegby
Mr Daniel Buston	Kirkby in Ashfield
Rodger Butler	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr & Ms Paul & Kay Buttery	Sutton in Ashfield
Jane Campbell	Kirkby in Ashfield
P B & M Canlin	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr Robert Carlin	Sutton in Ashfield
Mrs Joanne Carr	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs Cartledge	Kirkby in Ashfield
Ms Emma Caswell	Riddings
Mr Alan Cater	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr Gordon Caunt	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs Caunt	Sutton in Ashfield
Mrs J.M Caunt	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs Stewart and Anne Chalkley	Kirkby in Ashfield
Sarah Chalkley	Kirkby in Ashfield
Miss Sarah Challands	Alfreton
Becky Challday	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mrs Lisa Chambers	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr Andrew Chipperfield-Taylor	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr Christopher Christodoulou	Kirkby in Ashfield
Giovanni Cirignano	Kirkby in Ashfield
Andrew Clark	Sutton in Ashfield
John Clarke	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr C Clay	Sutton in Ashfield
Kirsty Cohen	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr Roy Coleman	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs Coleman	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr R & J Collier	Kirkby in Ashfield
D & J Collins	Nottingham
D Connah	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs Connell	Sutton in Ashfield
David Cook	Nottingham
G Cook	Nottingham

**Ashfield District Council - Statement of Consultation**

N Cooke	Sutton in Ashfield
Simon Cooke	Kirkby in Ashfield
W & A Cooper	Kirkby in Ashfield
W & E Cooper	Kirkby in Ashfield
Penny Cooper	Nottingham
P & J Copson	Kirby
Andrew Copson	Mansfield
Alison Corbett	Sutton in Ashfield
George Cordy	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mrs Margaret Costall	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mrs Ann Cowie	Hucknall
Mrs Catherine Cox	Sutton in Ashfield
J Crafts	Sutton in Ashfield
Mrs Janet Crane	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr Ken Creed	Hucknall
Alex Croft	Nottingham
Mr & Mrs N Crofts	Sutton in Ashfield
Dr David Cross	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mrs P Cumberland	Kirkby in Ashfield
Miss Esther Curtis	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr Lester Dacunha	Kirkby in Ashfield
Y & K Daniels	Sutton in Ashfield
J & A Dare	Sutton in Ashfield
R Davidson	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr David Davies	Sutton in Ashfield
Michael Davies	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr Brian Davies	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mrs Helen Davies	Kirkby in Ashfield
Arlene de Cruz	Nottingham
Anna, Georgina, Lorna, Janet & Neil Deakin	Sutton in Ashfield
Roger Dean	Kirkby in Ashfield
Paula & Michael Dear	Sutton in Ashfield
Mrs Valerie Demiral	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr Robert Denny	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mrs Sarah Derbyshire	Kirkby in Ashfield
Jane Devonshire	Sutton in Ashfield
Shirley Dorsett	Nottingham
Mr Shlomo Downen	Forest Town
Mr. James kenneth Draycott	Sutton in Ashfield
John Dring	
Mr & Mrs Ian and Mary Dyer	Sutton in Ashfield
M & S Dymond	Belper
Mr Paul Earnshaw	Skegby, Sutton-in-Ashfield
Geoff, Irene & Deborah Eggleshaw	Nottingham
Mr & Mrs R Elliott	Sutton in Ashfield
Mrs Joanne English	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr David Ensor	Kirkby in Ashfield

