

Ashfield District Council

Preferred Approach Local Plan

2017-2032

Housing Site Selection Technical Paper

CONTENTS

	PAGE
BACKGROUND	3
INTRODUCTION	3
HOUSING SITE SELECTION PROCESS	5
SUTTON & KIKRBY HOUSING SITES SELECTED FOR ALLOCATION	9
HUCKNALL HOUSING SITES SELECTED FOR ALLOCATION	31
RURAL HOUSING SIITES SELECTED FOR ALLOCATION	41
HOUSING SITES NOT ALLOCATED – SUTTON & KIRKBY	45
HOUSING SITES NOT ALLOCATED – THE RURALS	73
HOUSING SITES NOT ALLOCATED – HUCKNALL	87
APPENDIX 1 – DISCOUNTED SITES	94

BACKGROUND

In December 2013 Ashfield District Council submitted its Submission Local Plan to the Secretary of State, who appointed a Planning Inspector to examine the soundness of the Plan. Following initial assessment and discussions with the Council, the Inspector raised significant concerns with the Submission Plan, and the Council subsequently withdrew the Plan in July 2014. These concerns primarily related to the Sustainability Appraisal and the selection of Green Belt sites in the north of the District.

As a result of the concerns raised by the Inspector, the Council has undertaken a number of new and revised studies to produce a robust evidence base to support the creation of a sound Local Plan for Ashfield. The key elements of this work comprise:

- Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA)
- A Green Belt Review
- Employment Land Forecasting Study
- Landscape Assessments
- Sustainability Appraisal (SA)

These studies have provided the Council with the information to understand the development needs of Ashfield, enabling it to positively plan to accommodate and meet these needs, as required by the NPPF.

14. At the heart of the National Planning Policy Framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development, which should be seen as a golden thread running through both plan-making and decision-taking.

For plan-making this means that:

- *local planning authorities should positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs of their area;*
- *Local Plans should meet objectively assessed needs, with sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change, unless:*
 - *any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole; or*
 - *specific policies in this Framework indicate development should be restricted.*

156. Local planning authorities should set out the strategic priorities for the area in the Local Plan. This should include strategic policies to deliver:

- *the homes and jobs needed in the area;*
- *the provision of retail, leisure and other commercial development;*

158. Each local planning authority should ensure that the Local Plan is based on adequate, up-to-date and relevant evidence about the economic, social and environmental characteristics and prospects of the area. Local planning authorities should ensure that their assessment of and strategies for housing, employment and other uses are integrated, and that they take full account of relevant market and economic signals.

In line with these national policy requirements, the Local Plan proposes a Vision and Strategic Objectives for the District, with a Spatial Approach and a set of Strategic and Development

Management Policies that will seek to achieve this Vision. The allocation of deliverable sites plays a fundamental role in this, enabling the delivery of homes, jobs and town centre uses.

INTRODUCTION

In order to help realise the Local Plan's Vision for Ashfield, the Council has proposed a Spatial Approach to housing that will seek to distribute appropriate levels of growth across the District, ensuring economic growth is supported, town centre regeneration is promoted, and communities in each of the three areas can access new housing to meet their needs.

The site selection process has followed the principles and policies of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). To ensure the housing needs of the District are met within the 15 year Plan period, the Council has sought to identify sites which have the least policy and physical constraints whilst ensuring that they will deliver sustainable development.

National Policy

The NPPF identifies that Local Plans are the key to delivering sustainable development that reflects the vision and aspirations of local communities. Plans must be prepared with the objective of contributing to the achievement of sustainable development. The NPPF sets out the three dimensions to sustainable development, which are:

- An economic role – contributing to building a strong, responsive and competitive economy, by ensuring that sufficient land of the right type is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth and innovation; and by identifying and coordinating development requirements, including the provisions of infrastructure;
- A social role – supporting strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by providing the supply of housing required to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by creating a high quality built environment, with accessible local services that reflect the community's needs and support its health, social and cultural well-being; and
- An environmental role – contributing to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment; and, as part of this, helping to improve biodiversity, use of natural resources prudently, minimise waste and pollution, and mitigate and adapt to climate change including moving to a low carbon economy.

Local Planning Authorities should seek opportunities to achieve each of the economic, social and environmental dimensions of sustainable development, and net gains across all three. Significant adverse impacts on any of the three dimensions should be avoided and, wherever possible, alternative options which reduce or eliminate such impacts should be pursued. Where adverse impacts are unavoidable, measures to mitigate the impact should be considered.

The NPPF stresses that Local Planning Authorities should set out the strategic priorities for the area. This should include strategic policies to deliver homes, jobs, retail, leisure and other commercial development, infrastructure to support growth, and climate change mitigation and adaption, and conservation of the natural and historic environment, including landscape.

To boost significantly the supply of housing, local planning authorities should use their evidence base to ensure that their Local Plan meets the full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing in the housing market area, as far as is consistent with the policies set out in the NPPF, including identifying key sites which are critical to the delivery of the housing strategy over the plan period.

This involves identifying a supply of deliverable¹ sites sufficient to provide five years worth of housing against the District's housing requirements, and identifying a supply of developable² sites or broad locations for growth for years 6 to 15.

Crucially, Local Plans should plan positively for the development and infrastructure needs of the District to meet the objectives, principles and policies of the NPPF. They should allocate sites to promote development and flexible use of land, bringing forward new land where necessary.

This Site Selection Paper has been produced to explain the rationale for the sites selected to be taken forward as residential allocations. The sites selected to be taken forward are considered to offer the most appropriate options when taking into consideration the three dimensions of sustainable development and any physical constraints which would restrict development.

Settlement Hierarchy

The established settlement hierarchy has played an important role in the site selection process. It has informed the distribution of development throughout the District. Sutton in Ashfield, Kirkby in Ashfield and Hucknall are well established towns which provide a wide range of services and facilities, including well established rail and bus stations and networks, retail, leisure, education, employment, and parks and recreation grounds. The towns are very well located with excellent access to the strategic road network. The towns are connected via an extensive green infrastructure network which promotes and supports walking and cycling, and biodiversity. The majority of development will be concentrated within these settlements.

Selston, Jacksdale and Underwood are large villages located to the west of the District. They are well connected to the surrounding areas via the public transport, Green Infrastructure routes and the road network. The largest settlement is Selston which provides a number of key services including a secondary school, primary schools, medical centre, leisure centre, community centre, supermarket, public houses, golf course, allotments and a number of formal open spaces. Jacksdale has a local shopping centre which has seen a steady increase in the number of vacant shops over the past few years. There is a need to support the continuation of these services and it is considered that Selston and Jacksdale are the most appropriate locations for a lower level of growth. The Council has worked closely with Selston Parish Council's, Neighbourhood Group in assessed potential sites for new development.

The Greater Nottingham and Ashfield Accessibility Study identifies that Teversal is the least sustainable settlement in Ashfield District. The SHLAA also identifies that the majority of the Teversal sites score quite poorly for access to services and facilities. Taking this and other site specific factors into consideration, the Council is not intending to take forward sites in Teversal.

Housing

The site selection process outlined within this document utilises the evidence base, national policy and site specific information to assess the deliverability and suitability of the sites submitted to the Council within the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA).

The key pieces of evidence used to inform site selection are:

¹ To be considered deliverable, sites should be available now, offer a suitable location for development now, and be achievable with a realistic prospect that housing will be delivered on the site within five years and in particular that development of the site is viable. Sites with planning permission should be considered deliverable until permission expires, unless there is clear evidence that schemes will not be implemented within five years, for example they will not be viable, there is no longer a demand for the type of units or sites have long term phasing plans.

² To be considered developable, sites should be in a suitable location for housing development and there should be a reasonable prospect that the site is available and could be viably developed at the point envisaged.

- Nottingham Outer Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) (informed the number of dwellings required and locations for growth)
- Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA)
- Sustainability Appraisal of potential sites
- Green Belt Review
- Whole Plan Viability Assessment (to be updated)
- Infrastructure Delivery Plan (to be updated)
- Landscape Assessments
- Greater Nottingham and Ashfield Accessible Settlements Study

Allied with these studies, the Council has undertaken extensive consultation with Nottinghamshire County Council Highways Department to understand the access and highway requirements and constraints of all potential sites. Consultation with internal and external specialists has also been undertaken. The Council's Landscape team, Environmental Health team, Conservation Officer, Tree Officer, and Development Management team have been involved in the site assessment process. Advice has also been sought from the Coal Authority, Network Rail and the Environment Agency with regard to site constraints.

Gypsy and Travellers

Policy Planning Statement 'Planning Policy for Traveller sites' (August 2015) requires local need for accommodation to be based on robust evidence. Specific deliverable sites should be identified in order to meet accommodation needs for 5 years, together with a supply of developable sites or broad locations for growth for 6 to 10 years, and where possible, for years 11 to 15.

The Ashfield Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessment 2015 sets out the level of future need for the District for the period 2014 to 2029 as illustrated in Table 1 below. This assessment was undertaken using a joint methodology adopted by the Nottinghamshire Districts, based on a supply versus demand approach. The current assessment indicates a nil need for Showmen's accommodation over and above the current provision. With regard to Gypsies/Travellers this is also minimal.

Table 1
Ashfield District: Future Pitch/Plot Requirements 2014 to 2029

Period	Gypsy/Traveller Pitches	Showmen's Plots/Yards
2014 to 2019	0	0
2019 to 2024	1	0
2024 to 2029	1	0

Due to the relative low level of need the strategic approach to providing sites focuses on the allocation of unimplemented planning approvals in the area specific policies, alongside a criteria based policy (HG1).

A call for sites undertaken in Spring 2014 yielded a total of 4 sites put forward for Traveller use. Of these, 3 were located in the GB – contrary to national policy as set out in Planning policy for Traveller Sites Policy E which clearly states that Traveller sites in the Green Belt are inappropriate. The 4th site

was put forward for considerations as a Travelling Showman’s site located on land currently designated as Countryside (in line with the NPPF Core Planning Principle to recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside). A further call for sites in late 2014 did not yield any further potential sites.

Given the minimal assessed level of future need (set out above), it is not considered necessary to allocate additional sites for Traveller accommodation. It would not be appropriate to re-designate any Countryside or Green belt land on this basis.

Housing Target

The Council jointly commissioned the Nottingham Outer Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) with Mansfield and Newark and Sherwood Council’s. The Nottingham Outer SHMA was completed in October 2015. It can be viewed on the Council’s website.

The role of this document is to understand the housing needs across the Nottingham Outer Housing Market Area and to undertake an objective assessment of housing needs for each District. As required by NPPF Paragraph 47, Ashfield intends to meet the District’s full objectively assessed housing need of 480 dwellings per year. This has been adopted as its housing target over the 15 year plan period. This equates to 8,268 dwellings over the plan period (this figure is derived from the OAN being back dated to 2013). The District already has a number of planning permissions which will contribute to this supply, with the remainder sourced from new sites detailed within this document. To enable appropriate flexibility within the supply of sites, the Council has sought to allocate a greater number of sites than required and applied what it considers to be a conservative yield / density to its site assessment.

Town Centres (including retail and leisure)

The regeneration of the Town Centres is a key priority for the Council. With regard to the site selection process, the Council considers that it is important to ensure development is located as close to the town centres as possible to ensure continued promotion of their viability and vitality.

The Council is in the process of appointing consultants to undertake a Retail and Leisure Study of the District. This will inform the site allocations process. The current Ashfield Retail Study (2011) identifies a need (by 2030) for an additional 2,750 square metres floorspace for convenience shopping and 7,800 to 13,000 square metres of floorspace for comparison goods in Sutton in Ashfield. For Hucknall it recommends 1,600 square metres of floor space for convenience goods and 3,130 to 5,200 square metres for comparison goods. According to the Study, Kirkby in Ashfield does not require additional floorspace. This will be updated following the completion of the Retail and Leisure Study in 2016.

There are very limited opportunities for the expansion of Sutton in Ashfield Town Centre and Hucknall Town centre. The Council has identified areas of development opportunity and the Town Centre Masterplans provide more detail of the areas for growth in the town centres.

Employment

The Council jointly commissioned an Employment Land Forecasting Study (ELF) with all Nottinghamshire Authorities (with the exception of Bassetlaw) in 2015 in order to understand the anticipated level of employment growth across each authority. This growth forecast was then translated into the employment land requirement needed to achieve this growth.

The employment growth forecasts for Ashfield are positive, with both the Experian and Policy-On forecasts placing Ashfield within the top 3 areas of growth across the study area:

Policy On - Largest Job Growth

- Rushcliffe 10,754 (23.79%)
- Broxtowe 9,249 (21.93%)
- Ashfield 10,724 (19.96%)

Experian - Largest Job Growth

- Rushcliffe 9,834 (21.76%)
- Ashfield 9,713 (18.07%)
- Broxtowe 7,174 (16.68%)

These translate into the following employment land / space requirements for the District (a forecast based on past take-up rates was also estimated within the report, but this is not considered a realistic forecast to take forward):

	Office	Industrial & Distribution
Policy – On	44,415 m ²	53.11 ha
Labour Supply	48,47 m ²	54.60 ha

These employment land requirements fall below the existing supply of employment land within the District. As such, the Council is confident it can fulfil the employment forecasts outlined within the ELF study. This level of supply would also enable the District to support an increased level of employment growth, if actual growth exceeds forecasts.

Prior to the ELF study, the Council undertook a joint call for sites exercise in October to December 2014, to establish if there were any additional sites landowners wished to promote for employment development. The Council received a small number of sites, which have been compiled in an employment land SHLAA. As a result of this exercise, no additional employment sites are proposed to be taken forward.

As a result of the ELF study and the call for sites exercise, the Council is not proposing to allocate any new sites for employment uses. The sites contained within the Preferred Approach Site allocations for employment are being carried forward from the existing Ashfield Local Plan Review (2002). Due to this, the Council has not undertaken a site selection process as it has done with the sites submitted within the SHLAA. However, given the discrepancy between the District’s supply and forecast demand, the Council has undertaken an assessment of the supply to establish if any sites should be considered for alternative uses, primarily residential. As a result of this assessment only one site is considered to be suitable for residential use. This site is included with the site selection process outlined below.

HOUSING SITE SELECTION PROCESS

SHLAA

The Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) is the primary means by which the Council has identified potential housing sites that could meet the District’s housing requirements. The Council undertook a call for sites (this included land for other uses such as Employment and Retail) in October – December 2014 which enabled landowners and developers the opportunity to submit sites to the Council they wished to promote for housing development.

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

In May 2015 the Council wrote to all landowners and agents of sites submitted to the SHLAA process to consult them on the draft results of the SHLAA. The main focus of the consultation was on the deliverability of development on sites submitted. The comments received have been reviewed and amendments have been made where necessary.

Suitable, Available and Achievable

As required by NPPF paragraph 47, the Council has sought to ensure that the sites it has proposed to allocate within the Preferred Approach Local Plan are deliverable – suitable, available and achievable.

An initial assessment of deliverability is undertaken within the District's SHLAA, (which was subject to consultation with land owners, as detailed above) which has been enhanced further during this site selection process. In considering deliverability in line with NPPF Paragraph 47, the Council has assessed whether they consider sites are:

Suitable

Is the site's location appropriate for development?

Are there any policy or physical constraints that impact on its deliverability?

Available

Is the site being promoted for development by the owner?

Are there any land ownership constraints?

Achievable

Is the site considered to viable?

Are there any known constraints that could impact on this?

'Achievability'

A key element of the site selection process, as required by Paragraph 47 of the NPPF, is to assess and make a judgement on whether a site is deliverable. To be considered deliverable, sites should be available for development now, offer a suitable location and be achievable. The Council's assessment of a site's availability and suitability is outlined below.

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

While the Council believes the assessments made by the Viability Assessment remain valid, it will seek to refresh this piece of evidence base prior to Local Plan Submission.

Thresholds & Densities

No thresholds have been applied to the assessment of sites submitted to the SHLAA process. However, the Council does not intend to allocate sites under 10 dwellings. These could potentially come forward as windfall sites unless there are policy constraints. Another option for sites under 10 dwellings would be rural exception sites. However, the Council does not intend to allocate rural exception sites as, based on evidence in the Nottingham Outer SHMA, it is not considered necessary.

Many of the largest sites have masterplans or have been subject to a planning application which has informed the site capacity. For other sites, the densities applied accord with Policy HG3 (Housing densities) of the ALPR (2002). This policy is still applicable and is considered to be up to date as the lowest density is 30 dwellings per hectare and the highest is 40 dwellings per hectare. The District consists of towns and villages with very few high density developments.

Where sites exceed 2 hectares, 10% of the site size has been deducted to comply with the Open Space requirements of Ashfield Local Plan Review (2002) Policy HG6. A further 15% has been deducted to take account of the necessary infrastructure on sites over 2 hectares. On sites with an area between 0.4 and 2 hectares, a 10% reduction has been applied for infrastructure requirements. Exceptions to this include sites where the application has been for conversion and sites where other constraints dictate the number of dwellings that may be built and sites where comments from the owner have justified a different capacity. On very large sites (over 10 Hectares) a density multiplier of 60% has been applied.

With regard to the proposed urban extensions, Mowlands and East of Sutton in Ashfield, indicative Masterplans have been submitted which have helped informed the number of dwellings on each site.

Known Site Constraints

In order to understand the potential constraints that may restrict the deliverability of sites, the Council has utilised the site specific information it holds and undertaken relevant consultation with stakeholders and Council Departments. For each site the Council has assessed and considered potential constraints related to:

- Highways & Access
- Potential for contamination
- Historic coal mining activity
- Topography
- Telecommunication or services (water, electricity, gas) infrastructure
- Flooding
- High quality soils (Grades 2 and 3a)
- Bad neighbours e.g. heavy industry

Where there are physical constraints, the Council has sought to identify appropriate mitigation through consultation with land owners and consultees. In some rare instances where mitigation is not possible, sites have been assessed as being unsuitable.

Discounting of sites

The Council has discounted sites at various stages of the Local Plan preparation process.

SHLAA - excluded sites

In accordance with the Council's SHLAA Methodology, sites submitted to the SHLAA process which do not adjoin a settlement boundary are automatically excluded from being assessed. This does not include sites which adjoin other sites submitted to the SHLAA process which do adjoin a settlement boundary. A total of 33 sites were discounted at this stage.

SHLAA – small sites (accommodating less than 10 dwellings)

Sites assessed as suitable and deliverable within the urban area which can accommodate less than 10 dwellings have been included within the land supply in the trajectory. It is not considered necessary to allocate these sites. As such, they have been discounted from the site selection process.

SHLAA - unsuitable sites

Sites within floodzones 2 and 3 (where any part of the site is within the floodzone), sites designated as formal open spaces, and sites designated as Local Wildlife Sites have all been assessed as 'unsuitable' unless it has been determined that such constraints could be appropriately mitigated. There are also a small number of sites with other constraints which have been assessed as unsuitable, for the following reasons:

- Sites where development would result in the creation of urban sprawl e.g. sites adjoining ribbon development which are not well contained by existing development or physical features (this includes sites in Green Belt and Designated Countryside);
- Green Belt sites where it would result in the merging of settlements;
- Sites with severe highway constraints where no mitigation is possible.
- Sites which contain major underground gas pipes.
- Sites which are no longer available.
- Sites which have bad neighbours e.g. heavy industry

A total of 31 sites were assessed as unsuitable via the SHLAA process. Consequently they have not been included in the Sustainability Appraisal and they have been discounted from the site selection process.

Green Belt Sites

All sites in Green Belt submitted to the Council through the 'Call for Sites' process have been considered. Sites which do not adjoin a settlement boundary were discounted at an early stage.

In total 7 sites were assessed as being unsuitable through the SHLAA process due to the fact that development would result in the merging of settlements and/or sprawl of settlements. It should be noted that these site assessments have been reviewed following the completion of the 2015 Green Belt Assessment to ensure that the conclusions accord with this. The remainder of the sites in Green Belt have been assessed as 'May be suitable subject to policy change'. These sites have also been reviewed following the completion of the 2015 Green Belt Assessment to determine which sites may potentially be suitable for development.

Sites which have scored the highest when assessed against three of the five purposes of the Green Belt have been discounted from the Local Plan site allocation process, these are:

- Checking the unrestricted sprawl of settlements.
- Preventing neighbouring towns from merging into one another.

- Preserving the setting and special character of historic settlements.

It was not considered to be appropriate to discount sites which scored highest for encroachment into the countryside as residential development would inevitably encroach on the countryside to a large extent. Similarly it was not considered to be appropriate to score sites in terms of whether development would assist in urban regeneration.

Following the assessment of land supply, it has been determined that there is enough land available for housing development in the countryside in Sutton in Ashfield and Kirkby in Ashfield. As such there are no exceptional circumstances for Green Belt release in Kirkby in Ashfield, Annesley Woodhouse and New Annesley. Green Belt sites in Kirkby in Ashfield and Annesley Woodhouse and New Annesley have been discounted from being taken forward for further consideration. This approach accords with the Local Plan Strategy.

The Council considers that there are exceptional circumstances for Green Belt release in Hucknall and the villages as there is a need to deliver housing to meet the needs of the settlements, including affordable housing, and to support local services and the local economy.

A total of 90 sites have been discounted from the site selection process. Appendix 1 contains a list of discounted sites.

Green Belt Review (2015)

The purpose of the Green Belt Review is to provide a means of identifying the most important areas of Green Belt, when assessed against the 5 purpose of Green Belt as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework:

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

The review assessed all Green Belt around the Main Urban Areas and Named Settlements within Ashfield. Areas of land were chosen using defined physical feature such as roads, railways, watercourses, tree belts, woodlands, ridgelines or field boundaries. Ordnance Survey Maps, Topographical Maps, professional judgement and site visits were used in this process.

Sites were then assessed using the Assessment Criteria and Assessment Matrix in the joint Green Belt Assessment Framework (see Ashfield District Council web site). Ashfield, Broxtowe, Gedling and Nottingham City Councils worked jointly to prepare the Framework to support their emerging Local Plans within their authorities. The Framework has enabled all involved to undertake a robust assessment of Green Belt boundaries within their area.

Each assessment gave an overall score ranging between 4 (low) and 20 (high). Whilst a site may have a low overall score, it may score particularly high for one single Green Belt purpose (the maximum score for any single purpose is 5). In these instances, it could be considered to be of sufficient importance on that one single purpose for the site to be retained as Green Belt. This is particularly important for the following Green Belt purposes:

- Check the unrestricted sprawl of settlements.
- Prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another.
- Preserve the setting and special character of historic settlements.

Certain SHLAA sites are covered by more than one Green Belt Assessments. This is because Green Belt Assessment sites were chosen using defined physical boundaries such as roads, railway line and

woodlands. The Green Belt Assessment sites may not necessarily be the same as the sites submitted for consideration to the SHLAA.

Sustainability Appraisal

The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) promotes sustainable development through the consideration of the environmental, social and economic considerations of the Local Plan. It is a legal requirement under the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. The SA incorporates the requirements of the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) introduced to the United Kingdom through the European Union Directive 2001 / 42 / EC, and in England the Directive has been implemented via the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 referred to as the SEA Regulations). SEA is a systematic process for the evaluation of the likely environmental consequences of proposed policies, plans or programmes in order to ensure that environmental issues are fully integrated and assessed at the earliest appropriate stage of decision making.

Under the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (Section 39) the Council is under a duty to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. This reflects how best to shape the District of Ashfield to meet the requirements of housing and economic growth, to further social and environment objectives and to mitigate against climate change. Both the SEA and the sustainability appraisal are important in forming a judgment to be made under Section 39 (2).

The SA sets out 17 objectives, which the sites have been assessed against. These relate to housing, social inclusion, crime prevention, health and wellbeing, climate change, employment, landscape protection, heritage assets, open space, biodiversity, town centre regeneration and the local economy.

The sites under consideration, excluding those that have been discounted, have been included in the SA. Whilst the results from the SA have informed the site selection process, the Council has also needed to consider the deliverability of development. Some sites have major constraints, particularly with regard to access to the public highway. Consequently, there are instances where the Council has determined that some of the sites which appear to come out better in the SA in terms of sustainability should not be taken forward due to the fact that there is uncertainty with regard to overcoming physical constraints and the site's overall deliverability.

Infrastructure & Key Mitigation Requirements

The Infrastructure Delivery Plan includes details of the requirements associated with the proposed development. It should be noted that this is a living document which is constantly being updated. The Council is continuing to work with its partners, including Nottinghamshire County Council and other infrastructure providers/agencies, to ensure that the document includes the infrastructure requirements associated with the proposed development. The current document will be refreshed for the Publication Local Plan.

Also set out below is a brief description of the infrastructure requirements of the sites selected to be taken forward as residential allocations.

Landscape Assessment

The Landscape assessments of sites have been undertaken in response to the Inspectors comments on the withdrawn Local Plan in 2014. The National Planning Policy Framework stresses that great weight should be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty. There are none of these designated areas within the District of Ashfield. Nevertheless at a local level, the landscape is highly valued by the local community, and as

such it is important to understand the impacts, effects and significance of potential development on the landscape.

A landscape character assessment of the Greater Nottingham area has been undertaken focusing on the countryside around Nottingham, including all of the District of Ashfield³. This document researches and categorises features and characteristics of the landscape. It divides the study area into broad landscape types and more detailed landscape character areas. However, this is still at a relatively strategic level. As part of the assessment of the Local Plan and particularly housing and employment sites, site specific landscape assessments have been undertaken by Ashfield District Council's landscape architects who have devised and utilised a methodology which aligns with the Greater Nottingham Landscape Character Assessment Methodology.

Sites within the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) and the Strategic Employment Land Availability Assessment (SELAA) have been assessed for landscape purpose where:

- a) They have been identified as potential suitable sites to consider for future development. That is they have not been discounted as part of the SHLAA or SELAA as being unsuitable.
- b) They are located in the countryside.

The landscape assessments provide detailed information at a site level on the value of the landscape, the potential impact of development and possible mitigation measures. They have been utilised as a contribution towards the appraisal of potential development sites for allocation within the Local Plan and to inform the sustainability appraisal of individual sites, which meet the criteria set out above.

Generally sites that have scored the highest with regard to the capacity to accommodate development have not been selected to be taken forward. However, the Council has decided to take forward Beck Lane in Skegby, which has scored the highest in terms of its capacity to accommodate development. This is due to the fact that many of the sites submitted to the Council have severe access constraints which creates a high risk that development would not be delivered within the 15 year Plan period. Beck Lane has fewer physical constraints and there is an extant planning permission for a football academy on the site. As such, the principle of some development on the site which will impact on the landscape has already been established. The site also lies adjacent to the MARR, which is a regeneration corridor supported by D2N2, which development on the site will help support.

Agricultural Land Quality

Whilst the agricultural land quality has been taken into consideration, there is a lack of available land on sites with a poorer grade of soil. Consequently it has been necessary to allocate sites which contain Grade 2 soils.

Sites with Planning Permission

There are a number of proposed housing allocations which have received planning permission. For such sites, the Council has not undertaken a sustainability appraisal or assessment them as part of this documents, as it has assumed the sustainability and deliverability of the sites has been assessed during the planning application process using relevant national and local planning policy.

Details of the site with planning permission are outlined with Housing Monitoring Report and the housing Area Policies within the Preferred Approach Local Plan.