**Ashfield District Council - Statement of Consultation**

Miss Kirsty Evans	Sutton in Ashfield
John Evans	
Miss Terri-Ann Eyre	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr and Mrs R and M Facer	Sutton in Ashfield
Emma Fawcett	Beeston
Mr & Mrs Fisher	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr M Fisher	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr Nicholas Flint	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr Neil Footitt	Mansfield
Mr & Mrs Ford	Sutton in Ashfield
Mrs M Ford	Sutton in Ashfield
Paul Fowkes	Mansfield
Mrs Elaine Fowler	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr and Mrs L L Fox	Sutton in Ashfield
Miss Sian Kerry Galvin	Kirkby in Ashfield
A Garner	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr Ian Garratt	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr Philip Garvican	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mrs Irene Gasgoine	Sutton in Ashfield
Mrs Doris Gent	Kirkby in Ashfield
P Gibbons	Hucknall
Mr & Mrs Gibson	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr and Mrs A. Gibson	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mrs Andrea Giles	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mrs Sally Glass	Kirkby in Ashfield
Brad Goff	Nottingham
Mrs Joyce Goodall	Kirkby in Ashfield
Martyn, Gill & Jade Goodfellow	Nottingham
Steve Goodgroves	
Kelly Greaves	
Mr George Greaves	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mrs J Green	Kirkby in Ashfield
Jean, Peter and Joanne Green	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr Jonathan Gregory	Kirkby in Ashfield
W Grieveson	Nottingham
M Guy	Kirkby in Ashfield
Hall	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs K & G Hall	Sutton in Ashfield
Mrs Sarah Hall	Kirkby in Ashfield
Chris Hall	Mansfield
Mr and Ms R & P Hallam	Mansfield
Mr & Mrs C Hallam	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr Rob Hallam	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr Keith Hallam	Nottingham
Mrs J Hallam	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs Michael and Kathleen Hallsworth	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr M Harby	Sutton in Ashfield

**Ashfield District Council - Statement of Consultation**

Darren Harding	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mrs Sylvia Hardwick	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr and Mrs David Hardy	Sutton in Ashfield
Michelle Hardy	Sutton in Ashfield
Angela & Stephen Hardy	Nottingham
Mr David Hare	Mansfield
Mrs Margaret Hare	Mansfield
Mr Norman Harley	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs Harris	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mrs Lisa Harrison	Kirkby in Ashfield
Peter Hart	Mansfield
Mr & Mrs David & Wendy Hartley	Kirkby in Ashfield
Shaun Hartley	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs Hartwell	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr Neil Harvey	Kirkby in Ashfield
Ms Suzanne Haslam	Kirkby in Ashfield
V Hayes	Kirkby in Ashfield
H Headworth	Kirkby in Ashfield
Adam Heathcote	Ravenshead
Mrs Karen Jane Hemingray	Kirkby in Ashfield
Paul and Anne Hemstock	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr Samuel C Hemstock	Kirkby in Ashfield
Lynn Henstock	Sutton in Ashfield
Tim Henstock	Sutton in Ashfield
Mrs Charlotte Henton	Sutton in Ashfield
C Hewitt	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr Michael Higgins	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr Malcolm Hodgkinson	Bulwell
Mr P Hodson	Sutton in Ashfield
Mrs S M Holland	Mansfield
Mr & Mrs G Holmes	Hucknall
Mr Anthony Holmes	Kirkby in Ashfield
A V Holmes	Sutton in Ashfield
Alison Holmes	Kirkby in Ashfield
Annette Holmes	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr Kevin Hooton	Kirkby in Ashfield
Edmund Hopkins	Nottingham
Mr & Mrs Hopkinsin	Sutton in Ashfield
Beverly Howard	Sutton in Ashfield
Gillian Howell	Kirkby in Ashfield
A J Howells	Nottingham
Mr & Mrs Hubbard	Mansfield
Ms June Hudson	
Moira & Robert Hufton	Kirkby in Ashfield
Stephen Hull	
E Hutchinson	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr Colin Hutson	Hucknall
J Webster & L Ives	Teversal, Sutton-in-

**Ashfield District Council - Statement of Consultation**

	Ashfield
Mr S P & A Jackson	Kirkby in Ashfield
M.E Jackson	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mrs Michelle Jackson	Kirkby in Ashfield
Ms Teresa Jackson	Mansfield
Natasha Jackson	Kirkby in Ashfield
Miss Emily Jeffs	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr Wayne Jeffs	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr and Mrs Jepson	Sutton in Ashfield
Ralph Jepson	Nottingham
Mrs M L Johnson	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mrs Kathy Johnson	
Mr Alan Jones	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr Stuart Jones	Sutton in Ashfield
Denis Jones	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr John Jordan	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr Kevin Kania	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs Karakurt	Sutton in Ashfield
A Keeling	Sutton in Ashfield
Mrs Valerie Kelly	Hucknall
Mr & Mrs Kelsall	Sutton in Ashfield
Mrs C Kemp	Kirkby in Ashfield
Ms Sarah Kiddy	Northampton
Mr Ian King	Kirkby in Ashfield
Miss Elizabeth Kirk	Kirkby in Ashfield
Ms Sandra Kirton	
Mrs Ellen Elizabeth Kitching	Kirkby in Ashfield
Ms Jacqueline Knowles	Kirkby in Ashfield
Kerry Knowles	
Mrs Haydee Lafferty	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mrs Linda Lakin	Sutton in Ashfield
R Lancashire	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mrs J M Lathall	Kirkby in Ashfield
R & A Lathall	Kirkby in Ashfield
Sophie Lawes	Bolsover
Mr Victor Lawley	Sutton in Ashfield
Shaun Lawrence	Nottingham
S & A Lawrence-Gough	Nottingham
Mr Frank Lee	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr T Lee	Kirkby in Ashfield
K Lee	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr David Leivers	Kirkby in Ashfield
A & K Lindley	Nottingham
Mrs Shirley Lock	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr Terry Lock	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr Peter Lock	Kirkby in Ashfield
Martin & Sally Lounds	Nottingham
Mr & Mrs R & G Louth	Kirkby in Ashfield
Marie Love	Nottingham



**Ashfield District Council - Statement of Consultation**

Mr J C Lowe	Kirkby in Ashfield
J Lowe	Sutton in Ashfield
M & M Lowe	Kirkby in Ashfield
Jen Lowe	Sutton in Ashfield
Ms Angela Ludlam	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr Mark Lyons	Kirkby in Ashfield
Kenneth and Elaine Maltby	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr Ernest Mann	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs Mannix	Sutton in Ashfield
I Markham	Kirkby in Ashfield
John Marples	
Mr Ronald Marriot	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr Trevor Marsh	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr Ian Marshall	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mrs Clare Marshall	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs Martinez	Kirkby in Ashfield
Derek & Mary Martland	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mrs Diane Massey	Kirkby in Ashfield
J Mathews	Sutton in Ashfield
Mrs Emma Matthews	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs Mayhew	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs S & M McCamdless	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr H McDonald	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mrs J McGinney	Sutton in Ashfield
D & J McLean	Sutton in Ashfield
Miss Charlotte McPhail	Sutton in Ashfield
Marjorie McPhilbin	Nottingham
Mr & Mrs Mee	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr Brian Millett	Sutton in Ashfield
Susan Mohammed	Sutton in Ashfield
Ms Joyce Mole	Ilkeston
Mr & Mrs J A Moore	Sutton in Ashfield
Ms Marie Moore	Mansfield
Mr Graham Morgan	Kirkby in Ashfield
Joanne Morley	Sutton in Ashfield
Mrs Angela Morris	Mansfield
Mr Wayne Morrison	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr Robert Mouloycliff	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mrs Hilda Patricia Musgrove	Mansfield
Mr Peter Musgrove	Mansfield
Mr Ryan Neary	Sutton in Ashfield
Mrs H Newbury	Sutton In Ashfield
Paula Newcombe	
Richard Newton	Sutton-in-Avenue
Iona Nicoll	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr P Nicoll	Kirkby in Ashfield
Hugh Nicoll	Sutton in Ashfield
Ms Ruth Norman	Mansfield
Mr & Mrs Norris	Hucknall