³ Greater Nottingham Landscape Character Assessment 2009. Nottinghamshire County Council & TEP.

Sutton & Kirkby - Housing Sites Selected for Allocation

SHLAA Reference	Location	Area (ha)	No. Dwellings	Greenfield (G) / Brownfield (B)	Green Belt Review Scores					Suitability, Availability, Achievability	Sustainability Appraisal Summary	Known Physical Constraints	Infrastructure & Key Mitigation Requirements	Conclusion
					Unrestricted sprawl	Prevent merging	Safeguard from encroachment	Preserve historic settlements	Total Score					
SM44	Land North of Kingsmill Hospital, Skegby Lane, Sutton	14.7	250	G	N /A	N /A	N/ A	N/ A	N /A	<p><u>The site is suitable subject to policy change</u> The site is designated countryside and has good access to the public highway. It is well contained by existing development and forms part of a natural open break between Sutton in Ashfield and Mansfield. Given the size of the site, the open break could be maintained through good design. With regard to the landscape, the site scores very well in terms of capacity to accommodate development (1 out of 3 points).</p> <p><u>The site is available</u> The landowner has indicated that development could be delivered within 5 years.</p> <p><u>Achievability</u> Based on whole Plan viability evidence, development is considered to be achievable.</p>	<p><u>Positive Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential delivery of 250 dwellings Potentially deliver of affordable housing Located within 800 m or 10 minutes walk of Dalestorth Primary School and a post office/cash machine. While the current access to open space is limited, the size of the site means that it will need to include on site open space provision of approximately 1.4 ha Low impact on the landscape, the site scores very well in terms of capacity to accommodate development (1 out of 3 points). <p><u>Negative Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development could impact on the setting of Dalestorth House a Grade II Listed Building which is located opposite site. However, development at this site is likely to be considered as 'less than substantial harm' and should be considered against the public benefits of the proposal (NPPF para 134). It is anticipate that suitable mitigation measure will lessen the impact of the development. Greenfield site and as the development is anticipate to be more than 100 dwellings it is within the Impact Risk Zone for Teversal Pastures SSSI. 	<p><u>Highways / Access</u> Whilst the site does have access to the public highway (via Skegby Lane) it is not well integrated into the existing settlement. The site would require two points of access from Skegby Lane.</p> <p><u>Topography</u> This is an undulating site which may have some topographical constraints to address during development.</p> <p><u>Neighbour</u> There are no neighbouring constraints. The site is adjacent to a residential area and countryside.</p> <p><u>Flood Risk</u> The site is located within Flood zone 1 where the risk of flooding is low.</p> <p><u>Agricultural Land Quality</u> Grade 3 (Good-moderate)</p> <p><u>Contamination</u> No known contamination</p>	<p><u>Infrastructure & Key Mitigation Requirements</u> May require a new school.</p> <p>Highway infrastructure improvements required in line with recommendations of the Transport Study.</p> <p>On site open space provision required.</p> <p>High quality design that acknowledges and does not have a detrimental impact on the setting of Grade II Listed Dalestorth House.</p> <p>Further investigation required to assess the flood risk. A SuDs scheme may be required</p>	<p><u>Conclusion</u> The Council considers that this is a suitable site to take forward as an allocation.</p> <p>Development of the site would help to meet the Strategic Objectives of the Local Plan through appropriate mitigation. Sutton in Ashfield and Mansfield have a wide range of services and facilities with excellent retail and leisure provision in the town centres. The site is in close proximity to employment opportunities e.g. Kingsmill Hospital, the Mansfield and Ashfield Regeneration Route etc. Open space could be delivered onsite and Green Infrastructure routes could be improved through development of the site. Whilst development may harm the setting of Dalestorth House, this could be appropriately mitigated through design. Development of the site would reduce the gap between Sutton in Ashfield and Mansfield to some extent but an area of open land adjoins the site in Mansfield District. This would maintain a gap between the settlements. The positive aspects of development far outweigh any negative impact.</p>

											<ul style="list-style-type: none">Very small areas of the site are identified as having surface water flooding but it is not anticipate to have any significant impact on the development of the site.While the site is well linked to the major road network, being located off the MARR route, travel choice is limited as there are currently no bus routes on Skegby Lane.			The site is located on the MARR which is identified by the D2N2 (LEP) a major growth area for Ashfield and Mansfield. New development in this location would support the growth aspiration for the MARR, benefiting both Districts
S47	Blackwell Road, Huthwiate	2.9	65	G	N /A	N /A	N/ A	N/ A	N /A	<p>The site is suitable subject to policy change</p> <p>The site is designated countryside. Development of the site would logically round off the settlement of Huthwaite. The site has good access to the public highway and it is well contained and partially well screened by mature trees. The site has poor drainage and it is likely to require mitigation in this respect.</p> <p><u>The site is available</u> The landowner has indicated that development could be delivered within 5 years.</p> <p><u>Achievability</u> Based on whole Plan viability evidence, development is considered to be achievable.</p>	<p><u>Positive Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">The site is anticipated to deliver a number of dwellings and is of sufficient size to contribute towards affordable housing and other infrastructure requirements. It will be required to include provision for new open space and has access to the footpath network.The site has good access to services and is anticipated to promote social equality. It is also expected to have a minor positive impact on the town centre of Sutton in Ashfield <p><u>Negative Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Development would have a medium impact on the landscape.As greenfield land it has the potential to have a negative impact in terms of agricultural production, habitat/species and amenity/recreation value.It is also in a Minerals Safeguarding Area for Coal Measures. However, it is emphasised that this does not necessary prevent the site from being developed. The impact on the site will need to be determined with the Minerals Authority and ultimately prior extraction could take place before development.It is within a Coal Mining Risk Area. The Coal Authority has indicated that any constraints could potentially be mitigated.	<p><u>Highways / Access</u> There are no access constraints. Access is achievable via Blackwell Road.</p> <p><u>Topography</u> The site is steeply sloping to the north (site S63) and more gently sloping to the south. The land to the south is less prominent.</p> <p><u>Neighbour</u> The site is adjacent to a paint factory.</p> <p><u>Flood Risk</u> Flood Zone 1 and no surface water flooding identified.</p> <p><u>Contamination</u> Contamination is suspected - Approximately 20% of site is historic landfill; Brickyard excavations/Factories & Works.</p> <p><u>Agricultural Land Quality</u> Grade 4 (Poor)</p>	<p><u>Infrastructure & Key Mitigation Requirements</u> The public highway on Main Street may need improving if accessed via this point (i.e. pavement widening).</p> <p>A noise impact assessment and odour assessment would be required, as the site is adjacent to a paint factory. However, following consultation with the Council's Environmental Health Officer it is anticipated that any impact could be appropriately mitigated.</p> <p>Any surface water flooding issues identified can be mitigated through the incorporation of an appropriately designed SuDS system.</p> <p>Further investigation required, possibility of flooding from the brook to the south west of the site.</p> <p>Any planning permission would be subject to conditions requiring at least a Phase I Desktop Survey and potentially further investigation where contamination is suspected.</p>	<p><u>Conclusion</u> The Council considers that this is a suitable site to take forward as an allocation.</p> <p>Development of the site would logically round off the settlement of Huthwaite. The site has excellent access to services and facilities in Huthwaite and Sutton in Ashfield. However, the site has poor drainage and it is likely to require mitigation in this respect. Whilst it is acknowledged that the landscape value to the north of the site is higher than some sites which have not been taken forward, the site has excellent access to the public highway and is well contained. The site is relatively small and landscape impact can be addressed through good design to some extent. Development is considered to be more deliverable as the site can be accessed from the public highway and there are fewer physical constraints.</p>

											<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Part of the site is identified as a historic land fill site. Therefore, it is possible that some mitigation measure may be required. The sewerage works, which serves sites in Huthwaite is at near capacity. However, this will not prevent development but will potentially impact on the timescale. 			
S55	Ashland Road West, Sutton	10.3	235	G	N /A	N /A	N/ A	N/ A	N /A	<p><u>The site is suitable subject to policy change</u> The site is designated countryside. It forms an infill between Huthwaite and Brierley Forest Park and development would logically round off the settlement. The site is located within an area which is well served by existing services and has excellent facilities. It has good access to the public highway and it is well contained. The site has poor drainage and it is likely to require mitigation in this respect. Whilst the site is currently designated Countryside, the area is urban in character and development would integrate well. With regard to the landscape, the site scores very well in terms of capacity to accommodate development (1 out of 3 points).</p> <p><u>The site is available</u> The landowner has indicated that development could be delivered within 5 years.</p> <p><u>Achievability</u> Based on whole Plan viability evidence, development is considered to be achievable.</p>	<p><u>Positive Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site is anticipated to deliver a number of dwellings and is of sufficient size to contribute towards affordable housing and other infrastructure requirements. The site has excellent access to Brierley Forest Park and the wider countryside. It has local GI route S5 going along the north of the site. S5 connects GI-15 through Brierley Forest Park with the residential area of the Oval. Although in the countryside as defined by the Ashfield Local Plan Review 2002, the site is close to the settlement of Sutton in Ashfield. As such it has good access to services other than a GP and is anticipated to reduce social inequality. It is expected to have a minor positive impact on the town centre of Sutton in Ashfield. The effective of development on the landscape is anticipated to be low and the site is well contained, As the land is identified as Grade 4 it is not anticipated to have a significant impact in terms of the loss of highly quality agricultural land. <p><u>Negative Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site is located adjacent to the Local Wildlife Site at Brierley Park Marshy Grassland. A further Local Wildlife Site is located in close proximity at Sutton-in-Ashfield 	<p><u>Highways / Access</u> There are no access constraints; the site has good access to the highway.</p> <p><u>Topography</u> The site is gently sloping from south to north.</p> <p><u>Neighbour</u> There are no neighbouring issues. The site is adjacent to a residential area and a country park.</p> <p><u>Flooding</u> Council records indicate that surface water flooding occurs within the area.</p> <p><u>Contamination</u> No known contamination</p>	<p><u>Infrastructure & Key Mitigation Requirements</u></p> <p>Surface water flooding could potentially be mitigated through the incorporation of an on-site SuDS scheme.</p> <p>A flood risk assessment would be required as part of any future planning application.</p> <p>Any planning permission would be subject to conditions requiring at least a Phase I Desktop Survey and potentially further investigation where contamination is suspected.</p>	<p><u>Conclusion</u> The Council considers that this is a suitable site to take forward as an allocation.</p> <p>The site is well contained, forming an infill between Huthwaite and Brierley Forest Park. Development would logically round off the settlement. The site is located within an area which is well served by existing services and has excellent facilities. It has good access to the public highway and it is well contained. The site has poor drainage and it is likely to require mitigation in this respect. Whilst the site is currently designated Countryside, the area is urban in character and development would integrate well.</p>

											<p>District Grassland (a species-rich grassland with damp and dry parts) and Brierly Forest Park is designated as a Local Nature Reserve.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As greenfield land it has the potential to have a negative impact in terms of habitat/species and amenity/recreation value. The site falls within a Minerals Safeguarding Area for limestone. However, it is emphasised that this does not prevent the site from being development. 			
S51, S61, S108, S350	Clegg Hill Drive, Huthwaite	4.5	100	G	N /A	N /A	N/ A	N/ A	N /A	<p><u>The site is suitable subject to policy change</u> The site is designated countryside. The site is not prominent and it would logically round off the settlement of Huthwaite. It is well contained and well screened by mature trees. The site provides an opportunity to improve the existing open space provision which is poorly located, has no play equipment and is sloping. A new open space could be provided on site S350 which is closer to the centre of Huthwaite and it is more level. With regard to the landscape, the site scores relatively well in terms of capacity to accommodate development.</p> <p><u>The site is available</u> The sites are in multiple ownership, but all in agreement to release the sites for development. The landowner has indicated that development could be delivered within 5 years.</p> <p><u>Achievability</u></p>	<p><u>Positive Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site is anticipated to deliver a number of dwellings and is of sufficient size to contribute towards affordable housing and other infrastructure requirements. The site is relatively close to local GI route S6 passes by the lower part of SHLAA 54 to the south west. S6 is a series of footpaths which provide access to the major trails network to the north, and Brierley Forest Park to the east. However, some of the fields and the formal open space have a number of desire lines running through them, the impact on walkers is likely to be high. Although in the countryside, as defined by the Ashfield Local Plan Review 2002, the site is close to the settlement of Huthwaite. As such it has reasonable access to services and is anticipated to reduce social inequality. It is expected to have a minor impact positive impact on the town centre of Sutton in Ashfield. <p><u>Negative Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As greenfield land part of which part is identified as Grade 2 	<p><u>Highways / Access</u> There are currently access constraints which require mitigation. Access is achievable via adjoining roads provided that the access roads achieve highway standards.</p> <p><u>Topography</u> Level changes occur on Chesterfield road where the access road has been proposed. Sites S61 and S51 are relatively even and sites S108 and S351 are gently sloping.</p> <p><u>Neighbour</u> Noise would be a concern due to the close proximity of a boarding kennels and shooting club. However, it is understood that the shooting club only permits air rifles and is done indoors and the kennels do not have outside runs for the dogs.</p> <p><u>Flood Risk</u> Flood Zone 1 and no surface water flooding identified. Any surface water flooding issues identified can be mitigated</p>	<p><u>Infrastructure & Key Mitigation Requirements</u> Potential to overcome access constraints via S61. Site S108 is accessible via adjoining road but only has the capacity for limited development. Site capable of being split into 2 sites with improved open space provision incorporated into the central area (mitigation for loss of open space (Site S350)). ADC own sites S108 and S350.</p> <p>Level changes would need to be addressed through the design of the scheme</p> <p>A Noise Impact Assessment at the application stage and would consider any mitigation proposed. Following consultation with the Council's Environmental Health Officer it is anticipated that any impact could be appropriately mitigated.</p> <p>Further investigation required to assess the flood risk. A SuDs scheme may be required</p>	<p><u>Conclusion</u> The Council considers that this is a suitable site to take forward as an allocation.</p> <p>Development of the site would help to meet the Strategic Objectives of the Local Plan. Huthwaite is a settlement which has good access to a range of services. There is a major employment area to the south, a local shopping centre with a good range of convenience provision, primary schools, open space (Brierley Forest Park and Huthwaite Recreation Ground), a golf course, a medical centre and a regular bus service with good connections to facilities and services in Sutton in Ashfield. Any negative effects can be appropriately mitigated. The positive aspects of development far outweigh any negative impact.</p>

										Based on whole Plan viability evidence, development is considered to be achievable.	<p>Agricultural Land, therefore it has the potential to have a negative impact in terms of agricultural production, habitat/species and amenity/recreation value.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There would be the loss of formal open space but this could be mitigated through the provision of new open space within the development. The hedgerows would need to be retained where possible and managed. The combined site is anticipated to have a moderate landscape impact. It is a Minerals Safeguarding Area for Coal Measures and Limestone. However, it is emphasised that this does not necessary prevent the site from being developed. The sewerage works, which serves sites in Huthwaite is at near capacity. This would delay development. 	<p>through the incorporation of an appropriately designed SuDS system.</p> <p><u>Contamination</u> No significant land contamination suspected. Require testing of topsoil prior to development.</p>	Any planning permission would be subject to conditions requiring at least a Phase I Desktop Survey and potentially further investigation where contamination is suspected.	
S60	Newark Road, Sutton	16.8	266	G	N /A	N /A	N/ A	N/ A	N /A	<p><u>The site is suitable subject to policy change</u> The site is designated as Countryside (Policy EV2, ALPR, 2002) and is currently unsuitable for development. The site is adjacent to the main urban area and is considered to be well served by a range of services. It may be suitable if policy changes. Part of the land is a registered landfill site and may be unsuitable due to contamination. A land quality audit report has been submitted by the landowner which suggests that remediation works could be undertaken - further assessments may be required. There is a problem with surface water flooding. This could be mitigated through a</p>	<p><u>Positive Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site would deliver approximately 378 new dwellings. It would increase in the number of affordable homes. There is good access to a bus service. It would result in an improvement in health and social inclusion. There would be no loss of designated wildlife sites. There would be no impact on heritage assets. There are opportunities to improve the GI network (Local GI route S12). Development would support town centre regeneration. Development would support employment growth and the local economy. <p><u>Negative Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Poor existing access to Primary 	<p><u>Highway/Access</u> Access can be achieved via Newark Road.</p> <p><u>Topographical constraints</u> The site is steeply sloping to the east. This may result in a reduction in the number of dwellings that the site could accommodate.</p> <p><u>Neighbour</u> No neighbouring issues.</p> <p><u>Flood Risk</u> Council records indicate that surface water flooding occurs within the area.</p> <p><u>Contamination</u> Part of the land is a registered landfill site.</p>	<p><u>Infrastructure & Key Mitigation Requirements</u> Surface water flooding could potentially be mitigated through the incorporation of an on-site SuDS scheme. A flood risk assessment would be required as part of any future planning application.</p> <p>Phase I Desktop Survey and potentially further investigation where contamination is suspected. Remediation works would be required on the land that is a registered landfill site.</p>	<p><u>Conclusion</u> The Council considers that this is a suitable site to take forward as an allocation.</p> <p>Development would logically round off the settlement of Sutton in Ashfield. The site is located within designated countryside in an area which is adequately served by some services and facilities. It has good access to the public highway and, whilst it is acknowledged that it is designated Countryside, the site is quite well contained by existing development which has an urbanising effect on the site.</p> <p>The site has poor drainage and it is likely to require mitigation in this respect. The northern part of the site (approx 4.5 ha) is a licensed</p>

										<p>SUDS scheme should development be considered suitable.</p> <p><u>The site is available</u> The landowner has indicated that development could be delivered within 5 years.</p> <p><u>Achievability</u> Based on whole Plan viability evidence, development is considered to be achievable.</p>	<p>School and GP</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of Greenfield land. • Loss of Grade 3 agricultural land. • Negative impact on air quality. • Moderate impact on the landscape. 			landfill site. A land quality audit report has been submitted by the landowner. It suggests the site would be suitable for residential development following remediation works. Further assessments will be required at a later stage to determine what form of mitigation is required. Based on the evidence submitted and consultation with the Council's Environmental Health team, it is anticipated that any remediation works could be appropriately undertaken.
S66	Priestsic Road, Sutton	0.54	24	B	N /A	N /A	N/ A	N/ A	N /A	<p><u>The site is suitable subject to policy change</u> Outline planning permission for 24 dwellings has now expired. The site is adjacent to the town centre in a residential area. It is anticipated that development could be delivered within the Plan period.</p> <p><u>The site is available</u> The landowner has indicated that development could be delivered within 5 years.</p> <p><u>Achievability</u> Based on whole Plan viability evidence, development is considered to be achievable.</p>	<p><u>Positive Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site has the potential to deliver 22 dwellings including affordable housing and contribute toward wider infrastructure requirements. • The location of the site close to Sutton in Ashfield Town centre means that it has excellent access to local services (other than GP services) with a primary school the Bus Station and retail facilities within a short walk. • Access to open space is available through the Priestsic Recreation Ground. • The location also means that it is anticipated to have a significant positive impact for the town centre. <p><u>Negative Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is identified as greenfield. This reflects that although it is a former railway cutting, the cutting has been infilled and over time has blended into the landscape. While it has scored negatively on this aspect it will not have any detrimental impacts on agriculture but it may have a negative impact on habitat/species and/or 	<p><u>Highway/Access</u> No issues identified.</p> <p><u>Topography</u> No issues identified.</p> <p><u>Flood Risk</u> No flood risk issues identified.</p> <p>A small area of the site to the western boundary is identified as potentially having surface water flooding.</p> <p><u>Contamination</u> The former railway cutting is a licenced and historic landfill site. Contamination is suspected.</p>	<p><u>Infrastructure & Key Mitigation Requirements</u> The land is likely to have contamination issues due to former railway siding. Any planning permission would require at least a Phase 1 Desk top Study and potentially further investigation.</p> <p>Utilisation of SuDS may be required to address surface water flooding.</p>	<p><u>Conclusion</u> The Council considers that this is a suitable site to take forward as an allocation.</p> <p>Development of the site would help to meet the Strategic Objectives of the Local Plan.</p> <p>The site is located on the edge of Sutton in Ashfield town centre in a residential area and has excellent access to services and facilities.</p> <p>The site currently has an adverse effect on the surrounding area as it is currently vacant with overgrown vegetation. There is a need to improve this site and the landowner has indicated that it is still available.</p> <p>It is anticipated that development will occur towards the latter part of the plan period due to constraints relating to potential land contamination.</p>

											amenity/recreation value. <ul style="list-style-type: none">A small area of the site to the western boundary is identified as potentially having surface water flooding. However, this is not anticipated to be a significant impediment to development through the utilisation of SuDS.			
S68, S71, S337	Beck Lane, Sutton	19.0	400	G	N /A	N /A	N/ A	N/ A	N /A	<p>The site is suitable subject to policy change</p> <p>The site is currently designated Countryside and is unsuitable. The site scores high in terms of landscape character. It is open in character with views across to Pleasley. However, the adjacent area is suburban in character and has good access to a range of services. There is an extant planning permission for a football academy. If developed, this would impact on the openness of the landscape. The site can be accessed via Beck Lane but would require significant highway improvement works. If it can be demonstrated that highway constraints can be mitigated, the site may be suitable subject to a change to its current designation as countryside.</p> <p><u>Availability</u></p> <p>The landowners have indicated that the site is available. The deliverability of development would depend on a suitable solution to access constraints.</p> <p><u>Achievability</u></p> <p>Based on whole Plan viability evidence, development is considered</p>	<p><u>Positive Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Site will deliver a large number of new dwellings and contribute towards affordable housing and other infrastructure requirements.There is access to the countryside and wider Green Infrastructure through the footpath to the north which links Skegby and Teversal Trail route, with Mansfield in the east. The footpath also provides direct access to Teversal Trail (CI-20) for residents of Skegby.The size of the site means that it will need to include open space provision, which will assist in encouraging healthy lifestyles. <p><u>Negative Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">It is considered that the developed of Beck Lane will have a minor impact on the setting of Dalestorth House Grade II listed building.Greenfield site, identified as being a mix of Grade 2 and Grade 3 agricultural land.Within the Impact Risk Zone for Teversal Pastures SSSI.Part of the site is within a Minerals Safeguarding Area for Limestone. However, it is emphasised that this would not prevent the site being allocatedAreas of the site are identified as having surface water flooding but it is not anticipate having any significant impact on the development of the site.	<p><u>Highway/Access</u></p> <p>Access could be achieved but would require major highway improvement works.</p> <p><u>Topography</u></p> <p>No issues identified.</p> <p><u>Flood Risk</u></p> <p>Council records indicate that surface water flooding occurs on the site.</p> <p><u>Contamination</u></p> <p>No known issues.</p>	<p><u>Infrastructure & Key Mitigation Requirements</u></p> <p>Major highway improvement works and a traffic regulation order would be required.</p> <p>A flood risk assessment would be required as part of any future planning application.</p> <p>An on-site SuDS scheme may be required to mitigate surface water flooding.</p> <p>Any future scheme will need to take into consideration the impact it would have on the landscape in the design process.</p> <p>Within impact risk zone of a SSSI - mitigation may be required at a later stage in the planning process.</p> <p>The site is well linked to the major road net worth, being located off the MARR route. The size of the combined site may improve access to public transport services for local residents.</p>	<p><u>Conclusion</u></p> <p>The Council considers that this is a suitable site to take forward as an allocation.</p> <p>The site could deliver a significant amount of housing, including affordable housing, which would assist in achieving the strategic objectives of the Local Plan. It is located to the north of Sutton in Ashfield and could assist in supporting improved infrastructure including a new primary school, open space and public transport provision. The site is located on the MARR which is identified by the D2N2 (LEP) a major growth area for Ashfield and Mansfield. New development in this location would support the growth aspiration for the MARR, benefiting both Districts.</p> <p>Whilst development would have an adverse impact on the landscape, this could be mitigated to some extent through good design. The principle of development has also been established on the site through an extant permission for a football academy.</p> <p>Development would require major, but deliverable, highway improvement works.</p>

										to be achievable.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Poor access to transport services High landscape value. 			
S72 & S351	Alfreton Road, Sutton	7.0	184	G	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	<p><u>The site is suitable subject to policy change</u> The site is currently designated as an Open Area, is located within the main urban area and is well contained. Development would logically round off the settlement. The impact of new development on the landscape would be relatively low as the site is surrounded by development and is not prominent. The site is well served by existing services and facilities and development would assist in meeting the strategic objectives of the Local Plan. Whilst access to the public highway is currently poor, this could be overcome in the medium term (beyond 5 years). The site would assist in the delivery of development in the latter years of the plan. With regard to the landscape, the site scores relatively well in terms of capacity to accommodate development (2 out of 3 points).</p> <p><u>The site is available</u> The landowner has indicated that development could be delivered within 5 years.</p> <p><u>Achievability</u> Based on whole Plan viability evidence, development is considered to be achievable.</p>	<p><u>Positive Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site would significantly increase the number of new dwellings. It would contribute towards affordable housing and other infrastructure requirements. There is good access to key services and facilities. It would result in an improvement in health and social inclusion. There would be no loss of designated wildlife sites. There would be no impact on heritage assets. There are opportunities to improve the GI network (Local GI route S4). Development would support Sutton town centre regeneration. Development would support employment growth Development would support the local economy. <p><u>Negative Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of Greenfield land - potential to have a negative impact in terms of agricultural production, habitat/species and amenity/recreation value. Negative impact on air quality. Moderate impact on the landscape. The site is located adjacent to a Local Wildlife Site (LWS) and therefore there is the potential for the development of dwellings to have a negative impact on the LWS. 	<p><u>Highways / Access</u> There is currently no suitable access point from the public highway.</p> <p><u>Topography</u> This is an undulating, sloping site which may have some topographical constraints to address during development.</p> <p><u>Neighbour</u> The site is adjacent to an industrial estate to the west.</p> <p><u>Contamination</u> Part of the site lies within a 250m buffer around a landfill site.</p> <p><u>Site apparatus</u> Power lines run through the site. There are plans to re-route these, this will take up to 2 years.</p>	<p><u>Infrastructure & Key Mitigation Requirements</u> Third party land will be required to enable any future development to achieve highway standards.</p> <p>A noise impact assessment would be required at a later stage in the planning process if the site is taken forward.</p> <p>Further investigation required to assess the flood risk. A SuDs scheme may be required</p> <p>Phase I Desktop Survey and potentially further investigation where contamination is suspected.</p>	<p><u>Conclusion</u> The Council considers that this is a suitable site to take forward as an allocation.</p> <p>The site is currently designated as an Open Area within the main urban area of Sutton in Ashfield. It is located within the main urban area and is well contained. Development would logically round off the settlement. The impact of new development on the landscape would be relatively low as the site is surrounded by development and is not prominent. The site is well served by existing services and facilities and development would assist in meeting the strategic objectives of the Local Plan. Whilst access to the public highway is currently poor, this could be overcome in the medium term (beyond 5 years). The adjacent site has planning permission which is to achieve access via the removal of an existing dwelling.</p> <p>The site would assist in the delivery of development in the latter years of the plan.</p>
S83	Clare Road, Sutton	1.7	50	G	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	<p><u>The site is suitable subject to policy change</u></p>	<p><u>Positive Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site is anticipated to 	<p><u>Highway/Access</u> No constraints.</p>	<p><u>Infrastructure & Key Mitigation Requirements</u></p>	<p><u>Conclusion</u> The Council considers that</p>

										<p>The site is located within the main urban area and is well contained by existing development and by the A38. Development would logically round off the settlement of Sutton in Ashfield. It is well served by existing services and facilities and has good access to the public highway. Noise from the A38 is likely to impact on any future development but this could be mitigated. Whilst the site is currently designated as an open area in the Ashfield Local Plan Review (2002), the use of screening could assist in retaining the character of this open area. With regard to the landscape, the site scores very well in terms of capacity to accommodate development (1 out of 3 points).</p> <p><u>The site is available</u> The landowner has indicated that development could be delivered within 5 years.</p> <p><u>Achievability</u> Based on whole Plan viability evidence, development is considered to be achievable.</p>	<p>deliver 46 dwellings, which is anticipated to contribute towards affordable housing and other infrastructure requirements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local Corridor KS1 travels through the site. This route provides a key link between Kirkby west and Sutton, along an established bridleway. Clare Road has potential as a more inviting gateway site. Much of the route north into Sutton is on roads, which limits potential, but any opportunity to 'green' this corridor would be beneficial. The site has good access to services other than a GP and is anticipated to support social inclusion. It is expected to have a minor impact positive impact on the town centre of Sutton in Ashfield <p><u>Negative Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development of the site will result in the lost of an area of open space. It is anticipated that the impact on the landscape will be minimal, as the site is located between housing and the A38. As greenfield land it has the potential to have a negative impact in terms of habitat/species and amenity/recreation value. 	<p><u>Topography</u> No constraints.</p> <p><u>Neighbour</u> The site adjoins the A38. It is considered that any noise implications could be satisfactorily addressed through design.</p> <p><u>Flood Risk</u> No flood risk issues identified.</p> <p><u>Contamination</u> No issues identified.</p>	<p>A noise impact assessment may be required as part of any future planning application.</p> <p>Further investigation required to assess the flood risk. A SuDs scheme may be required</p>	<p>this is a suitable site to take forward as an allocation.</p> <p>The site is located within the main urban area and is well contained by existing development and by the A38. Development would logically round off the settlement of Sutton in Ashfield. It is well served by existing services and facilities and has good access to the public highway. Noise from the A38 is likely to impact on any future development but this could be mitigated. Whilst the site is currently designated as an open area in the Ashfield Local Plan Review (2002), the use of screening could assist in retaining the character of this open area.</p>
S93	Fisher Close, Sutton	3.6	100	G	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	<p><u>The site is suitable subject to policy change</u> The site, which is designated countryside, is located within an area which is well served by existing services and facilities including primary and secondary schools, shops, open spaces, and green infrastructure routes. Development would logically round off the settlement of Sutton in</p>	<p><u>Positive Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential to accommodate up to 100 dwellings. Site lies within close proximity to accessible open space at Brierley Forest Park Local Nature Reserve. Potential to deliver a proportion of affordable housing. Potential to improve a deprived area Good access to existing facilities (with the exception of 	<p><u>Highway/Access</u> There are access constraints which can be mitigated.</p> <p><u>Topography</u> No constraints.</p> <p><u>Neighbour</u> No constraints.</p> <p><u>Flood Risk</u> No flood risk issues identified.</p>	<p><u>Infrastructure & Key Mitigation Requirements</u> Third party land will be required to enable any future development to achieve highway standards.</p> <p>Further investigation required to assess the flood risk. A SuDs scheme may be required</p>	<p><u>Conclusion</u> The Council considers that this is a suitable site to take forward as an allocation.</p> <p>The site is located within an area which is well served by existing services and facilities including primary and secondary schools, shops, open spaces, and green infrastructure routes. Development would logically round off the settlement of</p>

										<p>Ashfield as the site is well contained by residential development and by Brierley Forest Park to the west where the landscape acts as a natural screen. There is a bus service within close proximity to the site which has regular services to Sutton in Ashfield town centre bus station. Whilst development would result in a loss of Countryside, the site is not particularly open in character and has built development to two sides which has created an urbanising effect. With regard to the landscape, the site scores very well in terms of capacity to accommodate development (1 out of 3 points).</p> <p><u>The site is available</u> The landowner has indicated that development could be delivered within 5 years.</p> <p><u>Achievability</u> Based on whole Plan viability evidence, development is considered to be achievable.</p>	<p>a GP).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development will help support employment. Development will support Sutton Town Centre. <p><u>Negative Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site is within an Impact Risk Zone for Teversal Pastures SSSI. Moderate landscape impact. Loss of Greenfield land. Within a Minerals Safeguarding Area - Limestone Negative impact on air quality. 	<p><u>Contamination</u> No issues identified.</p>		<p>Sutton in Ashfield as the site is well contained by residential development and by Brierley Forest Park to the west where the landscape acts as a natural screen. There is a bus service within close proximity to the site which has regular services to Sutton in Ashfield town centre bus station. Whilst development would result in a loss of Countryside, the site is not particularly open in character and has built development to two sides which has created an urbanising effect.</p>
S94	Hilltop Farm, Skegby	0.72	20	G	N /A	N /A	N/ A	N/ A	N /A	<p><u>The site is suitable subject to policy change</u> The site, which is designated countryside, is located within an area which is well served by existing services and facilities including primary and secondary schools, shops, open spaces, and green infrastructure routes. Development would logically round off the settlement of Skegby as the site is well contained by residential development. There is a</p>	<p><u>Positive Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site has the potential to accommodate up to 20 dwellings and to deliver a proportion of affordable housing. The site is within 200m of accessible open space and has good access to a primary school and post office/cash machine. Development will help support employment Development would have a minor positive impact on Sutton Town Centre. Good access to public 	<p><u>Highways / Access</u> There is currently no suitable access point from the public highway.</p> <p><u>Topography</u> No constraints.</p> <p><u>Neighbour</u> No issues identified.</p> <p><u>Flood Risk</u> No flood risk issues identified.</p> <p><u>Contamination</u> No issues identified.</p>	<p><u>Infrastructure & Key Mitigation Requirements</u> Third party land will be required to enable any future development to achieve highway standards.</p> <p>An on-site SuDS scheme may be required to mitigate surface water flooding.</p> <p>Future development should be sensitively designed taking into consideration the adjacent Grade II Listed property.</p>	<p><u>Conclusion</u> The Council considers that this is a suitable site to take forward as an allocation.</p> <p>The site is located within an area which is well served by existing services and facilities including primary and secondary schools, shops, open spaces, and green infrastructure routes. Development would logically round off the settlement of Sutton in Ashfield as the site is well contained by residential development.</p>

										<p>bus service within close proximity to the site. Whilst the site is designated Countryside, it is not open in character and the surrounding built development creates an urbanising effect. With regard to the landscape, the site scores very well in terms of capacity to accommodate development (1 out of 3 points). There are access constraints which could be mitigated. Development may impact on the setting of a Grade II Listed Building. This could be mitigated through design.</p> <p><u>The site is available</u> The landowner has indicated that development could be delivered within 5 years. Access constraints may impact on the timescale of development being delivered.</p> <p><u>Achievability</u> Based on whole Plan viability evidence, development is considered to be achievable.</p>	<p>transport.</p> <p><u>Negative Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a potential negative impact on the setting of Listed Buildings. • Loss of Greenfield land. • Development would have a moderate landscape impact, but this could be mitigated through good design. • The site is within a Minerals Safeguarding Area for Limestone. This would not prevent the site from being developed. • There would be a negative impact on air quality, but this is the case for most sites. • There are minor surface water issues on site, but this can be mitigated by an appropriate SuDs scheme. 			<p>There is a bus service within close proximity to the site which has regular services. Whilst the site is designated Countryside, it is not open in character and the surrounding built development creates an urbanising effect. Any future development would need to consider the impact it may have on the setting of the Listed Building and be appropriately designed.</p>
S112 & S316	Alfreton Road, Sutton	5.6	117	G	N /A	N /A	N/ A	N/ A	N /A	<p><u>The site is suitable subject to policy change</u> The site is currently designated as an Open Area, is located within the main urban area and is well contained. Development would logically round off the settlement. The impact of new development on the landscape would be relatively low as the site is surrounded by development and is not prominent. The site is well served by existing services and facilities and</p>	<p><u>Positive Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site would significantly increase the number of new dwellings. • It would contribute towards affordable housing and other infrastructure requirements. • There is good access to key services and facilities. • It would result in an improvement in health and social inclusion. • There would be no impact on heritage assets. • There are opportunities to improve the GI network (Local GI route S1). 	<p><u>Highways / Access</u> There is currently no suitable access point from the public highway.</p> <p><u>Topography</u> This is an undulating, sloping site which may have some topographical constraints to address during development.</p> <p><u>Neighbour</u> No issues identified.</p> <p><u>Flood Risk</u> A small area to the north</p>	<p><u>Infrastructure & Key Mitigation Requirements</u> Third party land will be required to enable any future development to achieve highway standards.</p> <p>Further investigation required to assess the flood risk. A Suds scheme may be required to address the surface water flooding to the north of the site.</p>	<p><u>Conclusion</u> The Council considers that this is a suitable site to take forward as an allocation.</p> <p>The site, which is an open area within the urban boundary, is well contained and development would logically round off the settlement. The impact of new development on the landscape would be relatively low as the site is surrounded by development and is not prominent. The site is well served by existing services and facilities and</p>

										<p>development would assist in meeting the strategic objectives of the Local Plan. Whilst access to the public highway is currently poor, this could be overcome in the medium term (beyond 5 years). The site would assist in the delivery of development in the latter years of the plan. With regard to the landscape, the site scores relatively well in terms of capacity to accommodate development (2 out of 3 points).</p> <p><u>The site is available</u> The landowner has indicated that development could be delivered within 5 years.</p> <p><u>Achievability</u> Based on whole Plan viability evidence, development is considered to be achievable.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Development would support Sutton town centre regeneration.Development would support employment growthDevelopment would support the local economy.Low impact on the landscape. <p><u>Negative Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Loss of Greenfield land - potential to have a negative impact in terms of agricultural production, habitat/species and amenity/recreation value.Negative impact on air quality.Low impact on the landscape.Local Wildlife Site (LWS) adjacent to the site and therefore there is the potential for the development of dwellings to have a negative impact on the LWS.	<p>of the site is affected by surface water flooding.</p> <p><u>Contamination</u> No issues identified.</p>		<p>development would assist in meeting the strategic objectives of the Local Plan. It is considered that access constraints could be overcome within the Plan period as there are a range of options which could address this constraint.</p>
S114	The Avenue, Sutton	0.5	15	G	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	<p><u>The site is suitable</u> The site is located within the urban boundary of Sutton in Ashfield and is allocated for residential development. As such, it is a suitable location for residential development. Access to the public highway is currently poor. This could be resolved by accessing the site from an adjacent road but there are severe constraints relating to multiple land ownership.</p> <p><u>Achievability</u> The landowner has indicated that development could be delivered within 5 years.</p>	<p><u>Positive Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Potential to accommodate up to 15 dwellings, including additional affordable housesSite lies within close proximity to accessible open spaceSite can access local services including GP facilities, cash machine, bus services.Site does not suffer from surface water flooding, nor is it within flood zone 2 or 3Development will help support local economy and Sutton town centre <p><u>Negative Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Possible impact on adjacent Local Wildlife Site (Huthwaite Grassland)Loss of Greenfield land.Negative impact on air quality.	<p><u>Highways / Access</u> Access into the site is currently restricted. There are no physical barriers, this purely relates to land ownership constraints.</p> <p><u>Topography</u> No constraints</p> <p><u>Neighbour</u> No issues identified.</p> <p><u>Flood Risk</u> Outside Floodzones 2 & 3</p> <p><u>Contamination</u> Contamination suspected. Approximately half of the site is Historic Allotments.</p>	<p><u>Infrastructure & Key Mitigation Requirements</u> Third party land is required for access.</p> <p>Any planning permission would be subject to conditions requiring at least a Phase I Desktop Survey and potentially further investigation where contamination is suspected. Developers are encouraged to contact the Council's Contaminated Land Officer.</p>	<p><u>Conclusion</u> The Council considers that this is a suitable site to take forward as an allocation.</p> <p>Development of the site would be appropriate as it is within the urban area and forms a logical infill. The site is well contained and partially well screened by mature trees. Currently the access constraints affect the delivery of development. The Council considers that, due to the fact that there are no physical constraints, access constraints could be overcome within the plan period.</p>

S320	Quantum Clothing, North Street, Huthwaite	2.19	90	B	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	<p><u>The site is suitable</u> The site, which is in the main urban area, was previously a clothing manufacturer. It is included on the Local Heritage List. The building may be suitable for conversion to residential.</p> <p><u>The site is available</u> The landowner has indicated that development could be delivered within 5 years.</p> <p><u>Achievability</u> Based on whole Plan viability evidence, development is considered to be achievable.</p>	<p><u>Positive Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is a brownfield site which has the potential to accommodate up to 90 dwellings and contribute towards affordable housing and other infrastructure requirements. The site lies within close proximity to accessible open space and local services including a GP and bus services. The site does not suffer from surface water flooding, nor is it within flood zone 2 or 3. Development will help support Sutton town centre. <p><u>Negative Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development may result in the loss of a local heritage asset. Development would result in the loss of an employment site and buildings. 	<p><u>Highways / Access</u> North Street would require an upgrade and improvement works to NCC. The site would require two permanent points of access with a looped linked infrastructure system in the site confines.</p> <p><u>Topography</u> No constraints</p> <p><u>Neighbour Issues</u> No issues identified.</p> <p><u>Flood Risk</u> Outside Floodzones 2 & 3</p> <p><u>Contamination</u> No Known Contamination Historic landfill site on small part of the car park.</p>	<p><u>Infrastructure & Key Mitigation Requirements</u> Pending planning application on the site. The Council are seeking to retain the building (on the Local List).</p> <p>Comprehensive site contamination investigations required due to existing use.</p> <p>Further investigation required to assess the flood risk. A SuDs scheme may be required</p>	<p><u>Conclusion</u> The Council considers that this is a suitable site to take forward as an allocation.</p> <p>The site is a vacant factory located within a residential area. It has excellent access to key services and facilities in Huthwaite and Sutton in Ashfield.</p> <p>Development of the site would assist in the retention of a local heritage asset which is an important local landmark.</p> <p>Highway constraints could be appropriately mitigated.</p>
S374	Brand Lane (Stubbin Hill Farm), Stanton Hill	7.2	160	G	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	<p><u>The site is suitable subject to policy change</u> The site, which is designated countryside, is located within an area which is well served by existing services and facilities including primary and secondary schools, shops, open spaces, and green infrastructure routes. The site is not very open within the landscape when viewed from the south and east as it is enclosed by Brierley Forest Park and by the residential housing of Stanton Hill. In areas where the site is more prominent, appropriate screening could be incorporated into any future development scheme. There is a bus service within close proximity to the site which has regular services to</p>	<p><u>Positive Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site has the potential to accommodate 160 dwellings, including affordable houses. The site lies within close proximity to accessible open space (Brierley forest Par LNR, statutory footpaths/bridleway) and a bus stop. Development will help support employment/ economy and Sutton Town Centre. <p><u>Negative Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of Greenfield land - potential to have a negative impact in terms of agricultural production, habitat/species and amenity/recreation value. Moderate landscape impact. It is within the potential impact zone of Sites of Special Scientific Interest. Increase in air pollution as a result of development, but this is the case for most developments. 	<p><u>Highways / Access</u> Potential constraints relating to the width of the public highway. Mitigation required.</p> <p><u>Topography</u> Gently undulating site.</p> <p><u>Neighbour</u> Majority of the site adjacent to countryside with residential development to the north east. A small part of the site adjoins industrial.</p> <p><u>Flood Risk</u> Outside Floodzones 2 & 3</p> <p><u>Contamination</u> No Known Contamination.</p> <p><u>Agricultural Land Quality</u> Grade 2 (very good)</p>	<p><u>Infrastructure & Key Mitigation Requirements</u> Opportunity for improvements to Stanton Hill Local Centre.</p> <p>Highway mitigation required.</p> <p>The majority of the site would require minimal testing for land contamination. The farm yard would require more intensive investigation.</p> <p>Further investigation required to assess the flood risk. A SuDs scheme may be required</p>	<p><u>Conclusion</u> The Council considers that this is a suitable site to take forward as an allocation.</p> <p>Development of the site would help to achieve the Strategic Objectives of the Local Plan. The site could deliver a significant amount of new housing over the Plan period, helping to meet the needs of the District for a sustained period. It is located within designated countryside in an area which is well served by existing services and facilities including primary and secondary schools, shops, open spaces, and green infrastructure routes. The site is not very open within the landscape when viewed from the south and east as it is enclosed by Brierley Forest Park and by the residential housing of Stanton Hill. In areas where</p>

										<p>Sutton in Ashfield town centre bus station. With regard to the landscape, the site scores relatively well in terms of capacity to accommodate development (2 out of 3 points).</p> <p><u>The site is available</u> The landowner has indicated that development could be delivered within 5 years.</p> <p><u>Achievability</u> Development is achievable.</p>					the site is more prominent, appropriate screening could be incorporated into any future development scheme. There is a bus service within close proximity to the site with regular services.
SM378	Cauldwell Road, Sutton	9.1	207	G	N /A	N /A	N/ A	N/ A	N /A	<p><u>The site is suitable subject to policy change</u> The site, which is designated countryside, is well contained and development would logically round off the settlement of Mansfield. It is located within designated countryside in an area which is well served by existing services and facilities and there is good access to the public highway. The site has poor drainage in some areas and it is likely to require mitigation in this respect. Development would form a natural continuation of the Lindhurst urban extension in Mansfield District which lies to the east of the site. With regard to the landscape, the site scores relatively well in terms of capacity to accommodate development (2 out of 3 points).</p> <p><u>The site is available</u> The landowner has indicated that development could be delivered within 5 years.</p>	<p><u>Positive Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Large housing site which is anticipated to contribute towards affordable housing and other infrastructure requirements.Access to open space with Strategic GI route GI-8 runs through the site. This is a corridor through Thieves Wood, linking further north into Mansfield. S14 also runs to the north of the site, this is an existing link along the new MARR road connecting Kingsmill reservoir (and GI-20) to the east towards Cauldwell and Thieves Wood. There is potential to enhance the ecological connections along this stretch and also enhance the green character for those travelling along it.The site as limited access to services but a bus stop is located within 800 m or 10 minutes walk. It is anticipated that this would improve through the development of Lindhurst in Mansfield.The site is anticipated to have a positive impact in reduce social inequality. <p><u>Negative Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Greenfield land.	<p><u>Highways / Access</u> The site could be accessed via Cauldwell Road.</p> <p><u>Topography</u> There are no significant constraints</p> <p><u>Neighbour</u> Adjacent to the MARR</p> <p><u>Flood Risk</u> Outside Floodzones 2 & 3</p> <p><u>Contamination</u> No Known Contamination.</p> <p><u>Agricultural Land Quality</u> Grade 3 (good - moderate)</p>	<p><u>Infrastructure & Key Mitigation Requirements</u> Noise impact assessment required as the site is adjacent to the MARR.</p> <p>Further investigation required to assess the flood risk. The site is potentially subject to some surface water flooding which is anticipated to be mitigated through the use of SuDS.</p> <p>Minimal topsoil testing would be required.</p> <p>Contributions to open space required.</p>	<p><u>Conclusion</u> The Council considers that this is a suitable site to take forward as an allocation.</p> <p>The site is well contained and development would logically round off the settlement of Mansfield. It is located within designated countryside in an area adjacent to the Lindhurst urban extension in Mansfield. It is anticipated that access to services and facilities will improve through the development of Lindhurst. The site has good access to the public highway but it has poor drainage in some areas and it is likely to require mitigation in this respect. Development would form a natural continuation of the Lindhurst urban extension in Mansfield District which lies to the east of the site.</p>	

										<p><u>Achievability</u> Based on whole Plan viability evidence, development is considered to be achievable.</p> <p><u>Note</u> Part of the site is in Mansfield District (this area is not included in the site capacity).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site is also potentially subject to some surface water flooding which is anticipated to be mitigated through the use of SuDS. Poor access to services other than a bus stop. This is expected to improve through the development of Lindhurst. Medium impact on the landscape. However, the site is not overly open within the wider landscape as it is contained by the landform and urban edge. Rushley Farm is located to the south of the site and has been identified as a local heritage asset on Ashfield Council's Local Heritage List (Ref 409). However, this is separated from the site by the MARR and the site is not anticipated to impact on this heritage asset. 			
S379	Common Road, Huthwaite	1.38	20	G	N /A	N /A	N/ A	N/ A	N /A	<p><u>The site is suitable</u> The site is currently allocated for housing in the Ashfield Local Plan Review (2002). The landowners have indicated that the site is available and development can be delivered within the Plan period.</p> <p><u>The site is available</u> The landowner has indicated that development could be delivered within 5 years.</p> <p><u>Achievability</u> Based on whole Plan viability evidence, development is considered to be achievable.</p>	<p><u>Positive Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site is anticipated to deliver 37 dwellings and is anticipated to contribute towards affordable housing and other infrastructure requirements. The site has good access to services in terms of a bus stop, primary school, GP surgery and cash machine. This improved travel choice and accessibility reduces the need for travel by car and shortens the length and duration of journeys. It is also anticipated to reduce equality and have a minor positive impact on Sutton in Ashfield town centre. It location means that there will be minimal impact on the landscape. <p><u>Negative Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site is Greenfield land. Therefore it has the potential to have a negative impact in terms of agricultural production, habitat/species and amenity/recreation value. 	<p><u>Highways / Access</u> No significant constraints as long as it meets necessary adopted standards.</p> <p><u>Topography</u> Steeply sloping on entrance to site.</p> <p><u>Neighbour</u> No bad neighbouring uses.</p> <p><u>Flood Risk</u> Outside Floodzones 2 & 3</p> <p><u>Contamination</u> Contamination Suspected.</p> <p><u>Natural Features</u> Part of the site contains an ancient orchard.</p>	<p><u>Infrastructure & Key Mitigation Requirements</u> Heavy tree coverage on parts of the site which has had an impact on the developable area. The Council's Tree Officer has recommended that the ancient orchard is retained.</p> <p>Special consideration for possible shallow coal mine workings may be necessary. Minimal testing of topsoil would be required.</p> <p>Further investigation may be required to assess the flood risk. A SuDs scheme may be required</p> <p>Phase I Desktop Survey and potentially further investigation where contamination is suspected.</p>	<p><u>Conclusion</u> The Council considers that this is a suitable site to take forward as an allocation.</p> <p>Development of the site would be appropriate as it is within the urban area and forms a logical infill. The site is well contained and partially well screened by mature trees. Part of the site contains an old orchard which has been recommended for retention. This has reduced the amount of land available for development.</p>

											<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within a Coal Authority Referral Area and special consideration may be necessary for possible shallow coal mining workings. • Sewerage works serving Huthwaite is at near capacity. However, this will not prevent development but will potentially impact on when development can be implemented as it may require the sewerage works to be upgraded. 			
S407	Former Social Club, Davies Ave	0.61	19	B	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	<p><u>The site is suitable</u> The site is located within a residential area to the north of Sutton in Ashfield. There are no constraints to development.</p> <p><u>The site is available</u></p> <p><u>Development is deliverable</u></p>	<p><u>Positive Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential to accommodate up to 19 dwellings. • Site lies within close proximity to accessible open space and walking routes. • Potential to deliver a proportion of affordable housing. • Potential to improve a deprived area • Good access to existing facilities (with the exception of a GP). • Development will help support employment and the economy. • Development will support Sutton Town Centre. <p><u>Negative Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within a Minerals Safeguarding Area - Limestone • Negative impact on air quality. • Surface water issues are present on site. • The site will lead to the loss of formal open space. 	<p><u>Highways / Access</u> No constraints.</p> <p><u>Topography</u> No constraints.</p> <p><u>Neighbour</u> No constraints.</p> <p><u>Flood Risk</u> No constraints.</p> <p><u>Contamination</u> No known constraints.</p>	<p><u>Infrastructure & Key Mitigation Requirements</u> Assumed no mitigation necessary.</p>	<p><u>Conclusion</u> The Council considers that this is a suitable site to take forward as an allocation.</p> <p>The site is formerly occupied by a social club. The Council has plans to deliver housing on the site.</p>
K23 & K33	Lowmoor Road, Kirkby in Ashfield	20.2	495	G	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	<p><u>The site is suitable subject to policy change</u> The site is designated Countryside (Policy EV2, ALPR 2002) and is currently unsuitable. It is adjacent to Kirkby and Sutton and, as such, it may be suitable if policy changes through the Local Plan process. There are issues in terms of surface water flooding and there is a Historic</p>	<p><u>Positive Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site would deliver a significant amount of new dwellings. • It would increase in the number of affordable homes. • Good access to a bus service and the railway station. • It would result in an improvement in health and social inclusion. • There would be no loss of designated wildlife sites. 	<p><u>Highways / Access</u> No direct access from a classified road.</p> <p><u>Topography</u> Undulating site.</p> <p><u>Neighbour</u> Industrial estate adjacent to the site.</p> <p><u>Flood Risk</u> Outside Flood zones 2 & 3. Surface water flooding</p>	<p><u>Infrastructure & Key Mitigation Requirements</u> Infrastructure improvements will be required. Transport Assessment required.</p> <p>Further investigation required to assess the flood risk. A SuDs scheme may be required.</p> <p>Phase I Desktop Survey and potentially further investigation where</p>	<p><u>Conclusion</u> The Council considers that this is a suitable site to take forward as an allocation.</p> <p>Development would logically round off the settlement of Kirkby in Ashfield. The site has good access to the public highway and it is well contained. Its location, adjacent to Sutton Parkway Station, would support the use of sustainable modes of</p>