**Ashfield District Council - Statement of Consultation**

Jay North	Nottingham
Mr J Oakes	Sutton in Ashfield
S Oliver	Sutton in Ashfield
Peter, Joan & Deborah Olko	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr and Mrs Oneill	Sutton in Ashfield
David & Anne Orwin	Kirkby in Ashfield
Helen Orwin	
Grace Palmer	Mansfield
Mr John Parker	Kirkby in Ashfield
John Parker	Nottingham
Mr & Mrs Geoffrey & Norma Parkin	Kirkby in Ashfield
Ian & Karen Parkinson	Mansfield
Mr C B & M Pascoe	Hucknall
Mr Eric Patchett	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr Kenneth Payne	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs S & J Payne	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs Peacock	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr Stewart Pearson	Kirkby in Ashfield
E E Pearson	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mrs Olivia Pearson	Kirkby in Ashfield
A P & S Petchell	Kirkby in Ashfield
Felicity Pether	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs Alan & Monika Pinder	Kirkby In Ashfield
Adrian Pitchford	Sutton in Ashfield
Joe Poismans	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr S Pollard	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs Poole	Sutton in Ashfield
Mrs Kathleen Poole	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr Scott Poxon	Kirkby in Ashfield
Ray Poxon	Hucknall
Mrs M Pritchard	Sutton in Ashfield
Rob Pryer	Nottingham
Ms Helen Puntha	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mrs Caroline Quin	Sutton in Ashfield
John Radcliffe	Nottingham
S & J Radford	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs D Radford	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr Michael Randall	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr David Raybould	Sutton in Ashfield
Sharon & Mark Raynor	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs J Redfern	Sutton in Ashfield
Mrs Irene Redfern	Skegby, Sutton-in-Ashfield
Ms Sarah Reditt	Sutton in Ashfield
T Renshaw	Sutton in Ashfield
E & J Revill	Nottingham
Mr & Mrs Reynolds	Sutton in Ashfield
David, Joshua & Linda	Sutton in Ashfield

**Ashfield District Council - Statement of Consultation**

Reynolds	
Mr & Mrs A Rhodes	Kirkby in Ashfield
Benn Rice	Kirkby in Ashfield
T Rice	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr Michael Rich	Stapleford
Mr Peter Robertson	Kirkby in Ashfield
D Robinson	Nottingham
G & J Roe	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mrs D. Rogers	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr Alan Rooksby	Kirkby in Ashfield
David & Barbara Rose	Mansfield
J & S Rose	Nottingham
Mr David Ross	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr Duane Rutland	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mrs Mary Rutter	Nottingham
Miss Frances Ryan	Sutton in Ashfield
Bruce & Katherine Saunders	Kirkby in Ashfield
Miss M Saunders	Sutton in Ashfield
P & S Scrimshaw	Kirkby in Ashfield
Alison & Ryan Scrimshaw	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs William & Doreen Sharman	Kirkby-in-Ashfield
Mr & Mrs Sharman	Kirkby in Ashfield
R A Sharpe	Sutton in Ashfield
Mrs Pat Shaw	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr WD Shaw	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs L Shaw	Sutton in Ashfield
Ms Yvonne Shaw	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs C Shaw	Sutton in Ashfield
J & P Shaw	Kirkby in Ashfield
Richard Shaw	Hucknall
Kathryn Shaw	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr John Shaw	Kirkby in Ashfield
Julia Shaw	Sutton in Ashfield
Steve Shaw	Sutton in Ashfield
Mrs Mary Sheasby	Sutton in Ashfield
Pam Shelton	Sutton in Ashfield
Ian & Ruth Shepherd	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs Alan & Josephine Siddall	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr Paul Simpson	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mrs Jane Simpson	Hucknall
David Simpson	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs P Simpson	Kirkby in Ashfield
N Sinsel	Kirkby in Ashfield
Kevin Sisson	
F Sisson	Nottingham
Linda Sisson	Nottingham
Mr Alan Sivers	Kirkby in Ashfield