										<p>landfill on 35% of the site - further investigations would be required at a later stage in the planning process. A Flood Risk Assessment would be required prior to development taking place.</p> <p><u>The site is available</u> The landowner has indicated that the site is available within the 0 to 5 year period. There are no major access constraints which would require third party land.</p> <p><u>Achievability</u> Based on whole Plan viability evidence, development is considered to be achievable.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There would be no impact on heritage assets. There are opportunities to improve the GI network (Local GI route S12). Development would support town centre regeneration. Development would support employment growth and the local economy. <p><u>Negative Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Poor access to Primary School and GP Loss of Greenfield land. Negative impact on air quality. K33 – Impact of development on the landscape would be high. Some surface water flooding 	<p>issues could be addressed through the planning process.</p> <p><u>Contamination</u> Contamination Suspected - Southern half of site is licenced landfill (35% of the total site).</p> <p><u>Agricultural Land Quality</u> Grade 3 (Good-moderate)</p>	<p>contamination is suspected.</p> <p>A new primary school may be required.</p> <p>Open space is likely to be required.</p>	<p>transport, thereby reducing the reliance on private vehicles. It would also provide an opportunity to improve Green infrastructure routes in the area which would encourage walking and cycling.</p> <p>The site is located within designated countryside in an area which is adequately served by services and facilities. The site has poor drainage and it is likely to require mitigation in this respect. Access to services such as a primary school and open space could be mitigated through the development of the site. Whilst it is acknowledged that the impact on the landscape of site K33 would be high largely due to the prominence of the site, the development of site K23 would affect views of site K33 to a large extent. The effect of development could also be mitigated through the design of the scheme.</p>
K28 & K401	Wheatley's Yard, Lowmoor Road, Kirkby	1.71	63	B	N /A	N /A	N /A	N /A	N /A	<p><u>The site is suitable</u> Development of the site may be appropriate as it is a logical infill site between existing residential development. The site has good access to the public highway and it is well contained. Development of the site could result in a loss of employment if the businesses are not looking to relocate. However, there are a number of vacant units and the site contains very old buildings which creates an unattractive environment. Redevelopment of the site would improve the area.</p> <p><u>The site is available</u> The landowner has</p>	<p><u>Positive Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Delivery of housing. Potential to deliver affordable housing. Supports healthy living and choice of travel and accessibility. Good access to services, including public transport. Supports town centre regeneration. Development would meet national and local objectives of prioritising the development of brownfield land. <p><u>Negative Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of employment and Impact on the local economy. Site is subject to potential surface water flooding. However, the redevelopment of 	<p><u>Highway / access</u> No issues identified</p> <p><u>Topography</u> No issues identified</p> <p><u>Neighbour</u> Petrol Station adjacent to the site. Adjacent to sewage pumping station on Western edge.</p> <p><u>Flood Risk</u> Outside Floodzones 2 & 3. Surface water flooding issues.</p> <p><u>Contamination</u> Contamination Suspected - Historic landfill covers most of site; Brickworks excavation & works. Within 250 metres of a</p>	<p><u>Infrastructure & Key Mitigation Requirements</u> Any planning permission would be subject to conditions requiring at least a Phase I Desktop Survey and potentially further investigation where contamination is suspected.</p> <p>Further investigation required to assess the flood risk. A SuDs scheme may be required</p>	<p><u>Conclusion</u> The Council considers that this is a suitable site to take forward as an allocation.</p> <p>The landowner has indicated that the site is available and development is deliverable within the Plan period. Part of the site contains vacant industrial units and the remaining units are in need of redevelopment.</p> <p>The site, which is located on a gateway into Kirkby Town Centre, creates a very poor image of the area. Redevelopment of the site would assist in the regeneration of the town centre and edge of centre. The Council will seek to work</p>

										indicated that development could be delivered in 5 to 10 years. <u>Achievability</u> Based on whole Plan viability evidence, development is considered to be achievable.	the site has the potential to reduce surface water flooding through the use of SuDS and lower run off rates.	landfill site. <u>Other</u> Protected trees on the southern boundary - covered by a Tree Preservation order (TPO).		with the landowner and businesses to identify alternative sites for the remaining businesses.
K37 & K118	Skegby Road, Kirkby Woodhouse	0.85	23	G	N /A	N /A	N/ A	N/ A	N /A	<u>The site is suitable</u> There are no major policy constraints. The site is in a predominantly residential area within the main urban boundary. <u>The site is available</u> The landowner has indicated that development could be delivered within 5 years. <u>Achievability</u> Based on whole Plan viability evidence, development is considered to be achievable.	<u>Positive Impacts</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none">The site is anticipated to deliver 15 dwellings and is of sufficient size to contribute towards affordable housing and other infrastructure requirements.The site is located within the main urban area with good access to local services providing opportunities for residents to access facilities while reducing the use of the car.It is anticipate to have a positive impact in reduce social inequality and to have a minor impact positive impact on the town centre Ashfield <u>Negative Impacts</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none">The site is a greenfield on a sloping site but the impact on openness is considered to be minimal as it is well contain on all sites by existing residential development.	<u>Highway / access</u> The entrance is located near to a bend. <u>Topography</u> Sloping site. <u>Neighbour issues</u> None identified <u>Flood Risk</u> Outside Floodzones 2 & 3. Highway flooding issues in this area. <u>Contamination</u> No Known Contamination.	<u>Infrastructure & Key Mitigation Requirements</u> Third party land would be required to improve highway/access visibility.	<u>Conclusion</u> The Council considers that this is a suitable site to take forward as an allocation. Development of the site would be appropriate as it is well contained and forms a logical infill within the main urban area and it has excellent access to a range of services and facilities. There are currently access constraints which could be mitigated.
K79 (part – upper site)	Mowlands Farm, Doles Lane, Kirkby in Ashfield	112.5	900	G	N /A	N /A	N/ A	N/ A	N /A	<u>The site is suitable subject to policy change</u> The site is designated countryside and is currently unsuitable for residential development. The site is adjacent to Kirkby Cross Conservation Area which contains a scheduled ancient monument and listed buildings. Development could adversely affect the character of the conservation. There is a ridgeline within the site and part of the site is very	<u>Positive Impacts</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Potential to provide a large scale major housing development of approximately 900 dwellings.Site is within 800m or 10 minutes walking distance of a primary school and a bus stop.Site is within 500m of Natural Open Space, and has the capacity to provide on-site green infrastructure enhancement.Development could provide affordable housing contributionsDevelopment will help support the local economy.	<u>Highway / access</u> Highway constraints identified through the planning process. <u>Topography</u> Undulating landscape, with strong ridgelines towards the south of the site. <u>Neighbouring Issues</u> None identified <u>Flood Risk</u> Outside Floodzones 2 & 3. <u>Contamination</u>	<u>Infrastructure & Key Mitigation Requirements</u> Major highways infrastructure improvements required. Further investigation required to assess the flood risk. A SuDs scheme may be required. The design of the development should be sensitive to the character of the Conservation Area.	<u>Conclusion</u> The Council considers that the northern part of this site is a suitable site to take forward as an allocation. The housing trajectory indicates that the whole of the Mowlands site cannot be delivered within the 15 year Plan period. It has been determined that it could deliver a maximum of just over 1000 dwellings (1015). The north part of the site provides an opportunity to

										<p>prominent. The area adjacent to the main urban area is less prominent. Access to the site is currently restricted but this could potentially be mitigated as a new access road from the A38 has been proposed by the developer/landowner. A smaller scheme may be suitable if appropriately designed.</p> <p><u>Availability</u> The landowner has indicated that the site is available.</p> <p><u>Achievability</u> Based on whole Plan viability evidence, development is considered to be achievable.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development will support Sutton & Kirkby Town Centres. <p><u>Negative Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Moderate landscape impact. Loss of Greenfield land. Loss of Grade 2 agricultural land. Negative impact on air quality. The site lies adjacent to part of Kirkby Cross Conservation Area. 	<p>No Known Contamination</p> <p><u>Agricultural Land Quality</u> Grade 2 (Very good)</p>		<p>deliver a well-integrated urban extension which can provide for the needs of the community. It is well screened by existing development and, apart from the southern section of the site, it is not prominent in the landscape. The proposed new road would ease congestion on Sutton Road by helping to disperse traffic.</p> <p>There are currently highway constraints which the Council believes could be mitigated.</p> <p>Taking the north part of the site forward will help to provide a more flexible approach to the delivery of development as it allows the Council more choice of smaller sites and the opportunity to increase the number of dwellings delivered. In turn this flexibility will help the District sustain a 5 year land supply.</p>
K333	Kirkby House, Chapel Street, Kirkby	1.10	16	G	N /A	N /A	N/ A	N/ A	N /A	<p><u>The site is suitable subject to a suitable access arrangement</u> The site is within the urban area located in Kirkby Cross Conservation Area. As such, any future proposal would need to be sensitively designed. There are access constraints which could potentially be mitigated. The landowner has indicated that the site is available and development could be delivered within the Plan period.</p> <p><u>The site is available</u> The landowner has indicated that development could be delivered within 5 years.</p> <p><u>Achievability</u></p>	<p><u>Positive Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site provides for a limited number of dwellings. It is accessible to open space. It is anticipate to have a positive impact on social inclusion and on the town centre at Kirkby-in-Ashfield. Other than a GP, local services are readily accessible. <p><u>Negative Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site lies in and adjacent to Kirkby Cross Conservation Area, together with being adjacent or close to several Listed Buildings, local heritage assets and a scheduled ancient monument. If development is to be considered it will need to enhance and protect the character and setting of the heritage assets through appropriate mitigation and high 	<p><u>Highways / Access</u> There are currently access constraints which require mitigation. Access is achievable via adjoining roads provided that the proposed new access roads achieve highway standards.</p> <p><u>Topography</u> No issues identified.</p> <p><u>Neighbour Issues</u> None identified</p> <p><u>Flood Risk</u> Outside Floodzones 2 & 3</p> <p><u>Contamination</u> No Known contamination.</p>	<p><u>Infrastructure & Key Mitigation Requirements</u> New access road required to achieve highway standards.</p> <p>The design of the development should be sensitive to the character of the Conservation Area.</p>	<p><u>Conclusion</u> The Council considers that this is a suitable site to take forward as an allocation.</p> <p>Development of the site would be appropriate as it is well contained and forms a logical infill within the main urban area and it has excellent access to a range of services and facilities. There are currently access constraints which could be satisfactorily mitigated.</p>

										Based on whole Plan viability evidence, development is considered to be achievable.	<p>quality design. This includes consideration of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The significance of Kirkby House in relation to the character and appearance of the conservation area. • Impact of new development on the setting of the Grade II listed 'the Croft'. • Impact of new development on the character and appearance of the conservation area. • Impact on townscape. • Impact on stone walls in the Kirkby Cross conservation area which are protected by an Article 4 Direction. • Impact on any other historic features. 			
K334, K359	Laburnum Avenue, Kirkby	2.39	25	G	N /A	N /A	N/ A	N/ A	N /A	<p><u>The site is suitable subject to a suitable access arrangement</u> Development of the site, which is designated countryside, would logically round off the settlement. The site has good access to the public highway and it is well contained. Whilst local services (a primary school, Medical Centre and cash machine) are not within walking distance, it is located on a bus route and has good access to a regular service. With regard to the landscape, the site scores very well in terms of capacity to accommodate development (1 out of 3 points).</p> <p><u>The site is available</u> The landowner has indicated that development could be delivered within 5 years.</p> <p><u>Achievability</u> Based on whole Plan</p>	<p><u>Positive Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential to accommodate more than 10 dwellings and to provide some funding towards infrastructure and affordable housing. • Site lies within 800m / 10 mins from a bus stop. • Development will help support employment. • Development will support Sutton & Kirkby Town Centres. <p><u>Negative Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moderate landscape impact. • Loss of Greenfield land. • Negative impact on air quality. 	<p><u>Highway / access</u> Access to the site would need to be taken from one access point (i.e. a shared drive would be required)</p> <p><u>Topography</u> Gently sloping west (highest) to east (lowest)</p> <p><u>Neighbour Issues</u> None</p> <p><u>Flood Risk</u> Outside Floodzones 2&3</p> <p><u>Contamination</u> No known contamination, however the site is located within 250m of made ground. Such ground has the potential to give rise to elevated concentration of methane and carbon dioxide.</p> <p><u>Agricultural Land Quality</u> Unknown</p>	<p><u>Infrastructure & Key Mitigation Requirements</u> Potential methane and carbon dioxide. Any future planning application would likely be conditioned accordingly.</p> <p>Further investigation required to assess the flood risk. A SuDs scheme may be required</p>	<p><u>Conclusion</u> The Council considers that this is a suitable site to take forward as an allocation.</p> <p>The site is located within designated countryside in an area which is adequately served by services and facilities. Development would logically round off the settlement of Kirkby in Ashfield. The site has good access to the public highway and it is well contained. It would provide an opportunity to improve Green infrastructure routes in the area which would encourage walking and cycling.</p>

										viability evidence, development is considered to be achievable.				
K325	Walesby Road, Kirkby	32.0	150	G	N /A	N /A	N/ A	N/ A	N /A	<p><u>The site is suitable subject to a suitable access arrangement</u> The site, which is designated countryside, is well contained and development would logically round off the settlement. It has good access to local services and facilities. With regard to the landscape, the site scores relatively well in terms of capacity to accommodate development (2 out of 3 points).</p> <p><u>The site is available</u> The landowner has indicated that development could be delivered within 5 years.</p> <p><u>Achievability</u> Based on whole Plan viability evidence, development is considered to be achievable.</p>	<p><u>Positive Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Potential to accommodate up to 150 dwellings.• Site lies within 800m / 10 mins from a bus stop.• Development will help support employment.• Development will support Sutton & Kirkby Town Centres.• The sites does not contain or lie adjacent to any designated biodiversity assets <p><u>Negative Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Moderate landscape impact.• Loss of Greenfield land.• Negative impact on air quality.	<p><u>Highway / Access</u> There may be potential to access the site from the adjoining roads if a smaller scale development was proposed.</p> <p><u>Topography</u> Undulating landscape</p> <p><u>Neighbour</u> Part of the site is adjacent to Lowmoor Road Industrial Estate</p> <p><u>Flood Risk</u> Outside Floodzones 2&3</p> <p><u>Contamination</u> No known contamination</p> <p><u>Agricultural Land Quality</u> Grade 3 (good – moderate)</p>	<p><u>Infrastructure & Key Mitigation Requirements</u> Highway improvements required to form a suitable access route.</p> <p>Further investigation required to assess the flood risk. A SuDs scheme may be required</p>	<p><u>Conclusion</u> The Council considers that this is a suitable site to take forward as an allocation.</p> <p>The site is located adjacent to a residential area which has good access to services and facilities in Kirkby in Ashfield. Development would assist in helping to regenerate Kirkby town centre given its close proximity. It is well contained by existing development and by woodland to the east. The surrounding roads are narrow and this affects the capacity of the site to accommodate development. As such, approximately 150 dwellings could be accommodated on the site. This is based on the standards set out in the 6Cs Design Guide adopted as highways standards guidance by Nottingham County Council.</p>
K404	Diamond Avenue, Kirkby in Ashfield	2.2	67	G	N /A	N /A	N/ A	N/ A	N /A	<p><u>The site is suitable</u> The site, which is currently a residential allocation in the Ashfield Local Plan Review (2002), is available and development is deliverable. It has good access to the public highway and has no major physical constraints.</p> <p><u>The site is available</u> The landowner has indicated that development could be delivered within 5 years.</p> <p><u>Achievability</u> Based on whole Plan viability evidence, development is considered</p>	<p><u>Positive Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Potential to accommodate up to 67 dwellings, including additional affordable houses• Site lies within close proximity to the town centre.• Site can assess local services including GP facilities, cash machine, bus services.• Site does not suffer from surface water flooding, nor is it within flood zone 2 or 3• Development will help support local economy and Kirkby town centre <p><u>Negative Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Loss of Greenfield land.• Negative impact on air quality.	<p><u>Highway / access</u> No issues identified.</p> <p><u>Topography</u> No issues identified.</p> <p><u>Neighbour</u> No bad neighbours.</p> <p><u>Flood Risk</u> Outside Floodzone 2&3</p> <p><u>Contamination</u> No known contamination</p>	<p><u>Infrastructure & Key Mitigation Requirements</u> Any development scheme should protect trees worthy of retention.</p> <p>Further investigation required to assess the flood risk. A SuDs scheme may be required</p>	<p><u>Conclusion</u> The Council considers that this is a suitable site to take forward as an allocation.</p> <p>The site is currently a housing allocation in the Ashfield Local Plan Review (2002). It is available and the principle of residential development has been established. There are no major physical constraints. As such, development is considered deliverable within 5 years.</p>

									to be achievable.				
K406	Warwick Close, Kirkby in Ashfield		24						<p><u>The site is suitable</u> The site is a former housing site located within the main urban area which is planned for redevelopment. It has good access to the public highway and has no major physical constraints.</p> <p><u>The site is available</u> The landowner has indicated that development could be delivered within 5 years.</p> <p><u>Achievability</u> Based on whole Plan viability evidence, development is considered to be achievable.</p>		<p><u>Highway / access</u> No issues identified.</p> <p><u>Topography</u> No issues identified.</p> <p><u>Neighbour</u> No issues identified.</p> <p><u>Flood Risk</u> Outside Floodzone 2 &3</p> <p><u>Contamination</u> No known contamination.</p>	<u>Infrastructure & Key Mitigation Requirements.</u>	<p><u>Conclusion</u> The Council considers that this is a suitable site to take forward as an allocation.</p> <p>The Council has plans to redevelop the site. Development is planned for delivery within the next 5 years.</p>

Hucknall – Housing Sites Selected for Allocation

SHLAA Reference	Location	Area (ha)	No. Dwellings	Greenfield (G) / Brownfield (B)	Green Belt Review Scores					Suitability, Availability, Achievability	Sustainability Appraisal Summary	Known Physical Constraints	Infrastructure & Key Mitigation Requirements	Conclusion
					Unrestricted sprawl	Prevent merging	Safeguard from encroachment	Preserve historic settlements	Total Score					
H09, H51, H52, H81	Broomhill Farm extension	27.37	465	G	1	3	4	1	9	<p><u>The site is suitable subject to policy change</u> Development of the site would be contrary to policy as it is designated Green Belt Land. The site is well contained by existing development.</p> <p><u>The site is available</u> The landowner has indicated that development could be delivered within 5-10 years.</p> <p><u>Achievability</u> Based on whole Plan viability evidence, development is considered to be achievable.</p>	<p><u>Positive Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase number of new dwellings. • Increase in the number of affordable homes. • Good access to open green spaces. • Improvement in health and social inclusion. • Supports regeneration of Hucknall Town Centre. • Highways capacity is available. • Access to a bus stop <p><u>Negative Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of Greenfield land. • Negative impact on air quality. • No access to GP • Small risk of surface water flooding. • Within area that could affect a SSSI and a SINC. • Green belt land. • New access road onto site and related viability. 	<p><u>Highway / access</u> Currently no direct access from the public highway.</p> <p><u>Topography</u> Minor constraints</p> <p><u>Neighbour</u> Site adjacent to the A611.</p> <p><u>Flood Risk</u> No issues identified</p> <p><u>Contamination</u></p> <p><u>Agricultural Land Quality</u> Grade 3 (Good-moderate)</p> <p><u>Natural Features</u> Small part of the site is a Local Wildlife Site</p>	<p><u>Infrastructure & Key Mitigation Requirements</u> Highways assessment suggests major infrastructure works required.</p> <p>A noise impact assessment would be required.</p> <p>Further investigation required to assess the flood risk. A SuDs scheme may be required</p>	<p><u>Conclusion</u> The Council considers that this is a suitable site to take forward as an allocation.</p> <p>This site is within the Green Belt and adjoins a site that is currently being developed. Its allocation and development would require a change in policy in relation to Green Belt land release.</p> <p>The site is very well contained by residential development and by the A611. In terms of meeting the five purposes of the Green Belt the combined site scores 9 out of 20. The Council considers that there are exceptional circumstances for Green Belt release as there is a need to provide affordable housing in Hucknall (as identified in the Nottingham Outer SHMA). There are currently physical access constraints but these can be mitigated via land in the ownership of the landowner.</p>
					1	3	5	1	10					
					2	1	1	1	5					
					2	3	5	1	11					

H20	Land South of Papplewick Lane	0.87	26	G	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	<p><u>The site is suitable</u> This site forms part of a larger housing site where development has commenced. This site is available and generally suitable.</p> <p><u>The site is available</u> It is expected to be deliverable within 10 to 15 years time towards the end of the development of the existing scheme.</p> <p><u>Achievability</u> Based on whole Plan viability evidence, development is considered to be achievable.</p>	<p><u>Positive Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase number of new dwellings. • Increase in the number of affordable homes. • Good access to open green spaces. • Good access to local services and facilities. • Improvement in health and social inclusion. • No impact on heritage assets. • Supports regeneration of Hucknall Town Centre. • Supports employment and the local economy. <p><u>Negative Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of Greenfield land. • Negative impact on air quality. • Risk of surface water flooding. 	<p><u>Highway / access</u> Access is currently constrained as the site does not adjoin the public highway. This can be resolved when the adjoining site is developed.</p> <p><u>Topography</u> No constraints – the land is quite level.</p> <p><u>Neighbour</u> The site is adjacent to a golf course and residential properties.</p> <p><u>Flood Risk</u> Adjacent to Floodzone 2</p> <p><u>Contamination</u> No known contamination</p>	<p><u>Infrastructure & Key Mitigation Requirements</u> Highway improvements required.</p>	<p><u>Conclusion</u> The Council considers that this is a suitable site to take forward as an allocation.</p> <p>The site is currently a housing allocation in the Ashfield Local Plan Review (2002). Development of the site would be appropriate as it is within the urban area and forms a logical infill. The site is well contained and partially well screened by mature trees. Currently the access constraints affect the delivery of development and it is anticipated that the site could be developed within the 5 to 10 year period as an extension to the ongoing development at Papplewick Lane.</p>
-----	-------------------------------	------	----	----------	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---	---	--	---	--

H31	Former Bamkin factory site	0.56	23	B	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	<p><u>The site is suitable</u> There are no major policy constraints. The site is in a predominantly residential area within the main urban boundary.</p> <p><u>The site is available</u> The landowner has indicated that development could be delivered within 5-10 years.</p> <p><u>Achievability</u> Based on whole Plan viability evidence, development is considered to be achievable.</p>	<p><u>Positive Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase number of new dwellings. • Increase in the number of affordable homes. • Good access to key services and facilities. • Good access to open green spaces. • Benefit to health and social inclusion. • No loss of designated wildlife sites. • Supports regeneration of Hucknall Town Centre. <p><u>Negative Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Negative impact on air quality. • Loss of employment land. • There is a surface water flooding issue and potentially an issue with flooding from rivers on the site. • The site has a locally listed heritage site upon it, this is likely to be lost as part of any scheme. 	<p><u>Highway / access</u> No issues identified</p> <p><u>Topography</u> No issues identified</p> <p><u>Neighbour</u> No issues identified</p> <p><u>Flood Risk</u> No issues identified</p> <p><u>Contamination</u> Likely existence of contamination</p>	<p><u>Infrastructure & Key Mitigation Requirements</u></p> <p>Phase I Desktop Survey and potentially further investigation where contamination is suspected.</p>	<p><u>Conclusion</u> The Council considers that the site is suitable to be taken forward for allocation.</p> <p>This site is subject to a lapsed outline planning permission for residential development and is therefore considered suitable and developable. The availability timescale has been informed by contact with the applicant.</p>
-----	----------------------------	------	----	---	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	--	--	--	--	--

H48	Ruffs Farm, Langton Avenue, Hucknall	0.48	10	G	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	<p><u>The site is suitable</u> The site is within the main urban area and is currently allocated as an allotment site. It has been determined that this is not a statutorily protected allotment and can be released for development if policy changes. There are access constraints which do not require third party land and can be mitigated. The site may be suitable if policy changes and access constraints can be mitigated.</p> <p><u>The site is available</u> The landowner has indicated that development could be delivered within 5-10 years.</p> <p><u>Achievability</u> Based on whole Plan viability evidence, development is considered to be achievable.</p>	<p><u>Positive Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase number of new dwellings. • Increase in the number of affordable homes. • Good access to open green spaces. • Good access to local services and facilities. • Improvement in health and social inclusion. • No impact on heritage assets. • Supports regeneration of Hucknall Town Centre. • Supports employment and the local economy. • Highways capacity is available. <p><u>Negative Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of Greenfield land. • Negative impact on air quality. 	<p><u>Highway / access</u> There are access constraints which do not require third party land and can be mitigated.</p> <p><u>Topography</u> No issues identified.</p> <p><u>Neighbour</u></p> <p><u>Flood Risk</u> No issues identified.</p> <p><u>Contamination</u> No known contamination. Large part of the site falls within 250m landfill buffer.</p>	<p><u>Infrastructure & Key Mitigation Requirements</u> Highway improvements required.</p>	<p><u>Conclusion</u> The Council considers that the site is suitable to be taken forward for allocation.</p> <p>The site, which is located within the main urban area of Hucknall, is well contained by residential development. It is in Council ownership. It is available and development is deliverable.</p>
-----	---	------	----	----------	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---	---	---	---	--

H49	Broomhill Farm, Nottingham Road, Hucknall	6.7	151	G	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	<p><u>The site is suitable</u> This site is allocated for housing in the Ashfield Local Plan Review (2002) and is considered suitable and achievable. Part of the site has planning permission and development has commenced.</p> <p><u>The site is available</u> The landowner has indicated that development of the remaining area is deliverable within 5 years.</p> <p><u>Achievability</u> Based on whole Plan viability evidence, development is considered to be achievable.</p>	<p><u>Positive Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase number of new dwellings. • Increase in the number of affordable homes. • Good access to open green spaces. • Good access to local services and facilities. • Improvement in health and social inclusion. • Supports regeneration of Hucknall Town Centre. • Supports employment and the local economy. • Highways capacity is available. <p><u>Negative Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of Greenfield land. • Negative impact on air quality. • The site within the area of a listed building. • Small risk of surface water flooding. 	<p><u>Highway / access</u> No issues identified.</p> <p><u>Topography</u> No issues identified.</p> <p><u>Neighbour</u> No issues identified.</p> <p><u>Flood Risk</u> No issues</p> <p><u>Contamination</u> Contamination issues have been overcome either through design or remediation, or the site has been assessed and declared acceptable for residential development - Former quarry on Eastern edge of site, assumed mediated.</p> <p><u>Agricultural Land Quality</u> Grade 3 (Good-moderate)</p> <p><u>Natural Environment</u> Multiple Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs) on site.</p>	<p><u>Infrastructure & Key Mitigation Requirements</u> Further investigation required to assess the flood risk. A SuDs scheme may be required.</p> <p>Retention of protected trees.</p>	<p><u>Conclusion</u> The Council considers that the site is suitable to be taken forward for allocation.</p> <p>The site is located within the main urban area of Hucknall. It is currently a housing allocation. It is available and development is deliverable.</p>
-----	---	-----	-----	---	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---	---	---	---	---

H80	Hucknall Town Football Club, Watnall Road, Hucknall	3.35	108	G	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	<p><u>The site is suitable</u> The site is developable in the longer term. It previously was subject to an outline planning permission for mixed use development (including residential use) which has now lapsed. The owners are seeking residential development on the whole site. Part of the site is an Employment Allocation and the suitability of the site would be dependant on whether the site is required for that purpose. Hucknall Town Football Club is planning to relocate. Once the new stadium has been completed the site will be available for development.</p> <p><u>The site is available</u> The landowner has indicated that development of the remaining area is deliverable beyond 5 years.</p> <p><u>Achievability</u> Based on whole Plan viability evidence, development is considered to be achievable.</p>	<p><u>Positive Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase number of new dwellings. • Increase in the number of affordable homes. • Good access to open green spaces. • Good access to local services and facilities. • Improvement in health and social inclusion. • No impact on heritage assets. • Supports regeneration of Hucknall Town Centre. • Supports employment and the local economy. • Highways capacity is available. <p><u>Negative Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of Greenfield land. • Negative impact on air quality. And the site's positioning next to main roads could lead to air pollution and noise issues for potential residents. • The site within the area of an SSSI. • Risk of surface water flooding. 	<p><u>Highway / access</u> A Transport Assessment has been approved in principle for this site, for 120 dwellings and 2500 square metres of office space.</p> <p><u>Topography</u> No issues identified.</p> <p><u>Neighbour</u> No issues identified.</p> <p><u>Flood Risk</u> No issues identified.</p> <p><u>Contamination</u> Likely existence of contamination, no detailed assessment made</p>	<p><u>Infrastructure & Key Mitigation Requirements</u> Phase I Desktop Survey and potentially further investigation where contamination is suspected.</p> <p>Further investigation required to assess the flood risk. A SuDs scheme may be required.</p>	<p><u>Conclusion</u> The Council considers that the site is suitable to be taken forward for allocation.</p> <p>The site is located within the main urban area of Hucknall. It previously benefited from outline planning consent for residential development. The landowner has indicated that the site will be developed in the future following the relocation of the Football Club. Development is deliverable beyond 5 years.</p>
-----	---	------	-----	---	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---	--	--	--	--

H88	Land at Bolsover Street	0.4	16	B	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	<p><u>The site is suitable</u> The site, which is adjacent to Hucknall town centre, is currently occupied by a vacant factory building to the west and a joinery company to the south.</p> <p><u>The site is available</u> The landowner has indicated that development of the remaining area is deliverable within 5 – 10 years.</p> <p><u>Achievability</u> Based on whole Plan viability evidence, development is considered to be achievable.</p>	<p><u>Positive Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase number of new dwellings. • Increase in the number of affordable homes. • Good access to open green spaces. • Good access to local services and facilities. • Improvement in health and social inclusion. • Supports regeneration of Hucknall Town Centre. • Supports employment and the local economy. <p><u>Negative Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Negative impact on air quality. • Risk of surface water flooding. • Potential risk to heritage asset. 	<p><u>Highway / access</u> No issues</p> <p><u>Topography</u> No issues</p> <p><u>Neighbour</u> Moderate adverse effects from adjacent occupiers or development of the site for housing - Adjacent factory - potential minor noise.</p> <p><u>Flood Risk</u> EA Maps suggest area at no risk from flooding</p> <p><u>Contamination</u> Likely existence of contamination, no detailed assessment made.</p>	<p><u>Infrastructure & Key Mitigation Requirements</u></p> <p>Retention of building on local heritage list.</p> <p>Phase I Desktop Survey and potentially further investigation where contamination is suspected.</p>	<p><u>Conclusion</u> The Council considers that the site is suitable to be taken forward for allocation.</p> <p>The site, which is adjacent to Hucknall town centre, is currently occupied by a vacant factory building to the west and a joinery company to the south. To the east, a clothing manufacturer and a derelict/vacant industrial site adjoins the site boundary. Residential development adjoins the site to the south, west and north. Subject to satisfactory design, the vacant factory would be suitable for conversion to residential use as the building is of local historic interest (demolition and redevelopment would not be supported by the Council). Residential development would also be suitable on the remainder of the site subject to a suitable outcome for the business (i.e. Relocation to a suitable area) and the design of any future scheme.</p>
-----	-------------------------	-----	----	---	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---	---	--	---	--

H97	High Leys Road	0.32	10	G	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	<p><u>The site is suitable</u> The site is located within the main urban area of Hucknall which is considered a sustainable location in terms of access to local services. It has good access to the public highway and has no major physical constraints.</p> <p><u>The site is available</u> The landowner has indicated that development could be delivered within 5-10 years.</p> <p><u>Achievability</u> Based on whole Plan viability evidence, development is considered to be achievable.</p>	<p><u>Positive Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase number of new dwellings. • Increase in the number of affordable homes. • Good access to key services and facilities. • Good access to open green spaces. • Benefit to health and social inclusion. • No loss of designated wildlife sites. • Supports regeneration of Hucknall Town Centre. <p><u>Negative Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Negative impact on air quality. • There is a surface water flooding issue. 	<p><u>Highway / access</u> Third party land required</p> <p><u>Topography</u> No issues</p> <p><u>Neighbour</u> No issues</p> <p><u>Flood Risk</u> EA Maps suggest area at no risk from flooding</p> <p><u>Contamination</u> No known contamination</p>	<p><u>Infrastructure & Key Mitigation Requirements</u> Heavy tree coverage on site - tree survey required.</p> <p>Third party land required to gain access to the site.</p> <p>Further investigation required to assess the flood risk. A SuDs scheme may be required.</p> <p>Ecology Assessment required.</p>	<p><u>Conclusion</u> The Council considers that the site is suitable to be taken forward for allocation.</p> <p>The site is allocated for residential use and the principle of development has been established. There are physical constraints which restrict development of the site in the short term. There is heavy tree coverage on site but the majority of this is scrub and it would not prevent development. Further, there are access constraints and third party land would be required to overcome this constraint. However, there are no physical constraints in terms of access and this could be appropriately resolved.</p>
-----	----------------	------	----	---	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---	--	---	--	--

H98	Seven Stars Public House and adjoining land, West Street	0.7	25	G/B	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	<p><u>The site is suitable</u> The site is located within the main urban area of Hucknall which is considered a sustainable location in terms of access to local services. It has good access to the public highway and has no major physical constraints.</p> <p><u>The site is available</u> The landowner has indicated that development could be delivered within 5 years.</p> <p><u>Achievability</u> Based on whole Plan viability evidence, development is considered to be achievable.</p>	<p><u>Positive Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase number of new dwellings. • Increase in the number of affordable homes. • Good access to key services and facilities. • Good access to open green spaces. • Benefit to health and social inclusion. • No loss of designated wildlife sites. • Supports regeneration of Hucknall Town Centre. <p><u>Negative Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Negative impact on air quality. • There is a surface water flooding issue and potentially an issue with flooding from rivers on the site. • The site has a locally listed heritage site upon it, this could be affected by development. 	<p><u>Highway / access</u> There are no highway constraints.</p> <p><u>Topography</u> No issues</p> <p><u>Neighbour</u> Slight adverse effects from adjacent occupiers - Adjacent to a builders yard.</p> <p><u>Flood Risk</u> EA Maps suggest area at no risk from flooding.</p> <p><u>Contamination</u> Likely existence of contamination.</p>	<p><u>Infrastructure & Key Mitigation Requirements</u> Whilst there are no known ecological constraints, given the amount of unmanaged vegetation and vacant buildings on the site, an ecology assessment would be required if a planning application is submitted. If ecological constraints are identified, the owner/ applicant would need to demonstrate that appropriate mitigation can be achieved where necessary.</p> <p>Phase I Desktop Survey and potentially further investigation where contamination is suspected.</p>	<p><u>Conclusion</u> The Council considers that the site is suitable to be taken forward for allocation.</p> <p>The site is located within the main urban area of Hucknall. The Seven Stars Public House is a Local Heritage Asset. Consequently, the Public House is considered to be suitable for conversion into residential accommodation subject to satisfactory design and configuration arrangements. The remainder of the site is located within a residential setting and is considered to be suitable for residential development subject to any future scheme being of a good quality design.</p>
-----	--	-----	----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	--	--	--	---	--

H100	Land adjacent to the Arrow Centre, Annesley Road	1.48	60	G	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	<p><u>The site is suitable</u> The site is located within the main urban area of Hucknall which is considered a sustainable location in terms of access to local services. It has good access to the public highway and has no major physical constraints.</p> <p><u>The site is available</u> The landowner has indicated that development could be delivered within 5-10 years.</p> <p><u>Achievability</u> Based on whole Plan viability evidence, development is considered to be achievable.</p>	<p><u>Positive Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase number of new dwellings. • Increase in the number of affordable homes. • Good access to key services and facilities. • Good access to open green spaces. • Benefit to health and social inclusion. • No loss of designated wildlife sites. • Supports regeneration of Hucknall Town Centre. <p><u>Negative Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Negative impact on air quality. • There is a surface water flooding issue. 	<p><u>Highway / access</u> Current information suggests sufficient capacity, no detailed assessment made.</p> <p><u>Topography</u> No issues</p> <p><u>Neighbour</u> Slight adverse effects from adjacent occupiers or development of the site for housing - The site adjoins the A611. Noise levels could be mitigated through good design.</p> <p><u>Flood Risk</u> EA maps</p> <p><u>Contamination</u> No known contamination</p>	<p><u>Infrastructure & Key Mitigation Requirements</u></p> <p>Further investigation required to assess the flood risk. A SuDs scheme may be required.</p>	<p><u>Conclusion</u> The Council considers that the site is suitable to be taken forward for allocation.</p> <p>The site is located within the main urban area in Hucknall. To the east of the site is a large residential estate. To the south and west, the site is contained by the boundary of a secondary school and the A611. Residential development would be in keeping with the character of the surrounding area. Currently the land is allocated for employment use. An analysis of evidence taken from the 2015 Employment Land Forecast Study indicates that Ashfield has a slight excess of allocated employment land. As such, the site is considered to be suitable for residential development.</p>
------	--	------	----	----------	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---	--	--	---	--

Sites Selected for Allocation - Rurals

SHLAA Ref.	Location	Area (ha)	No. Dwellings	Greenfield (G) / Brownfield (B)	Green Belt Review Scores					Suitability, Availability, Achievability	Sustainability Appraisal Summary	Known Physical Constraints	Infrastructure & Key Mitigation Requirements	Conclusion
					Unrestricted sprawl	Prevent merging	Safeguard from encroachment	Preserve historic settlements	Total Score					
V15, V16 & V17	Church Lane, Underwood	0.79	21	G	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	<p><u>The site is suitable</u> The site is located within the settlement of Underwood which is considered a sustainable location in terms of access to local services. It has good access to the public highway. There is heavy tree coverage on some areas of the site. An initial tree survey undertaken by the Council's Forestry Manager suggests that there may be a requirement to retain some trees. A more in-depth assessment would be required at a later stage. An ecology assessment would also be required as the site has the potential to form a habitat for protected species.</p> <p><u>The site is available</u> The landowner has indicated that development could be delivered within 5 years.</p> <p><u>Achievability</u> Based on whole Plan viability evidence, development is considered to be achievable.</p>	<p><u>Positive Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Affordable housing likely to be part of development. Close to bus stop and primary school Development would help support local economy/employment. Development would support Ashfield's town centres. <p><u>Negative Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Surface water flooding in the area Air and noise pollution Impact on landscape Loss of Greenfield land Locally listed heritage site nearby the site. Mine shaft entrances upon the site. No GP near the site. 	<p><u>Highway / access</u> Current access to Church Street requires upgrading.</p> <p><u>Topography</u> The site contains mature trees and remnants of a former orchard.</p> <p><u>Neighbour Issues</u> None</p> <p><u>Flood Risk</u> Outside Floodzone 2 & 3.</p> <p><u>Contamination</u> No known issues.</p> <p><u>Agricultural Land Quality</u> Grade 4 (Poor)</p>	<p><u>Infrastructure & Key Mitigation Requirements</u> A tree survey would be required to assess the value of the trees on site.</p> <p>Ecological survey would be required.</p> <p>Public highway requirement required.</p> <p>Further investigation required to assess the flood risk. A SuDs scheme may be required.</p>	<p><u>Conclusion</u> The Council considers that the site is suitable to be taken forward for allocation.</p> <p>The site is located within the Named Settlement of Underwood within a residential area. The landowners have indicated that the site is available for development and it is deliverable within the Plan period.</p> <p>The majority of the site is considered to be suitable for development. However, there may be a requirement for the retention of trees to the south of the site. An ecology survey would also be required to determine if there are any protected species on the site.</p>

V140	Westdale Road, Jacksdale	2.14	58	G	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	<p><u>The site is suitable</u> The site is located within the settlement of Jacksdale which is considered a sustainable location in terms of access to local services. The site is available and development is deliverable. It has good access to the public highway and has no major physical constraints.</p> <p><u>The site is available</u> The landowner has indicated that development could be delivered within 5 years.</p> <p><u>Achievability</u> Based on whole Plan viability evidence, development is considered to be achievable.</p>	<p><u>Positive Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential to accommodate up to 58 dwellings. Site is within 500m of accessible open space and 800m of a, primary school, bus stop. Potential to deliver 25% affordable housing. Development would help support local economy/employment. Development would support Ashfield's town centres. <p><u>Negative Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of greenfield land Within a minerals safeguarded area: coal measures Negative impact on air quality Moderate landscape impact 	<p><u>Highway / access</u> The site has good access to the public highway.</p> <p><u>Topography</u> Undulating. Rises northwards to meet Wagstaff Lane to the north.</p> <p><u>Neighbour Issues</u> None</p> <p><u>Flood Risk</u> Outside Floodzone 2 & 3</p> <p><u>Contamination</u> No known contamination.</p> <p><u>Agricultural Land Quality</u> Grade 4 (poor)</p>	<p><u>Infrastructure & Key Mitigation Requirements</u></p> <p>The site is in an area where the potential land stability and other safety risks associated with former coal mining activities are likely to be greatest. They include, for example, areas of known or suspected shallow coal mining, recorded mine entries and areas of former surface mining. As such, the Coal Authority would require a Coal Mining Risk Assessment to be undertaken prior to development taking place.</p> <p>Further investigation required to assess the flood risk. A SuDs scheme may be required.</p>	<p><u>Conclusion</u> The Council considers that the site is suitable to be taken forward for allocation.</p> <p>Development of the site would be appropriate as it is well contained and forms a logical infill within the main urban area. It has access to a range of services and facilities and would contribute towards meeting the strategic objectives of the Local Plan.</p>
V141	Westdale Road, Jacksdale	0.51	15	G	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	<p><u>The site is suitable</u> The site is located within the settlement of Jacksdale which is considered a sustainable location in terms of access to local services.</p> <p><u>The site is available</u> The landowner has indicated that development could be delivered within 5-10 years.</p> <p><u>Achievability</u> Based on whole Plan viability evidence, development is considered to be achievable.</p>	<p><u>Positive Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential to accommodate up to 14 dwellings. Site is within 500m of accessible open space and 800m of a, primary school and bus stop. Potential to deliver 25% affordable housing. Development would help support local economy/employment. <p><u>Negative Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of greenfield land. Within a minerals safeguarded area: coal measures. Negative impact on air quality. Moderate landscape impact. Surface water flooding could be an issue. 	<p><u>Highway / access</u> No direct access to public highway. Access via V140.</p> <p><u>Topography</u> No issues.</p> <p><u>Neighbour Issues</u> None.</p> <p><u>Flood Risk</u> Outside Floodzone 2 & 3.</p> <p><u>Contamination</u> No known contamination.</p>	<p><u>Infrastructure & Key Mitigation Requirements</u> Third party land requires for access.</p> <p>The site is in an area where the potential land stability and other safety risks associated with former coal mining activities are likely to be greatest. They include, for example, areas of known or suspected shallow coal mining, recorded mine entries and areas of former surface mining. As such, the Coal Authority would require a Coal Mining Risk Assessment to be undertaken prior to development taking place.</p> <p>SuDs may be required to address any surface water flooding.</p>	<p><u>Conclusion</u> The Council considers that the site is suitable to be taken forward for allocation.</p> <p>The site is located within the named settlement of Jacksdale within a residential area. The site has reasonable access to a range of services. The landscape is overgrown with shrubs and weeds and has an unmaintained appearance. Development would provide an opportunity to enhance the appearance of this site.</p>
V84 & V87	Park Lane, Selston	9.2	110	G	1	1	4	1	7	<p><u>The site is suitable subject to policy change</u> The site is in Green Belt</p>	<p><u>Positive Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential to accommodate up to 109 dwellings. 	<p><u>Highway / access</u> Access from the public highway is currently</p>	<p><u>Infrastructure & Key Mitigation Requirements</u> Further investigation required</p>	<p><u>Conclusion</u> The Council considers that the site is suitable to be taken</p>

										<p>and is currently unsuitable for development. Access from the public highway could be achieved via SHLAA site ref. V87.</p> <p><u>The site is available</u> The landowner has indicated that development could be delivered within 5 years.</p> <p><u>Achievability</u> Based on whole Plan viability evidence, development is considered to be achievable.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase in the number of affordable homes. • Good access to key services and facilities. • Will help support the local economy. <p><u>Negative Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of Greenfield land. • Green Belt • Site lies within minerals safeguarding area for coal. • Negative impact on air quality. • Potential contamination from historic landfill sites. • Site lies within the SSSI consultation zone 	<p>restricted. The only suitable access would be via the adjacent site on Park Lane.</p> <p><u>Topography</u> No issues.</p> <p><u>Neighbour</u> Noise levels are high due to the proximity of the M1 motorway. Partly within M1 Motorway Buffer Zone</p> <p><u>Flood Risk</u> Outside Floodzones 2 & 3</p> <p><u>Contamination</u> Contamination Suspected Historic landfill within site; Embankment & Pond, Tramway & Engine House.</p> <p><u>Agricultural Land Quality</u> Grade 3 (Good-moderate)</p>	<p>to assess the flood risk. A SuDs scheme may be required.</p> <p>Any planning permission would be subject to conditions requiring at least a Phase I Desktop Survey and potentially further investigation where contamination is suspected. In cases where contamination is suspected, developers are encouraged to contact the Council's Contaminated Land Officer</p>	<p>forward for allocation.</p> <p>The Nottingham Outer Strategic Housing Market Area indicates that there is a need for additional housing in the rural area of the District, which includes the villages of Selston, Jacksdale and Underwood. Selston is the largest of the three settlements and it has a good level of service provision. The Green Belt has constrained development in this area since it was designated in the late 1980s. The Council considers that it is appropriate to seek to locate development in this area to support the retention of local services and facilities.</p> <p>The site forms a logical rounding off of the settlement of Selston. It has good access to services and facilities and could deliver a significant amount of new housing to help meet the needs of the area. The site scores 7 out of a potential 20 in terms of meeting the five purposes of the Green Belt. Taking the evidence into consideration, the Council considers that there are exceptional circumstances for an amendment to the Green Belt boundary to accommodate housing growth that will help sustain the rural communities.</p>
V346, V347, V348	Land rear of Bull and Butcher Public House, Nottingham Road, Selston	6.5	137	G	1	1	5	1	8	<p><u>The site is suitable subject to policy change</u> The site is in Green Belt and development is therefore currently contrary to policy. The site is an area where coal mining activities are likely to be greatest. A small area of the site would be unsuitable for development due to historic mines entries. The Coal Authority would require a Coal Mining Risk Assessment prior to any</p>	<p><u>Positive Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Boost to local economy • Affordable housing likely to be part of development. • Boost to town centre • Close to bus stop and primary school <p><u>Negative Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Surface water flooding in the area • Air and noise pollution • Impact on landscape • Loss of Greenfield land • Locally listed heritage site 	<p><u>Highway / access</u> Access constraints.</p> <p><u>Topography</u> No issues</p> <p><u>Neighbour Issues</u> None</p> <p><u>Flood Risk</u> Outside Floodzone 2 & 3</p> <p><u>Contamination</u> No known contamination. Special consideration for possible shallow coal mining</p>	<p><u>Infrastructure & Key Mitigation Requirements</u> An appropriate integrated highway solution is required.</p> <p>Coal Mining Risk Assessment to determine remediation works where necessary.</p> <p>Further investigation required to assess the flood risk. A SuDs scheme may be required.</p>	<p><u>Conclusion</u> The Council considers that the site is suitable to be taken forward for allocation.</p> <p>The Nottingham Outer Strategic Housing Market Area indicates that there is a need for additional housing in the rural area of the District, which includes the villages of Selston, Jacksdale and Underwood. Selston is the largest of the three settlements and it has a good level of service provision. The Green Belt has constrained</p>

									<p>development taking place. The Coal Authority has indicated that this could potentially be appropriately mitigated and should not prevent development of the site.</p> <p><u>The site is available</u> The landowner has indicated that development could be delivered within 5 years.</p> <p><u>Achievability</u> Based on whole Plan viability evidence, development is considered to be achievable.</p>	<p>nearby the site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mine shaft entrances upon the site. • No GP near the site. 	<p>workings.</p> <p><u>Agricultural Land Quality</u> Grade 4 (Poor)</p>		<p>development in this area since it was designated in the late 1980s. The Council considers that it is appropriate to seek to locate development in this area to support the retention of local services and facilities.</p> <p>The site forms a logical rounding off of the settlement of Selston. It has good access to services and facilities and could deliver a significant amount of new housing to help meet the needs of the area. The site scores 8 out of a potential 20 in terms of meeting the five purposes of the Green Belt. Taking the evidence into consideration, the Council considers that there are exceptional circumstances for an amendment to the Green Belt boundary to accommodate housing growth that will help sustain the rural communities.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---	---	--	--

Housing Sites Not Allocated – Sutton & Kirkby

SHLAA ref	Location	Area (ha)	No. Dwellings	Greenfield (G) / brownfield (B)	Green Belt Review Scores					Suitability, Availability, Achievability	Sustainability Appraisal Summary	Known Physical Constraints	Conclusion
					Unrestricted sprawl	Prevent merging	Safeguarding encroachment	Preserve historic settlements	Total Score				
SM42	Rostellen, Derby Road, Mansfield	0.28	8	G	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	<p><u>Suitability</u> The site is in designated Countryside and development would be contrary to Policy EV2 (ALPR,2002). The site has no suitable access. This could be achieved via third party land but this would require tree felling resulting in a poorly designed, backland scheme with a very long access road. Alternatively access could be achieved via demolition of the semi-detached property but this is not likely to be feasible.</p> <p><u>Availability</u> The landowner has indicated that the site is available but the access constraints restrict the deliverability of development.</p> <p><u>Achievability</u> Based on whole Plan viability evidence, development is considered to be achievable.</p>	<p><u>Positive Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site will bring forward a small number of dwellings to meet objective housing needs. It is located where there is access to open space and the wider countryside, which has the potential to facilitate a healthy lifestyle. It is also located within 800m of a bus stop with a bus services offering travel choice, facilitating access to services and reducing social exclusion. <p><u>Negative Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Greenfield site It is poorly connected to the settlement of Mansfield and is remote from the urban areas of Sutton in Ashfield and Kirkby in Ashfield. The site is of insufficient size to contribute towards affordable homes and other infrastructure requirements. 	<p><u>Highways / Access</u> There is currently no suitable access point from the public highway. This would require demolition of the property which is semi-detached.</p> <p><u>Topography</u> No issues</p> <p><u>Neighbour</u> No issues</p> <p><u>Flood Risk</u> Outside Floodzone 2 & 3</p> <p><u>Contamination</u> No known contamination</p> <p><u>Agricultural Land Quality</u> Grade 4 (poor)</p>	<p><u>Conclusion</u> The Council considers that this site should not be taken forward as an allocation within the Preferred Approach Local Plan.</p> <p>The site is poorly connected to the urban area and there is no suitable access into the site from the Public Highway. Given the capacity of the site to accommodate development, it is considered unsuitable to take forward as a housing allocation.</p>
S48	Main Street, Huthwaite	2.5	56	G	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	<p><u>Suitability</u> The site is designated countryside. Development of the site is would logically round off the settlement of Huthwaite. The site has good access to the public highway and it</p>	<p><u>Positive Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site is anticipated to deliver a number of dwellings and is of sufficient size to contribute towards affordable housing and other infrastructure requirements. 	<p><u>Ownership</u> Currently the adjacent Golf Club has a tenancy on the site which expires in 2020. The landowner has indicated that the site will be available when the tenancy expires. As such, it is</p>	<p><u>Conclusion</u> The Council considers that this site should not be taken forward as an allocation within the Preferred Approach Local Plan.</p>

										<p>is well contained and partially well screened by mature trees. The site would not be available in the short-medium term due to its current use as a golf driving range and the associated tenancy agreement (to 2020). However, the site is capable of delivering development in the medium to long term (beyond 2020). Whilst the site is designated Countryside it is not particularly open in character and is urbanised influenced by its connection to Huthwaite and Brierley Forest Park. Development would have a low impact on the landscape and would integrate well into the settlement. With regard to the landscape, the site scores very well in terms of capacity to accommodate development (1 out of 3 points).</p> <p><u>The site is available</u> The landowner has indicated that development could be delivered in 5 to 10 years.</p> <p><u>Achievability</u> Based on whole Plan viability evidence, development is considered to be achievable.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site has very good access to the open space and the rights of way network giving access to the open countryside. The size of the site is such that additional on site open space will be a requirement. From a landscape perspective it is identified as having a low landscape impact and development will not have a significant effect on the surrounding landscape. The site has good access to services and is anticipated to reduce social inequality. It is also expected to have a minor impact positive impact on the town centre of Sutton in Ashfield. <p><u>Negative Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site is current part of the golf course, therefore there may well be a negative impact on the local economy as well as a negative impact in terms of the loss of a Greenfield site and recreation value. It is also in a Minerals Safeguarding Area for Limestone. However, it is emphasised that this does not necessary prevent the site from being development. The impact on the site will need to be determined with the Minerals Authority and ultimately prior extraction could take place before development. The sewerage works, which serves sites in Huthwaite is at near capacity. However, this will not prevent development but will potentially impact on when development can be implemented as it may require the sewerage works to be upgraded. 	<p>developable within the 5 to 10 year delivery tranche.</p> <p><u>Highways / Access</u> There are no access constraints. Access is achievable via Main Street.</p> <p><u>Topography</u> The site is fairly level with a number of raised plateaus. There is little vegetation on the site due to the levelling works which have taken place. On the southern boundary is a large bund. Copse/ woodland are located on the northern and eastern boundaries.</p> <p><u>Neighbour</u> There are no neighbour constraints. The site is adjacent to a golf course, residential area and small employment site.</p> <p><u>Flood Risk</u> Flood Zone 1 and no surface water flooding identified. Any surface water flooding issues identified can be mitigated through the incorporation of an appropriately designed SuDS system.</p>	<p>The site is located within the countryside and adjoins the main urban area of Huthwaite. It is currently in use as a golf driving range. Loss of the site is likely to have a negative impact on the local economy. It would also result in the loss of a sport and leisure facility in the area. As such, it is not considered to be suitable.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

S50	Rear of Hill Top Farm, Huthwaite	0.4	12	G	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	<p><u>Suitability</u> The site is in designated Countryside and development would be contrary to Policy EV2 (ALPR,2002). The site has no suitable access and would require third party land to make improvements.</p> <p><u>The site is available</u> The landowner has indicated that development could be delivered in 5 to 10 years.</p> <p><u>Achievability</u> Based on whole Plan viability evidence, development is considered to be achievable.</p>	<p><u>Positive Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site will contribute a small amount of dwellings but the size of the site means that it is unlikely to contribute to affordable housing and wider infrastructure requirements based on the Council's Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document 2009. The site has good access to the countryside and local services. It is also expected to have a minor impact positive impact on the town centre of Sutton in Ashfield <p><u>Negative Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As greenfield land it has the potential to have a negative impact in terms of agricultural production, habitat/species and amenity/recreation value. It is in a Minerals Safeguarding Area. However, it is emphasised that this does not necessary prevent the site from being development. The impact on the site will need to be determined with the Minerals Authority and ultimately prior extraction could take place before development. The sewerage works, which serves sites in Huthwaite is at near capacity. However, this will not prevent development but will potentially impact on when development can be implemented as it may require the sewerage works to be upgraded. 	<p><u>Highways / Access</u> The public highway is currently substandard and would require third party land to make improvements.</p> <p><u>Flood Risk</u> Outside Floodzone 2 & 3</p> <p><u>Topography</u> The site is fairly level with a number of raised plateaus. There is little vegetation on the site due to the levelling works which have taken place. On the southern boundary is a large bund. Copse/ woodland are located on the northern and eastern boundaries.</p> <p><u>Neighbour</u> No issues identified</p> <p><u>Contamination</u> No known contamination</p>	<p><u>Conclusion</u> The Council considers that this site should not be taken forward as an allocation within the Preferred Approach Local Pan.</p> <p>Development of the site would be appropriate as it is within the urban area and would logically round off the settlement of Huthwaite. The site is well contained and partially well screened by mature trees. Currently the access constraints significantly affect the delivery of development. The Council does not consider the site to be suitable to take forward for allocation due to the uncertainty surrounding the deliverability of development.</p>
-----	----------------------------------	-----	----	---	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---	--	---	---