**Ashfield District Council - Statement of Consultation**

Mr Roy Slater	Sutton in Ashfield
Steven Slater	Nottingham
Mr & Mrs Smith	Sutton in Ashfield
Ms Jane Smith	Nottingham
R & A Smith	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr Charles Smith	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr Douglas Smith	Sutton in Ashfield
Roger Smith	Nottingham
Miss Ann Elizabeth Smith	Hucknall
J Smith	Nottingham
Mr Clifford Speed	Sutton in Ashfield
Melanie Spencer	Sutton in Ashfield
Philip and Brenda Spolton	Kirkby in Ashfield
Sue Spolton	Hucknall
Mrs Joan Staley	Kirkby in Ashfield
Peter Stanley	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs Stanley	Kirkby in Ashfield
Bob Stapleton	Nottingham
Mrs P Starling	Kirkby in Ashfield
Kenneth, Lesley & Julia Steeples	Sutton in Ashfield
Mrs Joan Stewart	Kirkby in Ashfield
Brian Stirland	Nottingham
Mr & Mrs Stokes	Sutton in Ashfield
Stuart Stone	
R Storer	
Ken Straw	Nottingham
P Street	Hucknall
Street	
Sandra Stringfellow	Sutton in Ashfield
Miss Samantha Styles	Kirkby in Ashfield
Ms Bettina Sutcliffe	Nottingham
Mr David Swain	Sutton in Ashfield
Vicky & Peter Swaisland	Sutton in Ashfield
Linda Swann	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr S Swift	Sutton in Ashfield
C Swift	Nottingham
S & W Sykes	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs S.J Szubert	Sutton in Ashfield
Mrs Karen Taqvi	Kirkby in Ashfield
John & Tracy Tasker	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs Paul Taylor	Hucknall
Stephen Taylor	Mansfield
Mr Derek & Ruth Taylor	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr John Tedstone	Hucknall
Deborah & Paul Thompson	Sutton in Ashfield
J Thompson	Kirkby in Ashfield
M & A Thorpe	Sutton in Ashfield
Mark Tootell	Kirkby in Ashfield

**Ashfield District Council - Statement of Consultation**

Jean Toseland	Hucknall
Mr & Mrs K Townsey	Mansfield
Mr Trevor Tunrer	Kirkby in Ashfield
Neil Turk	
Mrs M Turner	Mansfield
Mr David Turner	Sutton in Ashfield
S Turner	Nottingham
Mr Malcolm Turner	Hucknall
Mrs Mary Umney	Hucknall
Mrs C Vale	Sutton in Ashfield
Miss Janine Vardy	Sutton in Ashfield
M W and S Vardy	Sutton in Ashfield
Michael Wade	Sutton in Ashfield
Christian Wakelin	Sutton in Ashfield
Mrs Cheryl Walker	Kirkby in Ashfield
Antonia Walker	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr Ivor Walker	Mansfield
Mr & Mrs Wallace	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr John C Ward	Sutton in Ashfield
P & E Ward	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr Martin Ward	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr Darren Ward	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr K Wardle	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr B & G Wardle	Sutton in Ashfield
Ken Waterfield	
Mrs M Waterhouse	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mrs Carly Watson	Sutton in Ashfield
Mrs B Weeks	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs T Wesley	Sutton in Ashfield
Ms L West	
Mrs Michelle West	Sutton in Ashfield
Ms Jill West	Sutton in Ashfield
M Westmoreland	Nottingham
B Weston	Sutton in Ashfield
Mrs Debra Wharton	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr Whelan	Nottingham
Mrs Margaret Whilde	Hucknall
Ms Christina White	Sutton in Ashfield
M White	Hucknall
Trevor & Christine White	Nottingham
Stephen Whitehead	
Ernie Whittaker	Nottingham
Mrs Shirley Wiffen	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs Wiggins	Sutton in Ashfield
Mrs Jennifer Wilcock	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr John Wilkinson	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mrs Fay Williams	Sutton in Ashfield
Maria Willis	Kirkby in Ashfield
Mr & Mrs Andrew and Jane	Mansfield

Ashfield District Council - Statement of Consultation

---

Wilson	
Mr & Mrs Wilson	Sutton in Ashfield
Mrs Josephine Wood	Mansfield
Mrs Helen Wood	Sutton in Ashfield
P & C Wood	Kirkby in Ashfield
Dave Wood	Stapleford
Mr Adrian Woodhouse	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr C Woods	Sutton in Ashfield
Mr John Woolley	Kirkby in Ashfield
J Wordley	Sutton in Ashfield