S54	Barker Street, Huthwaite	7.6	17 1	G	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	<p><u>Suitability</u> The site is currently designated as Countryside and is considered to be unsuitable for residential development. This policy will be reviewed through the Local Plan process.</p> <p>Access to the site from the public highway is severely constrained by existing development. The road leading into the site is a cul de sac and consists of a large amount of terraced housing. On street parking restricts access and there is a primary school at the end of the road which creates an increase in traffic. It is unclear how this could be mitigated and no solution has been identified.</p> <p><u>Availability</u> The landowner has indicated that the site is available. However, given the access constraints development is not considered to be deliverable.</p> <p><u>Achievability</u> Unknown due to access constraints.</p>	<p><u>Positive Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site could accommodate approximately 170 dwellings if access constraints could be mitigated; It could contribute towards affordable housing and other infrastructure requirements The site has good access to the countryside via the footpath network. Part of the site is within 300 metres of a recreation ground. It is anticipated from the size of the site that that a recreation ground would need to be provided as part of any development which should be located close to Barker Street. It has good access to services in Huthwaite and is anticipated to enhance social equality. It is expected to have a minor positive impact on the town centre of Sutton in Ashfield <p><u>Negative Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development is anticipated to have a high landscape impact. Development may result in a loss of hedgerows. There is potential for development to have a negative impact on the adjacent Local Wildlife Site. The site is Greenfield land. It is identified as Grade 2 Agricultural Land It is in a Minerals Safeguarding Area for Coal Measures. A small area of the site is identified as potentially having surface water flooding. The sewerage works in the area is near capacity. This may delay development. 	<p><u>Highways / Access</u> Major access constraints with no identified solution.</p> <p><u>Flooding</u> Outside Floodzone 2 &3. Council records indicate that surface water flooding occurs within the area. This could potentially be mitigated through the incorporation of an on-site SuDS scheme. A flood risk assessment would be required as part of any future planning application.</p> <p><u>Topography</u> Gently undulating</p> <p><u>Neighbour</u> No issues</p> <p><u>Contamination</u> No Known Contamination - Coal mining area and in a 250m landfill buffer. North West corner adjacent to licenced landfill.</p> <p><u>Agricultural Land Quality</u> Grade 2 (Very good) – Part of site. Grade 4 (Poor) to North.</p>	<p><u>Conclusion</u> The Council considers that this site should not be taken forward as an allocation within the Preferred Approach Local Pan.</p> <p>The site is currently designated Countryside. It has a high landscape value and a low capacity to accommodate development. Access to the site from the public highway is severely constrained by existing development. The road leading into the site is a cul-de-sac and consists of a large amount of terraced housing. On street parking restricts access and there is a primary school at the end of the road which creates an increase in traffic. It is unclear how this could be mitigated and no solution has been identified.</p>
-----	--------------------------	-----	---------	---	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	--	--	--	---

S62	Searsby Road (part of S67)	6.32	161	G	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	<p><u>Suitability</u> The site is designated as Countryside and is currently unsuitable for development. Whilst the site is contained to some extent by residential development to the north and east, it is quite open in character. Access to the public highway may be problematic if the site was developed in isolation as landownership may create restrictions. Council records indicate that there is a problem with surface water flooding. This could potentially be mitigated. The Environment Agency has advised that a flood risk assessment would be required.</p> <p><u>Availability</u> The landowners have indicated that the site can be released for development. Development could commence within the next 5 years.</p> <p><u>Achievability</u> Based on whole Plan viability evidence, development is considered to be achievable.</p>	<p><u>Positive Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site would deliver approximately 160 new dwellings. • It would increase in the number of affordable homes. • There is good access to a bus service and the railway station. • It would result in an improvement in health and social inclusion. • There would be no loss of designated wildlife sites. • There would be no impact on heritage assets. • There are opportunities to improve the GI network (Local GI route S12). • Development would support town centre regeneration. • Development would support employment growth and the local economy. <p><u>Negative Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poor existing access to Primary School and GP • Loss of Greenfield land. • Loss of Grade 3 agricultural land. • Negative impact on air quality. • High impact on the landscape. 	<p><u>Highways/Access</u> Third party land required to form an access into the site.</p> <p><u>Topography</u> Gently undulating</p> <p><u>Neighbour</u> No issues identified</p> <p><u>Flood Risk</u> Outside Floodzone 2 & 3</p> <p><u>Contamination</u> No Known contamination</p> <p><u>Agricultural Land Quality</u> Grade 3 (Good-moderate)</p>	<p><u>Conclusion</u> The Council considers that this site should not be taken forward as an allocation within the Preferred Approach Local Plan.</p> <p>The site is located adjacent to a residential area to the east of Sutton in Ashfield. The landscape is very prominent and development would have an adverse impact. The Landscape Assessment identifies that the effect on the landscape would be high resulting in a total or major alteration to key elements, features or characteristics of the local or wider landscape resource, so that post development the baseline situation will be fundamentally changed. Development of the site would result in the creation of a second large urban extension. This does not accord with the Council's Strategy of two smaller urban extensions with dispersed growth across the District. As such, it is not considered suitable to be taken forward.</p>
-----	----------------------------	------	-----	---	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	--	--	--	---

S63	Chesterfield Road, Huthwaite	1.6	30	G	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	<p><u>Suitability</u> The site is designated Countryside and development is contrary to policy. The landscape is very prominent; it is a steeply sloping hillside which is visible from the wider area and access is very problematic from Chesterfield Road.</p> <p><u>Availability</u> The landowner has indicated that the site is available.</p> <p><u>Achievability</u> Based on whole Plan viability evidence, development is considered to be achievable.</p>	<p><u>Positive Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site is anticipated to deliver 30 dwellings and is anticipated to contribute towards affordable housing and other infrastructure requirements. It has excellent links to the GI network. The site has good access to services and is anticipated to reduce social inequality. It is expected to have a minor impact positive impact on the town centre of Sutton in Ashfield <p><u>Negative Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development would have a high impact on the landscape. The location of part of the site brings it within a Coal Mining Risk Area which may require mitigation measures. Development may have a negative impact on the adjoining Local Wildlife Site. The site is Greenfield land. It has the potential to have a negative impact in terms of agricultural production, habitat/species and amenity/recreation value. It is in a Minerals Safeguarding Area for Coal Measures. This does not necessary prevent the site from being development. The impact on the site will need to be determined with the Minerals Authority The sewerage works is at near capacity. This is likely to delay development. 	<p><u>Highway / access</u> Highway constraints to the north of the site (Chesterfield Road).</p> <p><u>Topography</u> Steeply sloping to the north of the site.</p> <p><u>Neighbour</u> No issues identified</p> <p><u>Flood Risk</u> Outside Floodzone 2 & 3</p> <p><u>Contamination</u> Contamination Suspected - Approximately 20% of site is historic landfill; Brickyard excavations/ factories & works.</p> <p><u>Agricultural Land Quality</u> Grade 4 (Poor)</p>	<p><u>Conclusion</u> The Council considers that this site should not be taken forward as an allocation within the Preferred Approach Local Pan.</p> <p>Development of the land to the north would not be appropriate as it is very steep, prominent and of high landscape value.</p>
-----	------------------------------	-----	----	---	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	--	---	--	--

S67 (include K23, K33, S60 and S62)	Sutton East	74.0	1000	G	N /A	N /A	N/ A	N/ A	N/ A	<p><u>Suitability</u> The site is designated as Countryside and is unsuitable for development. This site forms a natural break between Sutton and Kirkby. This could be maintained through sensitive masterplanning. Part of the site is adjacent to the urban boundary and is in close proximity to a major public transport node. Consequently, it may be suitable following a review of policy through the Local Plan process.</p> <p>Part of the site is a registered landfill and this will require a further assessment prior to any future development. There is also a flood risk from the run off of surface water onto adjacent land/properties. This could potentially be mitigated.</p> <p><u>The site is available</u> The landowners have indicated that development could be delivered within 5 years. However, given the size of the site and infrastructure requirements, it is likely to take a number of years to develop.</p> <p><u>Achievability</u> Based on whole Plan viability evidence, development is considered to be achievable.</p>	<p><u>Positive Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site would significantly boost the number of new homes in the District and would increase in the number of affordable homes. Good access to a bus service and the railway station. Consequently, it would result in an improvement in health and social inclusion. Development would not result in the loss of designated wildlife sites, nor would it impact on heritage assets. Provides an opportunity to improve the GI network (Local GI route S12). Supports town centre regeneration, employment growth and the local economy. <p><u>Negative Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site has poor access to Primary School but this could be mitigated through on site provision. Poor access to a GP service. Development would result in the loss of Greenfield land which is Grade 3 agricultural land. It would have a negative impact on air quality. High landscape score on some areas of the site (areas on higher ground towards the centre of the site score 3 out of 3 for capacity to accommodate development). 	<p><u>Highways / Access</u> No access constraints.</p> <p><u>Contamination</u> Contamination suspected – South-eastern part of site is a historic licensed landfill site and will require a phase 1 desktop survey with potentially further investigation. Northern part of the site (approx 4.5 ha) is also a licensed landfill site. A land quality audit report has been submitted by the landowner which suggests the site would be suitable for residential development following remediation works – further assessments may be required at a later stage.</p> <p><u>Surface Water Flooding</u> Some surface water flooding from the land affecting properties on Searby Road to the north. The Environment Agency has advised that a flood risk assessment would be required.</p> <p><u>Neighbour</u> No issues associated with the majority of the site. Industrial development adjoins the south western corner of the site.</p> <p><u>Agricultural Land</u> Grade 3</p>	<p><u>Conclusion</u> The Council considers that the whole of this site should not be taken forward as an allocation within the Preferred Approach Local Plan.</p> <p>Whilst parts of site S67 are considered suitable to be taken forward as housing allocations (K23, K33, S60), parts of S67 are not considered suitable (Site ref. S62).</p> <p>This site cannot be relied upon for delivering development within the Plan period as it can only be accessed via the adjoining sites (K33 and S60). This conclusion is based on historic evidence of the delivery of development on large urban extensions.</p> <p>Site S62 has also been assessed as having a high landscape value and a low capacity to accommodate development. The Landscape Assessment identifies that the effect on the landscape would be high, resulting in a total or major alteration to key elements , features or characteristics of the local or wider landscape resource, so that post development the baseline situation will be fundamentally changed.</p>
---	-------------	------	------	---	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------	---	--	---	---

S73	Tibshelf Road, Teversal	0.5	5	G	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	<p><u>Suitability</u> The site is designated Countryside and adjoins the settlement boundary of Fackley. It is located in an area which has more limited access to services. Also, there is currently a flood risk from the highway. This would need to be resolved if the site was taken forward. Approximately 30% of the site is undevelopable due to it being a mine entry and buffer zone. The remainder of the site could only accommodate approximately 5 dwellings. A traffic regulation order would be required to reduce the speed of traffic if the site was taken forward.</p> <p><u>Availability</u> The landowner has indicated that the site is available for development.</p> <p><u>Achievability</u> Based on whole Plan viability evidence, development is considered to be achievable.</p>	<p><u>Positive Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential to accommodate up to 5 dwellings. • Site lies within close proximity to accessible open space (statutory footpaths/bridleway). • Development will help support employment. • Development will support Sutton Town Centre. <p><u>Negative Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moderate landscape impact. • Loss of Greenfield land. • Negative impact on air quality. • Poor access to existing services. 	<p><u>Highway / access</u> Significant Constraints Traffic Regulation Order to reduce speed of traffic.</p> <p><u>Topography</u> No issues identified.</p> <p><u>Neighbour</u> No issues identified.</p> <p><u>Flood Risk</u> Known Issues Potential flooding from highway. Drainage improvements would be necessary. (SFRA Ref; S6) A further flood risk assessment would be necessary before development would be allowed on this site.</p> <p><u>Contamination</u> Contamination Suspected - Coal mining referral area. Approximately 30% of the site is undevelopable due to it being a mine entry and buffer zone.</p> <p><u>Agricultural Land Quality</u> Grade 4 (Poor)</p>	<p><u>Conclusion</u> The Council considers that this site should not be taken forward as an allocation within the Preferred Approach Local Plan.</p> <p>The site is not well integrated into the existing area as it is an infill plot between ribbon development. It is located within designated countryside in an area which is not well served by existing services and facilities. Approximately one third of the site is undevelopable as it was formerly a Coal Mine entry which has now been capped. The remainder of the site would not assist in significantly boosting the supply of housing.</p>
-----	-------------------------	-----	---	---	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---	---	--	--

S74	Fackley Road, Teversal	5.0	50	G	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	<p><u>Suitability</u> The site is currently not suitable as it is designated Countryside. The landscape is open in character and the site is not well integrated into the settlement. A development of this size would significantly impact on the gap between Teversal and Stanton Hill and the rural character of the settlement. If taken forward, the site would only be suitable for a small development due to the width of the public highway. A more suitable access would be via Fackley Road but this would require third party land. The site has good access to local services.</p> <p><u>The site is available</u> The landowner has indicated that development could be delivered within 5 years. Access constraints may restrict the delivery of development.</p> <p><u>Achievability</u> Based on whole Plan viability evidence, development is considered to be achievable.</p>	<p><u>Positive Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site would significantly increase the number of new dwellings. • It would contribute towards affordable housing and other infrastructure requirements. • There is good access to key services and facilities. • It would result in an improvement in health and social inclusion. • There would be no loss of designated wildlife sites. • There would be no impact on heritage assets. • Development would support Sutton town centre regeneration. • Development would support employment growth • Development would support the local economy. <p><u>Negative Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of Greenfield land - potential to have a negative impact in terms of agricultural production, habitat/species and amenity/recreation value. • Negative impact on air quality. • High impact on the landscape. 	<p><u>Highway / access</u> The existing road network would restrict any future development to approximately 50 dwellings.</p> <p><u>Topography</u> No issues identified</p> <p><u>Neighbour</u> Adjacent Floodzone 3</p> <p><u>Flood Risk</u> Adjacent Floodzone 3</p> <p><u>Contamination</u> No known contamination</p> <p><u>Agricultural Land Quality</u> Grade 4 (Poor)</p>	<p><u>Conclusion</u> The Council considers that this site should not be taken forward as an allocation within the Preferred Approach Local Plan.</p> <p>Whilst the Council acknowledges the site has reasonable access to facilities and services, the importance of the site in terms of landscape character overrides the benefits of housing development when compared against other sites submitted for consideration.</p> <p>The Council's primary rationale for this conclusion relates to the site's landscape assessment. The assessment concludes that the site capacity to accommodate development as High:</p> <p>High – total or major alteration to key elements , features or characteristics of the local or wider landscape resource, so that post development the baseline situation will be fundamentally changed.</p> <p>Building on this conclusion, the Council believes development of this site would represent sprawl into the countryside, drawing Fackley towards Stanton Hill, reducing the green break between these settlements.</p> <p>The site's highway / access constraints are a secondary consideration that the Council believes would restrict the sites deliverability.</p>
-----	------------------------	-----	----	---	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	--	--	--	--

S75	Pleasley Road, Teversal	2.5	56	G	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	<p><u>Suitability</u> The site, which is designated countryside, is well contained by landscape features. However, this settlement is quite isolated and has poor access to services and facilities. With regard to the landscape, the site scores relatively well in terms of capacity to accommodate development.</p> <p><u>The site is available</u> The landowner has indicated that development could be delivered within 5 years. There is developer interest in the site.</p> <p><u>Achievability</u> Based on whole Plan viability evidence, development is considered to be achievable.</p>	<p><u>Positive Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site would significantly increase the number of new dwellings and contribute towards affordable housing and other infrastructure requirements. • There is access to key services and facilities by public transport thereby contributing to health benefits and social inclusion. • Good access to open space. • No loss of designated wildlife sites. • Unlikely to impact on heritage assets. Development would support Sutton town centre regeneration, employment growth and the local economy. <p><u>Negative Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of Greenfield land - potential to have a negative impact in terms of agricultural production, habitat/species and amenity/recreation value. • Negative impact on air quality, but this is the case for most sites. • Moderate impact on the landscape but this could be mitigated through good design. • Poor access to key services and facilities on foot. • Limited bus service. 	<p><u>Highway / access</u> No issues identified</p> <p><u>Topography</u> No issues identified</p> <p><u>Neighbour</u> No issues identified</p> <p><u>Flood Risk</u> Outside Floodzone 2 &3</p> <p><u>Contamination</u> No known contamination. Adjacent to a former railway and siding.</p> <p><u>Agricultural Land Quality</u> Grade 4 (Poor)</p>	<p><u>Conclusion</u> The Council considers that this site should not be taken forward as an allocation within the Preferred Approach Local Plan.</p> <p>The site is located within designated countryside in an area which is not well served by existing services and facilities. The character of this area is rural and development would not integrate well with its surroundings. Whilst the site does have good access to open space, it has poor access to a number of services and facilities. Development would not be as sustainable in this location as residents are reliant on private vehicles for transport.</p> <p>Development in this location would adversely impact on the rural character of the area , including the entrance route to Teversal Conservation Area.</p>
-----	-------------------------	-----	----	---	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	--	--	--	---

S76	Molyneux Farm, Teversal	0.5	13	G	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	<p><u>Suitability</u> The site is designated Countryside and does not adjoin the main urban area boundary. It is not well contained being surrounded by open countryside to three sides and it would not form a logical extension to the settlement of Fackley. Land levels drop down significantly from the road to the site. This may create problems in terms of drainage and overshadowing of the site from adjoining properties. This area has previously experienced problems with surface water drainage. This could potentially be mitigated.</p> <p><u>Availability</u> The landowner has indicated that the site is available.</p> <p><u>Achievability</u> Based on whole Plan viability evidence, development is considered to be achievable.</p>	<p><u>Positive Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site is anticipated to deliver 13 dwellings. It is anticipated to contribute towards infrastructure requirements. The site has access to the rights of way network giving access to the open countryside. The site has good access to services and is anticipated to support social inclusion. It is expected to have a minor positive impact on the town centre of Sutton in Ashfield <p><u>Negative Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site is currently farm land and is a greenfield site. From a landscape perspective it is identified as having a low to moderate landscape impact. The site is subject to surface water flooding but it is anticipated that the surface water flooding can be mitigated through the incorporation of an appropriate designed SuDS scheme. 	<p><u>Highway / access</u> No significant constraints</p> <p><u>Topography</u> Severe level changes. The site is much lower than the adjoining public highway.</p> <p><u>Neighbour</u> No issues identified</p> <p><u>Flood Risk</u> Adjacent Zone 2</p> <p><u>Contamination</u> No Known Contamination Adjacent former Factories and Works; Teversal Garage and Petrol Stations & Fuel Tanks; Above ground storage tank.</p> <p><u>Agricultural Land Quality</u> Grade 4 (Poor)</p>	<p><u>Conclusion</u> The Council considers that this site should not be taken forward as an allocation within the Preferred Approach Local Plan.</p> <p>The site is located within designated countryside in an area which has reasonable access to existing services and facilities.</p> <p>Development of the site would create sprawl of the settlement as it is not well contained. It is significantly set back from the highway and does not integrate into the existing settlement.</p> <p>Consequently, development would not integrate well into the existing settlement.</p>
-----	-------------------------	-----	----	---	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	--	---	--	--

S78	Molyneux Farm, Teversal	0.4	12	G	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	<p><u>Suitability</u> The site is designated Countryside and does not adjoin the main urban area boundary. It is not well contained being surrounded by open countryside to three sides and it would not form a logical extension to the settlement of Fackley. Land levels drop down significantly from the road to the site. This may create problems in terms of drainage and overshadowing of the site from adjoining properties. This area has previously experienced problems with surface water drainage. This could potentially be mitigated.</p> <p><u>Availability</u> The landowner has indicated that the site is available.</p> <p><u>Achievability</u> Based on whole Plan viability evidence, development is considered to be achievable.</p>	<p><u>Positive Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site is anticipated to deliver 12 dwellings. It is anticipated to contribute towards infrastructure requirements. The site has access to the rights of way network giving access to the open countryside. The site has good access to services and is anticipated to support social inclusion. It is expected to have a minor positive impact on the town centre of Sutton in Ashfield <p><u>Negative Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site is currently farm land and is a greenfield site. From a landscape perspective it is identified as having a low to moderate landscape impact. The site is subject to surface water flooding but it is anticipated that the surface water flooding can be mitigated through the incorporation of an appropriate designed SuDS scheme. 	<p><u>Highway / access</u> Land levels are significantly lower. Highway improvement works required.</p> <p><u>Topography</u> Land levels are significantly different to the adjoining residential site.</p> <p><u>Neighbour</u> Adjacent Floodzone 3</p> <p><u>Flood Risk</u> Known Issues - Multiple flooding issues in close proximity to the site (SFRA; Ref; S7, S8 & S9). Adjacent Zone 3 Low lying land, potential risk of flooding.</p> <p><u>Contamination</u> No known contamination</p> <p><u>Agricultural Land Quality</u> Grade 4 (Poor)</p>	<p><u>Conclusion</u> The Council considers that this site should not be taken forward as an allocation within the Preferred Approach Local Plan.</p> <p>The site is located within designated countryside in an area which has reasonable access to existing services and facilities.</p> <p>Development of the site would create sprawl of the settlement as it is not well contained. Land levels are problematic in this area as the site drops quite significantly from the adjoining highway.</p> <p>Consequently, development would not integrate well into the existing settlement.</p>
-----	-------------------------	-----	----	---	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	--	---	--	--

S95	Stoneyford Road, Sutton in Ashfield	1.23	34	G	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	<p><u>Suitability</u> The site is designated Countryside and is currently unsuitable for development. There is currently no suitable access from the public highway. There may be potential to access the site from the adjoining site (SHLAA ref S93). This would impact on the timescale for delivery of development. The site is adjacent to a stream and a flood risk assessment would be required should the site be considered for development. All water from this area converges at Buttery Lane. If development were to occur there may need to be an upgrade on the culverts further downstream. The site may become suitable if the physical constraints can be mitigated. Development of the site would erode the open break between Sutton in Ashfield & Stanton Hill.</p> <p><u>Availability</u> The landowners have indicated that the site is available for development. However, the access constraints are likely to impact on the timescale for the delivery of development.</p> <p><u>Achievability</u> Based on whole Plan viability evidence, development is considered to be achievable.</p>	<p><u>Positive Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential to accommodate up to 24 dwellings. • Site lies within close proximity to accessible open space at Brierley Forest Park Local Nature Reserve. • Potential to deliver a proportion of affordable housing. • Potential to improve a deprived area • Good access to existing facilities (with the exception of a primary school). • Development will help support employment. • Development will support Sutton Town Centre. <p><u>Negative Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Part of the site has been identified as a Local Wildlife Site • Moderate landscape impact. • Loss of Greenfield land. • Within a Minerals Safeguarding Area - Limestone • Negative impact on air quality. • Some surface water issues – flood risk assessment required. 	<p><u>Highway / access</u> Significant Constraints Poor visibility towards Stanton Hill - third party land required to enable necessary public highway improvements.</p> <p><u>Topography</u> Steeply sloping to the north.</p> <p><u>Neighbour</u> Adjacent to a stream</p> <p><u>Flood Risk</u> Outside Floodzones 2 & 3 Directly adjacent to a stream.</p> <p><u>Contamination</u> Contamination Suspected Approximately 25% historic landfill; Quarry with Limekilns, further 20% Sewage Works.</p> <p><u>Agricultural Land Quality</u> Unknown</p>	<p><u>Conclusion</u> The Council considers that this site should not be taken forward as an allocation within the Preferred Approach Local Plan.</p> <p>The site is located within designated countryside in an area which has good access to services and facilities.</p> <p>Development would impact on the gap between Sutton in Ashfield and Stanton Hill. The Council considers that it is important to maintain this gap to ensure the characteristics of each settlement are maintained. This stance has been supported by a Planning Inspector through an Appeal (APP/W3005/A/14/2221907): <i>‘6. The site and the countryside that surrounds it in three sides forms part of the narrowest point of the open gap that separates the settlements of Sutton and Stanton Hill. Given that it close to Stoneyford Road the contribution of this open, green and undeveloped site in sepertaining the two settlements and establishing their rural setting is an important feature of the character and appearance of the area.’</i></p> <p>The site’s highway / access constraints are a secondary consideration that the Council believes would restrict the sites deliverability.</p>
-----	-------------------------------------	------	----	---	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---	---	---	--

S97	Silverhill Lane, Teversal	1.0	27	G	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	<p><u>Suitability</u> The site is located in an area which is designated Countryside and is currently unsuitable for development. It adjoins the settlement of Teversal which is also designated countryside. This is an open, prominent landscape with a ridgeline running diagonally through the site. Whilst there are no major physical constraints, the site is located in an area which has poor access to a range of services, including education and medical services. Development would have a sprawling affect as the site is not well contained.</p> <p><u>Availability</u> The landowner has indicated that the site is available and development could be delivered within 5 years.</p> <p><u>Achievability</u> Based on whole Plan viability evidence, development is considered to be achievable.</p>	<p><u>Positive Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential to accommodate up to 30 dwellings, including additional affordable houses Sites lies within close proximity to accessible open space Site can assess local bus services. Site does not suffer from surface water flooding, nor is it within flood zone 2 or 3 Development will help support local economy and Sutton town centre <p><u>Negative Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would result in the loss of a Greenfield site Scores highest for capacity to accommodate development in the Landscape Assessment due to the sites prominence. Increase in air pollution as a result of development 	<p><u>Highway / access</u> No significant constraints</p> <p><u>Topography</u> No issues identified</p> <p><u>Neighbour</u> No issues identified</p> <p><u>Flood Risk</u> Outside Floodzone 2 & 3</p> <p><u>Contamination</u> No known contamination</p> <p><u>Agricultural Land Quality</u> Grade 4 (Poor)</p>	<p><u>Conclusion</u> The Council considers that this site should not be taken forward as an allocation within the Preferred Approach Local Pan.</p> <p>The site is located within designated countryside in an area which is poorly served by existing services and facilities, including primary and secondary schools, GP services, and shops.</p> <p>The site is very open in character and not well contained. It scores the maximum points in the Landscape Assessment for capacity to accommodate development. Development would result in a fundamental change to the landscape from its baseline position. It would also ultimately result in urban sprawl and a reliance on private vehicles for transport.</p> <p>As such, the site is considered unsuitable to be taken forward as a housing allocation.</p>
-----	---------------------------	-----	----	---	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---	---	---	---

S98	Silverhill Lane, Teversal	1.0	27	G	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	<p><u>Suitability</u> The site is located in an area which is designated Countryside and is currently unsuitable for development. It adjoins the settlement of Teversal which is also designated countryside. This is an open, prominent landscape with a ridgeline running diagonally through the site. Whilst there are no major physical constraints, the site is located in an area which has poor access to a range of services, including education and medical services. Development would have a sprawling affect as the site is not well contained.</p> <p><u>Availability</u> The landowner has indicated that the site is available and development could be delivered within 5 years.</p> <p><u>Achievability</u> Based on whole Plan viability evidence, development is considered to be achievable.</p>	<p><u>Positive Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential to accommodate up to 30 dwellings, including additional affordable houses Sites lies within close proximity to accessible open space Site can assess local bus services. Site does not suffer from surface water flooding, nor is it within flood zone 2 or 3 Development will help support local economy and Sutton town centre <p><u>Negative Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would result in the loss of a Greenfield site Scores highest for capacity to accommodate development in the Landscape Assessment due to the sites prominence. Increase in air pollution as a result of development 	<p><u>Highways / Access</u> There is currently no suitable access point from the public highway. Access could potentially be achieved from the adjoining site (SHLAA ref. S97).</p> <p><u>Topography</u> No issues identified</p> <p><u>Neighbour</u> No issues identified</p> <p><u>Flood Risk</u> Outside Floodzone 2 & 3</p> <p><u>Contamination</u> No known contamination</p> <p><u>Agricultural Land Quality</u> Grade 4 (Poor)</p>	<p><u>Conclusion</u> The Council considers that this site should not be taken forward as an allocation within the Preferred Approach Local Pan.</p> <p>The site is located within designated countryside in an area which is poorly served by existing services and facilities, including primary and secondary schools, GP services, and shops.</p> <p>The site is very open in character and not well contained. It scores the maximum points in the Landscape Assessment for capacity to accommodate development. Development would result in a fundamental change to the landscape from its baseline position. It would also ultimately result in urban sprawl and a reliance on private vehicles for transport.</p> <p>The site is considered unsuitable to be taken forward as a housing allocation.</p>
-----	---------------------------	-----	----	---	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---	---	---	--

S100	Former Miners Welfare Ground, Stoneyford Road, Stanton Hill	3.8	62	G	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	<p><u>Suitability</u> The site is designated as Countryside and is unsuitable for development. A large part of the site is also designated as a Local Wildlife Site and this area is unsuitable. The area which is not designated as an LWS is situated adjacent to the main urban area and may become suitable should policy change. The site is also constrained by very poor access to the public highway. Access via the existing roads which adjoin the site would be unsuitable and this may render the site unsuitable in the medium/long term. There are opportunities to gain access to the public highway via third party land to the east of the site.</p> <p><u>Availability</u> The landowners have indicated that the site is available for development. However, the access constraints would have an impact on the delivery of development.</p> <p><u>Achievability</u> Based on whole Plan viability evidence, development is considered to be achievable.</p>	<p><u>Positive Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential to accommodate up to 60 dwellings, including additional affordable houses • Site lies within close proximity to Primary School, GP, Bus Stop, Post Office or Cash Machine and accessible open space • Site does not suffer from surface water flooding, nor is it within flood zone 2 or 3 • Development will help support local economy and Sutton town centre <p><u>Negative Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would result in the loss of a Greenfield site and part of a Local Wildlife Site • Low impact on landscape character • Increase in air pollution as a result of development 	<p><u>Highways / Access</u> There is currently no suitable access point from the public highway. Access could potentially be achieved from the adjoining site (SHLAA ref. S70).</p> <p><u>Topography</u> No issues identified</p> <p><u>Neighbour</u> No issues identified</p> <p><u>Flood Risk</u> Outside Floodzone 2 & 3</p> <p><u>Contamination</u> No known contamination</p> <p><u>Protected Species / Habitats</u> Part of site is a Local Wildlife Site (Site ref EV6/102) Stanton Hill Grasslands.</p>	<p><u>Conclusion</u> The Council considers that this site should not be taken forward as an allocation within the Preferred Approach Local Plan.</p> <p>The site is located within designated countryside in an area which is well served by existing services and facilities. It is well contained by existing residential development which envelopes the site to the north. Development would logically round off the area to the north of the site. To the south is a Local Wildlife Site and contributes to the green break between Sutton and Stanton Hill (as highlighted by Appeal APP/W3005/A/14/2221907). This area would not be suitable for development.</p> <p>With regard to the remainder of the site, it would only be suitable if an acceptable access arrangement was identified. The site adjoins a narrow street of terraced housing which has on-street parking. The entrance to the street is restricted in terms of poor visibility splays. Whilst this could potentially be mitigated to some extent, on-street parking is still likely to impact on visibility at the junction. Access could potentially be achieved via the adjoining site (SHLAA ref. S70) but the landowner has indicated that this would render the development unviable. Currently it is unclear how this could be resolved. Given the uncertainty regarding access issues/deliverability, the Council considers that this site is unsuitable to be taken forward.</p>
------	---	-----	----	---	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---	---	---	--

S142	Alfreton Road, Sutton in Ashfield	1.49	40	G	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	<p><u>Suitability</u> The site is currently a housing allocation and there are no major policy constraints to development. There are mature trees and hedgerow on some parts of the site. Appropriate mitigation would be required to address noise levels from the A38 and the adjacent industrial site. The site is adjacent to Fulwood Farmhouse, which is a Grade II listed building and the setting of this building will need to be considered. These issues could be mitigated through good design.</p> <p><u>Availability</u> The site has been allocated for housing since 2002. There are landownership constraints in relation to the access (a house in separate ownership would need to be demolished). This brings into question the deliverability of the site.</p> <p><u>Achievability</u> Based on whole Plan viability evidence, development is considered to be achievable.</p>	<p><u>Positive Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential to accommodate up to 40 dwellings, including additional affordable houses • Site lies within close proximity to accessible open space via Footpath 48 • Site can assess local services including primary school, GP facilities, cash machine, bus services. • Site does not suffer from surface water flooding, nor is it within flood zone 2 or 3 • Development will help support local economy and Sutton town centre <p><u>Negative Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Possible impact on adjacent Grade II Listed Building (Fulwood Farmhouse) • Loss of Greenfield land. • Negative impact on air quality. • A geological fault line runs SW - NE across the site. This would not prevent development but it is likely to impact on construction methods in the future. 	<p><u>Highway / access</u> Access into the site is currently restricted. Third party land would be required.</p> <p><u>Topography</u> Geological fault line runs SW - NE across the site.</p> <p><u>Neighbour</u> High noise levels from the A38 and potentially from the adjoining employment site.</p> <p><u>Flood Risk</u> Outside Floodzones 2 & 3.</p> <p><u>Contamination</u> No known contamination.</p> <p><u>Agricultural Land Quality</u> Unknown</p> <p><u>Built Heritage</u> Adjacent to Fulwood farm – a Grade II Listed Building</p>	<p><u>Conclusion</u> The Council considers that this site should not be taken forward as an allocation within the Preferred Approach Local Plan.</p> <p>Whilst the site is in a sustainable location, with good access to a number of services and facilities; and is an underutilised plot within the existing urban area, the Council questions its deliverability. The site has been allocated within the existing Ashfield Local Plan Review (2002), yet no form of planning application has been received on the site.</p> <p>There are severe access constraints and landownership issues to resolve. The Council therefore believes the site is not deliverable. As such, cannot rely on it to contribute towards the District's housing land supply.</p>
------	-----------------------------------	------	----	---	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	--	---	--	--

S314	Mill Lane, Huthwaite	15.7	295	G	N /A	N /A	N/ A	N/ A	N/ A	<p><u>Suitability</u> The site, which is designated as an open area, is located within the main urban area. Development of the site may be appropriate as it would form a logical infill within the urban area. It currently acts as an open break between Sutton in Ashfield and Huthwaite. The gap could be maintained through sensitive landscaping and a well-designed scheme. Access to Mill Lane is restricted as it is at capacity. An alternative access route would be required. The site also has poor drainage and it is likely to require mitigation in this respect. With regard to the landscape, the site scores relatively well in terms of capacity to accommodate development (2 out of 3 points).</p> <p><u>The site is available</u> The landowner has indicated that development could be delivered within 5 years.</p> <p><u>Achievability</u> Based on whole Plan viability evidence, development is considered to be achievable.</p>	<p><u>Positive Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site has the potential to accommodate up to 295 dwellings, and contribute towards affordable housing and other infrastructure requirements. The site lies within close proximity to a Bus Stop, Post Office or Cash Machine and accessible open space. The size of the site will lead to potential improvements to recreation and/or outdoor sports facilities for the surrounding area. Development will help support the local economy and Sutton town centre. Development would have a low impact on landscape character. <p><u>Negative Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of Greenfield land - potential to have a negative impact in terms of agricultural production, habitat/species and amenity/recreation value. The site has areas of surface water flooding that would require mitigation through appropriate SUDs systems. Increase in air pollution as a result of development, but this is the case for most developments. 	<p><u>Highway constraints</u> Significant constraints - Access would not be suitable from Mill Lane as it is at capacity.</p> <p><u>Topography</u> Steeply sloping to the north</p> <p><u>Neighbour</u> Adjacent to a registered landfill site.</p> <p><u>Flood Risk</u> Outside Floodzones 2 and 3. Natural springs. Substantial drainage improvements required. Surface water flooding. SUDS infiltration may be problematic on this site due to the Glacial Clay soil.</p> <p><u>Contamination</u> No Known Contamination. Site boundary is 8 metres from a former landfill site. Farm buildings with cement/asbestos on centre of site. Minerals/coal consultation required.</p> <p><u>Agricultural Land Quality</u> Grade 4 (Poor)</p> <p><u>Utilities</u> Sewerage capacity issues.</p>	<p><u>Conclusion</u> The Council considers that this site should not be taken forward as an allocation within the Preferred Approach Local Plan.</p> <p>Development of the site may be appropriate as it would form a logical infill within the urban area. It currently acts as an open break between Sutton in Ashfield and Huthwaite. The gap could be maintained to some extent through sensitive landscaping and a well-designed scheme. Access to Mill Lane is restricted as it is at capacity. An alternative access route would be required. There are very limited opportunities to address access constraints due to the nature of the surrounding area i.e. narrow streets, topography, cul-de-sacs adjoining the site. The site also has poor drainage and it is likely to require mitigation. There are opportunities to establish an access route via adjoining roads. However the landowner has not demonstrated that this is achievable and this creates uncertainty with regard to the deliverability of development. It is unclear how this could be resolved. There is also an ongoing issue with regard to landownership and the adoption of the highway on Mill Lane. Given the unresolved issues and uncertainty regarding access arrangements, the Council does not consider the site to be suitable to be taken forward for allocation.</p>
------	-------------------------	------	-----	---	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------	--	--	---	---

SM319	Rushley Farm, Mansfield	30.0	675	G	N /A	N /A	N/ A	N/ A	N/ A	<p><u>Suitability</u> The site is designated countryside and development would be contrary to policy. The Sherwood Forest area is currently being considered as a possible potential Special Protection Area (ppSPA), a Natura2000 site of European importance. If the area is formally designated as a potential SPA and then classified as a full SPA, planning applications within the vicinity (including those approved but not yet commenced or implemented) would be subject to provisions under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010. Whilst there are no access constraints, development of the site would require major infrastructure improvement works. The site is adjacent to the Lindhurst development. A transport assessment would be required to determine if the site would be suitable in highways terms.</p> <p><u>Availability</u> The landowner has indicated that the site is available for development.</p> <p><u>Achievability</u> Based on whole Plan viability evidence, development is considered to be achievable.</p>	<p><u>Positive Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential to accommodate up to 675 dwellings, including additional affordable houses. Site lies within close proximity to accessible open space. Development will help support employment. <p><u>Negative Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Possible impact on local heritage asset (Rushley Farm) Negative impact on possible potential Special Protection Area (SPA). If the Thieves Wood area is formally designated as a SPA, planning applications within the vicinity would be subject to provisions under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010. Moderate landscape impact. Loss of Greenfield land. Loss of very good/good quality agricultural land Negative impact on air quality. Poor access to existing services 	<p><u>Highway / access</u> No access constraints but major highway infrastructure improvements would be required.</p> <p><u>Topography</u> No issues identified</p> <p><u>Neighbour</u> Adjacent to the MARR</p> <p><u>Flood Risk</u> Outside Floodzone 2 &3</p> <p><u>Contamination</u> No known contamination</p> <p><u>Agricultural Land Quality</u> Grade 3 (Good-moderate)</p> <p><u>Built Heritage</u> Adjacent Rushley Farm which is a Local Heritage Asset.</p> <p><u>Protected Species / Habitats</u> Sherwood Forest area is currently being considered as a possible potential Special Protection Area (ppSPA).</p>	<p><u>Conclusion</u> The Council considers that this site should not be taken forward as an allocation within the Preferred Approach Local Pan.</p> <p>The Council's primary concern relates to the site's proximity to the Thieves Wood element of the Sherwood Forest 'possible potential' Special Protection Area (ppSPA). Whilst the site's potential yield of 675 dwellings would help the District meet its housing requirements, the potential deliverability risk associated with a SPA adjacent to the site would impact on the District's land supply. As such, until the outcome of the ppSPA is known, the Council does not feel it can rely on the site to be deliverable.</p> <p>In addition to the ppSPA constraint, the site is not considered to be in sustainable location, with poor access to services and facilities. The completion of the Lindhurst development may help the site's sustainability, but this will not be known until the site has been built out. The site is considered to be unsuitable due to the uncertainty surrounding the ppSPA and the timescale of Lindhurst.</p>
-------	-------------------------	------	-----	---	------	------	------	------	------	---	--	--	---

SM358	Land adjoining Rushley Pumping Station, Nottingham Road	3.4	77	G	N /A	N /A	N/ A	N/ A	N/ A	<p><u>Suitability</u> The site is located in an area designated as Countryside. It adjoins open countryside to three sides and woodland to the south (designated as a Local Wildlife Site). This area has also been identified as a possible potential Special protection Area by Natural England. The site adjoins an area which has planning permission for a large scale urban extension (Lindhurst development in Mansfield). Given the sites proximity to the ppSPA, it is unclear if the site would be suitable. A further, more detailed assessment would be required. Significant highway constraints (the site directly adjoins the A60). The site should preferably be served from the adjoining development at Lindhurst.</p> <p><u>Availability</u> The landowner has indicated that the site is available and development is deliverable.</p> <p><u>Achievability</u> Based on whole Plan viability evidence, development is considered to be achievable.</p>	<p><u>Positive Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential to accommodate up to 77 dwellings, including additional affordable houses. Site lies within close proximity to accessible open space. Development will help support employment. <p><u>Negative Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Negative impact on possible potential Special Protection Area (SPA). If the Thieves Wood area is formally designated as a SPA, planning applications within the vicinity would be subject to provisions under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010. High landscape impact. Loss of Greenfield land. Negative impact on air quality. Poor access to existing services. 	<p><u>Highway issues</u> Significant highway constraints (the site directly adjoins the A60). The site should preferably be served from the adjoining development at Lindhurst.</p> <p><u>Topography</u> No issues identified</p> <p><u>Neighbour</u> Adjacent to the Sherwood ppSPA. Adjacent to the A60 – potential noise issues.</p> <p><u>Flood Risk</u> Outside Floodzones 2 &3</p> <p><u>Contamination</u> No known contamination</p> <p><u>Agricultural Land Quality</u> Unknown</p> <p><u>Protected Species / Habitats</u> Directly adjacent to Sherwood Protected Bird Area which also forms part of Sherwood ppSPA.</p>	<p><u>Conclusion</u> The Council considers that this site should not be taken forward as an allocation within the Preferred Approach Local Plan.</p> <p>Whilst the site could have the potential to provide market and affordable housing for the District, the site is not considered to be in a sustainable location. It has poor access to services and facilities. The Highway Authority have indicated that they would not support access being taken from A60 and would seek to use the adjacent Lindhurst site for access. The Lindhurst site is a large urban extension to Mansfield. Whilst the site has planning permission, its phased development will take in excess of 10 years to develop. In terms of biodiversity and landscape impact, development of this site has the potential to impact on the Thieves Wood area of the ppSPA. If Thieves Wood is allocated as an SPA, it is considered this could impact on the site's deliverability. The site's landscape assessment highlights that the potential impact development would have on the landscape character is considered be high. Collectively, the Council believes the combination of constraints and its poor access of services and facilities are justification for not pursuing the allocation of this site.</p>
-------	---	-----	----	---	------	------	------	------	------	--	--	---	--

S363	Beck Lane, Skegby	0.09	2	G	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	<p><u>Suitability</u> The site is designated Countryside and does not adjoin the urban boundary. As such it is unsuitable for residential development. It adjoins another site which has been submitted to the SHLAA process to the south (S337). There is currently no suitable access. Access could potentially be achieved if the site formed part of a more comprehensive development with (S337). This would be reliant on an agreement between the landowners.</p> <p><u>Availability</u> The landowner has indicated that the site is available. However, access constraints would need to be resolved prior to the delivery of development.</p> <p><u>Achievability</u> Based on whole Plan viability evidence, development is considered to be achievable.</p>	<p><u>Positive Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It would deliver housing, including a small element of affordable housing. Access to the countryside and wider Green Infrastructure through the footpath to the north which links Skegby and Teversal Trail route. <p><u>Negative Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site located within the proximity of Dalestorth House a Listed Building. However, the site is separated from the listed building by the MARR. It could potentially have a minor impact on the setting of the listed building in terms of views from the upper floors to the north-west from the listed building and under these circumstances the sites has been assessed as neutral. It is a Greenfield land. Part of the site is within a Minerals Safeguarding Area for Limestone. However, it is emphasised that this does not necessary prevent the site from being development as the impact on the site will need to be determined with the Minerals Authority and ultimately prior extraction could take place before development. Areas of the site are identified as having surface water flooding but it is not anticipate having any significant impact on the development of the site. While the site is well linked to the major road net worth, being located off the MARR route, travel choice is limited as there are currently no bus routes on Skegby Lane and it has poor access to services. 	<p><u>Highway issues</u> Significant highway. The site could potentially be served from the adjoining site (S377).</p> <p><u>Topography</u> No issues identified</p> <p><u>Neighbour</u> No issues identified</p> <p><u>Flood Risk</u> Outside Floodzones 2 & 3</p> <p><u>Contamination</u> No known contamination</p> <p><u>Agricultural Land Quality</u> Unknown</p>	<p><u>Conclusion</u> The Council considers that this site should not be taken forward as an allocation within the Preferred Approach Local Pan.</p> <p>Development would not logically round off the settlement of Sutton in Ashfield as the landscape is very open, it is of a high value and the site is not well contained.</p> <p>The site is located within designated countryside in an area which is not well served by existing services and facilities.</p> <p>Access from the public highway is restricted and the site does not integrate well into the existing settlement of Skegby.</p> <p>The Highway Authority would not support a new access onto Beck Lane for the site in isolation.</p>
------	-------------------	------	---	---	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---	---	--	---

S371a	Land south of Unwin Road, Sutton	2.0	45	G	N /A	N /A	N/ A	N/ A	N/ A	<p><u>Suitability</u> Only a small part of the site is suitable (a small section of the site to the north has outline planning permission for 18 dwellings). The remainder of the site is in use as a sports pitch. The Playing Pitch Strategy identifies that there is a requirement to retain the pitch for sports use. As such, the site would not be suitable for further residential development. Development may be suitable where adequate replacement is provided or where it would make a significant improvement to existing open space.</p> <p><u>Availability</u> The landowner has indicated that the site is available for development.</p> <p><u>Achievability</u> Based on whole Plan viability evidence, development is considered to be achievable.</p>	<p><u>Positive Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site is anticipated to deliver a number of dwellings and is of sufficient size to contribute towards affordable housing and other infrastructure requirements. The site is located within the main urban area with access to a bus stop and to a primary school on Unwin Road. As such the site is reasonably accessible to services and provides opportunities for residents to access facilities while reducing the use of the car. It also is anticipate to have a positive impact in terms of promoting social inclusion Minor impact positive impact on the town centre of Sutton in Ashfield <p><u>Negative Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site is a recreation ground which, other than the frontage, provides opportunities for leisure activities, which will have a significant positive influence in terms of healthy lifestyles. The site is subject to some surface water flooding although this could be mitigated through the use of SuDS. 	<p><u>Highway / access</u> Access could be taken from Unwin Road</p> <p><u>Topography</u> there are no topographical constraints across the site.</p> <p><u>Neighbour</u> the site lies adjacent to water treatment works</p> <p><u>Flood Risk</u></p> <p><u>Contamination</u> There are no known contamination issues on the site</p> <p><u>Agricultural Land Quality</u></p>	<p><u>Conclusion</u> The Council considers that this site should not be taken forward as an allocation within the Preferred Approach Local Pan.</p> <p>The northern edge of the site (S371) has outline planning permission for 18 dwellings. However, the remainder of the site is a functioning sports pitch with associated pavilion. Whilst the sites lies within the existing urban area, with good access to some services, the Council believes its existing uses carry sufficient community benefit in terms of sports, health and amenity to justify its retention. The District's Playing Pitch Strategy supports this view, highlighting a requirement to retain the sports pitches. A reduction to the area surrounding the sports pitches is not considered to be appropriate.</p>
-------	----------------------------------	-----	----	---	------	------	------	------	------	---	---	--	---

S380	Silverhill Lane		50	G	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	<p><u>Suitability</u> The site, which is designated countryside, is well contained by landscape features. However, this settlement is quite isolated and has poor access to services and facilities. With regard to the landscape, the site scores relatively well in terms of capacity to accommodate development (2 out of 3 points).</p> <p><u>Availability</u> The landowner has indicated that development could be delivered within 5 years.</p> <p><u>Achievability</u> Based on whole Plan viability evidence, development is considered to be achievable.</p>	<p><u>Positive Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site is anticipated to deliver 65 dwellings Affordable housing provision Access to the rights of way network; Adjoins a large open space It is also expected to have a minor positive impact on the town centre of Sutton in Ashfield <p><u>Negative Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site is current farm land (Grade 4) and is a greenfield site. From a landscape perspective it is identified as having a moderate impact. This site is adjacent to the approach to Teversal village and conservation area along Pleasley Road. While the site does not directly affect the immediate setting of the conservation area development at these sites has potential to encroach on the rural character of the wider setting of Teversal and thus how the experience of how the village is approached. Insensitive access points and substantial loss of tree screening would be harmful the rural character of the setting of the conservation area but potentially could be mitigated. The site is subject to surface water flooding but it is anticipated that the surface water flooding can be mitigated through the incorporation of an appropriate designed SuDS scheme. 	<p><u>Highway / access</u> No issues identified</p> <p><u>Topography</u> No issues identified</p> <p><u>Neighbour</u> Adjacent to a large electricity sub station</p> <p><u>Flood Risk</u> Outside Floodzones 2 & 3</p> <p><u>Contamination</u> No known contamination.</p> <p><u>Agricultural Land Quality</u> Grade 4 (Poor)</p> <p><u>Built Heritage</u> Site within close proximity to Teversal Conservation Area.</p>	<p><u>Conclusion</u> The Council considers that this site should not be taken forward as an allocation within the Preferred Approach Local Plan.</p> <p>Whilst this is a well contained site, it is located within designated countryside in an area which is not well served by existing services and facilities. Whilst the site does have good access to open space and a limited bus service, development would not be as sustainable in this location and would result in the reliance of private vehicles.</p> <p>Development in this location would adversely impact on the rural character of the area, including the entrance route to Teversal Conservation Area.</p>
------	-----------------	--	----	---	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	--	--	--	---

S394	Beck Lane, Skegby	0.44	14	G	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	<p><u>Suitability</u> The site is designated Countryside and does not adjoin the urban boundary. As such it is unsuitable for residential development. It adjoins another site which has been submitted to the SHLAA process to the south (S337). There is currently no suitable access. Access could potentially be achieved if the site formed part of a more comprehensive development with (S337). This would be reliant on an agreement between the landowners.</p> <p><u>Availability</u> The landowner has indicated that the site is available. However, access constraints would need to be resolved prior to the delivery of development.</p> <p><u>Achievability</u> Based on whole Plan viability evidence, development is considered to be achievable.</p>	<p><u>Positive Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It would deliver housing, including a small element of affordable housing. There is access to the countryside and wider Green Infrastructure through the footpath to the north which links Skegby and Teversal Trail route, <p><u>Negative Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site is located within the proximity of Dalestorth House a Listed Building. However, the site is separated from the listed building by the MARR. It could potentially have a minor impact on the setting of the listed building in terms of views from the upper floors to the north-west from the listed building and under these circumstances the sites has been assessed as neutral. It is a Greenfield land. Part of the site is within a Minerals Safeguarding Area for Limestone. However, it is emphasised that this does not necessary prevent the site from being development as the impact on the site will need to be determined with the Minerals Authority and ultimately prior extraction could take place before development. Areas of the site are identified as having surface water flooding but it is not anticipate having any significant impact on the development of the site. While the site is well linked to the major road net worth, being located off the MARR route, travel choice is limited as there are currently no bus routes on Skegby Lane and it has poor access to services. 	<p><u>Highway issues</u> Significant highway constraints. The site could potentially be served from the adjoining site (S377).</p> <p><u>Topography</u> No identified issues</p> <p><u>Neighbour</u> No identified issues</p> <p><u>Flood Risk</u> Outside Floodzone 2 & 3</p> <p><u>Contamination</u> No known contamination</p> <p><u>Agricultural Land Quality</u> Grade 3 (Good-moderate)</p>	<p><u>Conclusion</u> The Council considers that this site should not be taken forward as an allocation within the Preferred Approach Local Pan.</p> <p>Development would not logically round off the settlement of Sutton in Ashfield as the landscape is very open. The landscape is of a high value and the site is not well contained. The site is located within designated countryside in an area which is not well served by existing services and facilities. Access from the public highway is restricted and the site does not integrate well into the existing settlement of Skegby. The Highway Authority has indicated that they would not support a new access onto Beck Lane for the site in isolation.</p>
------	-------------------	------	----	---	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---	---	---	---

K26	Penny Emma Way, Kirkby	0.66	10	G	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	<p><u>Suitability</u> The site forms a natural green break between Sutton in Ashfield and Kirkby in Ashfield and development is currently constrained by policy RC2 of ALPR, 2002. Whilst the site is within the urban boundary, it is quite open in character and only adjoins residential development to one side. Opposite the site are large industrial buildings. The site would not form a logical residential extension due to the lack of containment and the industrial character of the adjacent area. The site is also very narrow which would make it difficult to develop.</p> <p><u>Availability</u> The land owner has indicated that the site is available. There are no significant access constraints.</p> <p><u>Achievability</u> Based on whole Plan viability evidence, development is considered to be achievable.</p>	<p><u>Positive Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site would deliver approximately 10 new dwellings. • It would supply funding towards affordable homes. • Good access to a bus service and the railway station. • It would result in an improvement in health and social inclusion. • There would be no loss of designated wildlife sites. • There would be no impact on heritage assets. • There are opportunities to improve the GI network. • Development would support town centre regeneration. • Development would support employment growth and the local economy. <p><u>Negative Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poor access to Primary School and GP. • Loss of Greenfield land. • Negative impact on air quality. • Moderate impact on the landscape. 	<p><u>Highway / access</u> No issues identified</p> <p><u>Topography</u> No issues identified</p> <p><u>Neighbour</u> Large industrial estate is opposite</p> <p><u>Flood Risk</u> Outside Floodzone 2 & 3</p> <p><u>Contamination</u> No known contamination</p>	<p><u>Conclusion</u> The Council considers that this site should not be taken forward as an allocation within the Preferred Approach Local Plan.</p> <p>This is predominantly an industrial area and residential development would be out of character and not well integrated. The site is not well contained and is located within designated Open Area which has poor access to services and facilities.</p>
-----	------------------------	------	----	---	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	--	--	---	---

K116	Millers Way, Kirkby in Ashfield	1.37	49	G	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	<p><u>Suitability</u> The site is in use as a playing pitch and is allocated in the ALPR (2002) as a formal open space. The Playing Pitch Strategy recommends that the district should retain all playing pitches and the Green Space Strategy recommends that all adopted formal open spaces should be retained. As such development would not be permitted on this site unless adequate replacement provision is provided.</p> <p><u>Availability</u> The landowner has indicated that the site is available for development.</p> <p><u>Achievability</u> Based on whole Plan viability evidence, development is considered to be achievable.</p>	<p><u>Positive Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential to provide approximately 55 dwellings. • Site is within 800 m or 10 minutes walk of a bus stop, train station, primary school, GP surgery and a post office/cash machine. • Site is within 400m of Kirkby town centre • Site is within 500m of Natural Open Space. • Development could provide additional affordable housing contributions • Development will help support the local economy. • Development will support Kirkby Town Centre. <p><u>Negative Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of Greenfield land and sports playing pitch. • Negative impact on air quality. 	<p><u>Highway / access</u> Access via Millers Way may be suitable depending on the scale of development.</p> <p><u>Topography</u> No issues identified</p> <p><u>Neighbour</u> No issues identified</p> <p><u>Flood Risk</u> Outside Floodzone 2 & 3</p> <p><u>Contamination</u> No Known Contamination - Adjacent historic landfill; Quarry Face With Pond to South East & Former Colliery Spoil Tip to North. Site is also entirely within 250 metre landfill buffer.</p> <p><u>Natural Features</u> Tree Preservation Order on the eastern boundary of the site.</p>	<p><u>Conclusion</u> The Council considers that this site should not be taken forward as an allocation within the Preferred Approach Local Pan.</p> <p>The site is a functioning sports pitch with associated pavilion. Whilst the sites lies within the existing urban area, with good access to some services, the Council believes its existing uses within the urban area of Kirkby carries sufficient community benefit in terms of sports, health and amenity, to justify its retention. The District's Playing Pitch Strategy supports this view, highlighting a requirement to retain the sports pitch. This recommendation is mirrored by the District's Green Space Strategy.</p>
K382	Annesley Miners Welfare, Derby Road, Annesley Woodhouse	2.42	54	G	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	<p><u>Suitability</u> The site is located within the urban boundary in Annesley Woodhouse. It is currently designated open space and has previously been used for senior level football. Policy RC3 of the Ashfield Local Plan Review (2002) seeks to retain open spaces. The 2013 Ashfield Playing Pitch Strategy also seeks to retain playing pitches within the District.</p> <p><u>Availability</u> The landowner has indicated that the site is available for development.</p> <p><u>Achievability</u> Based on whole Plan viability evidence, development is considered to be achievable.</p>	<p><u>Positive Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential to accommodate up to 63 dwellings. • Site is within 200m of accessible open space. • Good access to services including a primary school, Bus stop and post office/cash machine. • Development will help support employment/economy. • Partial re-development of brownfield land • Development will support Ashfield's Town Centres. <p><u>Negative Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of open space • Development of greenfield land • Moderate impact on landscape • Negative impact on air quality • Minor surface water issues. 	<p><u>Highway / access</u> Severe access constraints. The Highway Authority has indicated that access should be taken from Forest Road. This would require third party land.</p> <p><u>Topography</u> No constraints.</p> <p><u>Neighbour</u> No constraints</p> <p><u>Flood Risk</u> No constraints</p> <p><u>Contamination</u> No constraints</p> <p><u>Agricultural Land Quality</u> No constraints</p>	<p><u>Conclusion</u> The Council considers that this site should not be taken forward as an allocation within the Preferred Approach Local Pan.</p> <p>The site is located within Annesley Woodhouse adjacent to a residential area. It has been vacant for a number of years. Part of the site is a sports pitch. The Council's Sports Pitch Strategy recommends no loss of sports pitches.</p> <p>There are also severe highway constraints in relation to access. The Highway Authority has indicated that the site should be accessed via Forest Road.</p>

Rural sites – not selected

V9	Green Crescent, Selston	2.4	65	G	3	1	4	2	10	<p><u>Suitability</u> The site directly adjoins the settlement boundary in Selston. It is in Green Belt and is currently unsuitable due to policy constraints. Development of the site would be severely constrained by poor access from the public highway. Third party land would be required to form a suitable access road into the site and this would be dependent on the consent of the landowners. Given that there are multiple landowners, it is unlikely that this could be easily resolved.</p> <p><u>Availability</u> The landowners have indicated that the sites are available. However, given the access constraints, it is unknown when development could be delivered.</p> <p><u>Achievability</u> Based on whole Plan viability evidence, development is considered to be achievable.</p>	<p><u>Positive Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential to accommodate up to 34 dwellings. • Site is within 500m of accessible open space and 800m of a GP, primary school, cash machine, bus stop. • Potential to deliver 25% affordable housing. • Development will help support local economy/employment. • Development will support Ashfield's town centres. <p><u>Negative Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of greenfield land • Within a minerals safeguarded area: coal measures • Negative impact on air quality • Moderate Landscape impact 	<p><u>Highway / access</u> There are severe access constraints; the site currently does not have access to the public highway. Third party land would be required to form a suitable access road into the site.</p> <p><u>Topography</u> Gently sloping from north to south.</p> <p><u>Neighbour</u> No issues identified</p> <p><u>Flood Risk</u> Outside Floodzone 2 & 3</p> <p><u>Contamination</u> Contamination Suspected Small part of North West edge is former tramway.</p> <p><u>Agricultural Land Quality</u> Grade 4 (Poor)</p>	<p><u>Conclusion</u> The Council considers that this site should not be taken forward as an allocation within the Preferred Approach Local Plan.</p> <p>The site's primary constraint is its Green Belt designation. In response to paragraph 83 of the NPPF, the Council has undertaken a Green Belt Review to understand the contribution sites adjacent to the urban area make to the 5 purposes of Green Belt (as set out in the NPPF). The site scored 10 out of a maximum 20. Because there are sites which score lower in Green Belt terms, (sufficient to fulfil the District's housing requirements); the Council does not believe it has the grounds to demonstrate '<i>exceptional circumstance</i>'. Furthermore, there are severe access constraints which would require third party land. It is unclear how this could be mitigated and this brings into question the deliverability of development.</p>
----	-------------------------	-----	----	---	---	---	---	---	----	--	--	--	--

V10	Alfreton Road, Selston	0.54	15	G	4	2	4	1	11	<p><u>Suitability</u> Whilst the site adjoins the settlement boundary of Selston, the majority of the site is currently in Green Belt and development would be contrary to Green Belt policy.</p> <p><u>Availability</u> The landowners have indicated that the sites are available.</p> <p><u>Achievability</u> Based on whole Plan viability evidence, development is considered to be achievable.</p>	<p><u>Positive Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential to accommodate up to 15 dwellings. • Site is within 800m or 10 minutes walking distance of a bus stop and cash machine or post office. • Potential to deliver additional affordable housing. • Development would help support local economy/employment. • Development would support Ashfield's town centres. <p><u>Negative Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of greenfield land • Within a minerals safeguarded area: coal measures • Negative impact on air quality • Moderate landscape impact 	<p><u>Highway / access</u> No issues identified</p> <p><u>Topography</u> No issues identified</p> <p><u>Neighbour</u> No issues identified</p> <p><u>Flood Risk</u> Outside Floodzone 2 & 3</p> <p><u>Contamination</u> No known contamination</p> <p><u>Agricultural Land Quality</u> Grade 4 (Poor)</p>	<p><u>Conclusion</u> The Council considers that this site should not be taken forward as an allocation within the Preferred Approach Local Plan.</p> <p>The site's primary constraint is its Green Belt designation. In response to paragraph 83 of the NPPF, the Council has undertaken a Green Belt Review to understand the contribution sites adjacent to the urban area make to the 5 purposes of Green Belt (as set out in the NPPF). The site scored 11 out of a maximum 20. Because there are sites which score lower in Green Belt terms, (sufficient to fulfil the District's housing requirements); the Council does not believe it has the grounds to demonstrate 'exceptional circumstance'.</p>
-----	------------------------	------	----	---	---	---	---	---	----	--	--	---	---

V12	Jacksdale Garden Centre, Main Road, Jacksdale	1.77	48	B	2	1	1	1	5	<p><u>Suitability</u> The site is in Green Belt and is unsuitable for development due to Green Belt Policy. With regard to physical constraints, access from the current entrance is unsuitable. In order to ensure highway standards are met, access from the public highway would require the acquisition of third party land. Further investigations would also be required relating to drainage due to flooding from the site into adjacent properties. Development would also result in a loss of employment if the business closes.</p> <p><u>Availability</u> The landowner has indicated that the site is available for development. However, the access constraints would restrict the delivery of development.</p> <p><u>Achievability</u> Based on whole Plan viability evidence, development is considered to be achievable.</p>	<p><u>Positive Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential to accommodate up to 48 dwellings. • Site is within 200m of accessible open space and 800m of a GP, primary school, bus stop and cash machine/post office. • Potential to deliver 25% affordable housing. • Re-development of brownfield land. • Development will help support local economy. <p><u>Negative Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within a minerals safeguarded area: coal measures • Negative impact on air quality • Potential loss of employment • Medium landscape impact, but capacity to accommodate development Low (lowest level of impact on landscape) 	<p><u>Highway / access</u> Significant Constraints Access from the existing entrance is substandard. Development would require third party land.</p> <p><u>Topography</u> No issues identified</p> <p><u>Neighbour</u> No issues identified.</p> <p><u>Flood Risk</u> No Known Issues. Further investigations required - adjacent properties have been affected by flooding from the site. Outside Floodzones 2 & 3</p> <p><u>Contamination</u> Contamination Suspected Entirely former plant nursery.</p> <p><u>Agricultural Land Quality</u> Grade 4 (Poor)</p>	<p><u>Conclusion</u> The Council considers that this site should not be taken forward as an allocation within the Preferred Approach Local Plan.</p> <p>The site is in use as a Garden Centre. Development would result in a loss of employment if the business closes and this would impact on the local economy.</p> <p>There are severe access constraints and third party land would be required to form a suitable access route. It is unclear how this can be resolved.</p> <p>Whilst it is acknowledged that the site scores quite low in terms of meeting the five purposes of the Green Belt, the Council is seeking to take forward two sites in Selston which have access to the public highway, better access to services and facilities, and which would not result in the loss of employment. Taking this into consideration, there are no exceptional circumstances for Green Belt release.</p>
-----	---	------	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	--	---	---	--

V18	Church Lane, Underwood	0.44	10	G	1	1	5	1	8	<p><u>Suitability</u> The site is in Green Belt and is currently unsuitable. The site is well contained with residential development to three sides. An ecology assessment would be required to determine if there are any protected species on the site. A hedgerow bounds the site on Church Lane. This is a registered landfill site which would require further assessment and remediation works prior to any development taking place.</p> <p><u>Availability</u> The landowner has indicated that the site is available for residential development. There is developer interest in the site.</p> <p><u>Achievability</u> Based on whole Plan viability evidence, development is considered to be achievable.</p>	<p><u>Positive Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential to accommodate up to 10 dwellings. • Site is within 500m of accessible open space and 800m of a GP • Good access to a Bus stop. • Potential to deliver 25% affordable housing. • Development will help support employment/economy. <p><u>Negative Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of greenfield land • Moderate impact on landscape • Within a minerals safeguarded area: coal measures • Negative impact on air quality 	<p><u>Highway / access</u> No constraints</p> <p><u>Topography</u> No constraints</p> <p><u>Neighbour</u> No constraints</p> <p><u>Flood Risk</u> No constraints</p> <p><u>Contamination</u> Registered Land Fill site. Further investigations required.</p> <p><u>Agricultural Land Quality</u> Grade 4 (poor)</p>	<p><u>Conclusion</u> The Council considers that this site should not be taken forward as an allocation within the Preferred Approach Local Plan.</p> <p>The site's primary constraint is its Green Belt designation. In response to paragraph 83 of the NPPF, the Council has undertaken a Green Belt Review to understand the contribution sites adjacent to the urban area make to the 5 purposes of Green Belt. The site scores 8 out of 20. Because there are sites which score lower in Green Belt terms, (sufficient to fulfil the District's housing requirements) which are considered to be more suitable; the Council does not believe it has the grounds to demonstrate '<i>exceptional circumstance</i>'. Whilst it is acknowledged that the site scores the same as sites taken forward in terms of meeting the five purposes of the Green Belt, the Council is seeking to take forward two sites in Selston which have better access to services and facilities (Secondary School, Leisure Centre and Supermarket). Taking this into consideration, there are no exceptional circumstances for Green Belt release.</p>
-----	------------------------	------	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	--	---	--

V19	Felley Mill Lane, Underwood	0.7	18	G	3	1	5	1	10	<p><u>Suitability</u> The site is located in the Green Belt and adjoins the settlement boundary of Underwood. As such, development of this site would be contrary to Green Belt Policy. The site is bound by a mature hedgerow to all sides, and adjoins residential properties to one side. Historic landfill site (sandpit) - further investigations required.</p> <p><u>Availability</u> The landowner has indicated that the site is available for residential development.</p> <p><u>Achievability</u> Based on whole Plan viability evidence, development is considered to be achievable.</p>	<p><u>Positive Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential to accommodate up to 18 dwellings. • Site is within 500m of accessible open space and 800m of a GP Surgery. • Good access to a Bus stop. • Potential to deliver 25% affordable housing. • Development will help support employment/economy. <p><u>Negative Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of greenfield land • Medium overall landscape impact • Within a minerals safeguarded area: coal measures • Negative impact on air quality 	<p><u>Highway / access</u> No constraints</p> <p><u>Topography</u> No constraints</p> <p><u>Neighbour</u> No constraints</p> <p><u>Flood Risk</u> No constraints</p> <p><u>Contamination</u> Contamination suspected. Further investigations required at a later stage if taken forward.</p> <p><u>Agricultural Land Quality</u> Grade 4 (poor)</p>	<p><u>Conclusion</u> The Council considers that this site should not be taken forward as an allocation within the Preferred Approach Local Plan.</p> <p>The site's primary constraint is its Green Belt designation. In response to paragraph 83 of the NPPF, the Council has undertaken a Green Belt Review to understand the contribution sites adjacent to the urban area make to the 5 purposes of Green Belt. The site scores 10 out of 20. Because there are sites which score lower in Green Belt terms, (sufficient to fulfil the District's housing requirements) which are considered to be more suitable; the Council does not believe it has the grounds to demonstrate '<i>exceptional circumstance</i>'.</p> <p>Whilst it is acknowledged that the site scores similar to sites taken forward in terms of meeting the five purposes of the Green Belt, the Council is seeking to take forward two sites in Selston which have better access to services and facilities (Secondary School, Leisure Centre and Supermarket). Taking this into consideration, there are no exceptional circumstances for Green Belt release.</p>
-----	-----------------------------	-----	----	---	---	---	---	---	----	---	--	---	---

V20	Mansfield Road, Underwood	1.5	41	G	4	1	5	1	11	<p><u>Suitability</u> The site is in Green Belt and development of the site would be contrary to Policy EV1 (ALPR, 2002). It is therefore unsuitable for development. Approximately 50% of the site is within the buffer zone of the adjacent SSSI. Natural England consultation required if proposed to be taken forward. The landscape is very open in character and views to the surrounding landscape can be experienced from Mansfield Road.</p> <p><u>Availability</u> The landowner has indicated that the site is available for residential development.</p> <p><u>Achievability</u> Based on whole Plan viability evidence, development is considered to be achievable.</p>	<p><u>Positive Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential to accommodate up to 41 dwellings. • Site is within 200m of accessible open space and 800m of a GP and cash machine. • Good access to a Bus stop. • Potential to deliver 25% affordable housing. • Development will help support employment/economy. <p><u>Negative Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site lies within the Impact Risk Zone for the adjacent Friezeland grassland SSSI. • Development of greenfield land • Moderate impact on landscape • Within a minerals safeguarded area: coal measures • Negative impact on air quality 	<p><u>Highway / access</u> No constraints</p> <p><u>Topography</u> No constraints</p> <p><u>Neighbour</u> No constraints</p> <p><u>Flood Risk</u> No constraints</p> <p><u>Contamination</u> No known constraints</p> <p><u>Agricultural Land Quality</u> Grade 4 (poor)</p>	<p><u>Conclusion</u> The Council considers that this site should not be taken forward as an allocation within the Preferred Approach Local Pan.</p> <p>The site's primary constraint is its Green Belt designation. In response to paragraph 83 of the NPPF, the Council has undertaken a Green Belt Review to understand the contribution sites adjacent to the urban area make to the 5 purposes of Green Belt. The site scores 11 out of 20. Because there are sites which score lower in Green Belt terms, (sufficient to fulfil the District's housing requirements) which are considered to be more suitable; the Council does not believe it has the grounds to demonstrate 'exceptional circumstance'.</p>
V85	Stoney Lane, Selston	0.76	23	G	2	4	5	1	12	<p><u>Suitability</u> The site is located in the Green Belt, adjacent to the settlement boundary of Selston. Development is contrary to Green Belt policy. No significant access constraints.</p> <p><u>Availability</u> The landowner has indicated that the site is available for residential development.</p> <p><u>Achievability</u> Based on whole Plan viability evidence, development is considered to be achievable.</p>	<p><u>Positive Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site would increase the number of new dwellings (approx. 23). • It has the potential to increase the number of affordable homes. • The site lies within 500m of natural open space. • Site is within walking distance/800 metres of a bus stop and primary school. • Development would support town centre regeneration. • Development would support employment growth and the local economy. <p><u>Negative Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of Greenfield Land. • Negative impact on air quality. • High impact on the landscape. 	<p><u>Highway / access</u> No constraints</p> <p><u>Topography</u> No constraints</p> <p><u>Neighbour</u> No constraints</p> <p><u>Flood Risk</u> No constraints</p> <p><u>Contamination</u> No known constraints</p> <p><u>Agricultural Land Quality</u> Grade 3 (good)</p>	<p><u>Conclusion</u> The Council considers that this site should not be taken forward as an allocation within the Preferred Approach Local Pan.</p> <p>The site's primary constraint is its Green Belt designation. In response to paragraph 83 of the NPPF, the Council has undertaken a Green Belt Review to understand the contribution sites adjacent to the urban area make to the 5 purposes of Green Belt. The site scores 12 out of 20. Because there are sites which score lower in Green Belt terms, (sufficient to fulfil the District's housing requirements) which are considered to be more suitable; the Council does not believe it has the grounds to demonstrate 'exceptional circumstance'.</p>

V89	Commonside Selston	0.77	10	G	4	4	4	1	13	<p><u>Suitability</u> The site is currently designated Green Belt and development would be contrary to policy. On-site flow attenuation would be required as any surface water drainage would run into Station Road where flooding already occurs during storms. This could have implications for properties on Station Road if not appropriately addressed.</p> <p><u>Availability</u> The landowner has indicated that the site is available for residential development.</p> <p><u>Achievability</u> Based on whole Plan viability evidence, development is considered to be achievable.</p>	<p><u>Positive Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site would increase the number of new dwellings (approx. 10). • It has the potential to increase the number of affordable homes. • The site lies within 500m of natural open space. • Site is within walking distance/800 metres of a bus stop. • Development would support employment growth and the local economy. <p><u>Negative Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of Greenfield Land. • Negative impact on air quality. • High impact on the landscape. 	<p><u>Highway / access</u> No constraints</p> <p><u>Topography</u> Sloping, undulating site. May have implications for development but would not prevent it.</p> <p><u>Neighbour</u> No constraints.</p> <p><u>Flood Risk</u> Drainage issues – water run off affects properties on Station Road.</p> <p><u>Contamination</u> No known contamination</p> <p><u>Agricultural Land Quality</u> Grade 4 (poor)</p>	<p><u>Conclusion</u> The Council considers that this site should not be taken forward as an allocation within the Preferred Approach Local Plan.</p> <p>The site's primary constraint is its Green Belt designation. In response to paragraph 83 of the NPPF, the Council has undertaken a Green Belt Review to understand the contribution sites adjacent to the urban area make to the 5 purposes of Green Belt. The site scores 13 out of 20. Because there are sites which score lower in Green Belt terms, (sufficient to fulfil the District's housing requirements) which are considered to be more suitable; the Council does not believe it has the grounds to demonstrate '<i>exceptional circumstance</i>'.</p>
-----	--------------------	------	----	---	---	---	---	---	----	---	---	---	--

V91	Land off Crescent Road	0.63	17	G	4	2	3	1	10	<p><u>Suitability</u> The site is currently designated Green Belt land and is unsuitable for development. The site is former Coal Authority land and there is a restrictive covenant. Highway improvements would be required if the site is taken forward.</p> <p><u>Availability</u> The landowner has indicated that the site is available for residential development.</p> <p><u>Achievability</u> Based on whole Plan viability evidence, development is considered to be achievable.</p>	<p><u>Positive Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential to accommodate up to 17 dwellings. • Site is within 800m or 10 minutes walking distance of a bus stop and cash machine or post office. • Potential to deliver additional affordable housing. • Development will help support local economy/employment. <p><u>Negative Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of greenfield land • Within a minerals safeguarded area: coal measures • Negative impact on air quality • Moderate landscape impact 	<p><u>Highway / access</u> No constraints</p> <p><u>Topography</u> No constraints</p> <p><u>Neighbour</u> No constraints</p> <p><u>Flood Risk</u> No constraints</p> <p><u>Contamination</u> No known constraints</p> <p><u>Agricultural Land Quality</u> Grade 4 (poor)</p>	<p><u>Conclusion</u> The Council considers that this site should not be taken forward as an allocation within the Preferred Approach Local Plan.</p> <p>The site's primary constraint is its Green Belt designation. In response to paragraph 83 of the NPPF, the Council has undertaken a Green Belt Review to understand the contribution sites adjacent to the urban area make to the 5 purposes of Green Belt. The site scores 10 out of 20. Because there are sites which score lower in Green Belt terms, (sufficient to fulfil the District's housing requirements) which are considered to be more suitable; the Council does not believe it has the grounds to demonstrate '<i>exceptional circumstance</i>'.</p> <p>Whilst it is acknowledged that the site scores similar to sites taken forward in terms of meeting the five purposes of the Green Belt, the Council is seeking to take forward two sites in Selston which have better access to services and facilities (Secondary School, Leisure Centre and Supermarket). Taking this into consideration, there are no exceptional circumstances for Green Belt release.</p>
-----	------------------------	------	----	---	---	---	---	---	----	---	---	--	---

V335	Stoney Lane, Selston	4.45	90	G	2	1	5	1	9	<p><u>Suitability</u> The site is in Green Belt and, as such, development is currently contrary to policy. There are several mine entries on the site mainly to the north. These areas would not be suitable for development. The southern section of the site has no major physical constraints. It adjoins another site put forward for consideration for housing development (V346, V347, V348).</p> <p><u>Availability</u> The landowner has indicated that the site is available for residential development.</p> <p><u>Achievability</u> Based on whole Plan viability evidence, development is considered to be achievable.</p>	<p><u>Positive Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential to accommodate up to 90 dwellings. • Site is within 800m or 10 minutes walking distance of a primary school, cash machine/post office and bus stop. • Potential to deliver 25% affordable housing. • Development will help support local economy/employment. • Development would support Ashfield's town centres. <p><u>Negative Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of greenfield land • Within a minerals safeguarded area: coal measures • Negative impact on air quality • Moderate landscape impact 	<p><u>Highway / access</u> No constraints</p> <p><u>Topography</u> No constraints</p> <p><u>Neighbour</u> No constraints</p> <p><u>Flood Risk</u> No constraints</p> <p><u>Contamination</u> Shallow seams of coal may be present. Intrusive investigations would be required at a later stage in the planning process if taken forward.</p> <p><u>Agricultural Land Quality</u> Grade 3 (good)</p>	<p><u>Consultation</u> The Council considers that this site should not be taken forward as an allocation within the Preferred Approach Local Plan.</p> <p>The site's primary constraint is its Green Belt designation. In response to paragraph 83 of the NPPF, the Council has undertaken a Green Belt Review to understand the contribution sites adjacent to the urban area make to the 5 purposes of Green Belt. The site scores 9 out of 20. Because there are sites which score lower in Green Belt terms, (sufficient to fulfil the District's housing requirements) which are considered to be more suitable; the Council does not believe it has the grounds to demonstrate '<i>exceptional circumstance</i>'.</p> <p>Whilst it is acknowledged that the site scores similar to sites taken forward in terms of meeting the five purposes of the Green Belt, the site is heavily constrained by coal mine entries. This has reduced the developable area of the site quite considerably. The site on Park Lane has good access to services and facilities and development would be easier to deliver as the physical constraints are much less severe.</p>
------	----------------------	------	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	--	---	---	---

V342	Cherry Hall Farm, Hanstubbin Road, Selston	0.9	28	G	2	1	3	1	7	<p><u>Suitability</u> The site is in Green Belt and is currently unsuitable for residential development as it would be contrary to policy. The site is well connected to the existing settlement of Selston and is well contained to all sides having residential development to the north, west and south and raised landscape to the east. There are highways constraints which could potentially be mitigated.</p> <p><u>Availability</u> The landowner has indicated that the site is available for residential development.</p> <p><u>Achievability</u> Based on whole Plan viability evidence, development is considered to be achievable.</p>	<p><u>Positive Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential to accommodate up to 28 dwellings. • Site is within 500m of accessible open space and 800m of a GP, primary school, cash machine, bus stop. • Potential to deliver 25% affordable housing. • Development will help support local economy/employment. • Development would support Ashfield's town centres. <p><u>Negative Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of greenfield land • Within a minerals safeguarded area: coal measures • Negative impact on air quality • Moderate landscape impact 	<p><u>Highway / access</u> Access constraint. Third party land may be required.</p> <p><u>Topography</u> No constraints.</p> <p><u>Neighbour</u> No constraints.</p> <p><u>Flood Risk</u> No constraints.</p> <p><u>Contamination</u> No known contamination.</p> <p><u>Agricultural Land Quality</u> Unknown</p>	<p><u>Conclusion</u> The Council considers that this site should not be taken forward as an allocation within the Preferred Approach Local Plan.</p> <p>The site's primary constraint is its Green Belt designation. In response to paragraph 83 of the NPPF, the Council has undertaken a Green Belt Review to understand the contribution sites adjacent to the urban area make to the 5 purposes of Green Belt. The site scores 7 out of 20. Because there are sites which score similar in Green Belt terms, (sufficient to fulfil the District's housing requirements) which are considered to be more suitable; the Council does not believe it has the grounds to demonstrate '<i>exceptional circumstance</i>'.</p> <p>Whilst it is acknowledged that the site scores similar to sites taken forward in terms of meeting the five purposes of the Green Belt, the two sites being taken forward provide more certainty with regard to the delivery of development due to the fact that they have less severe physical constraints in terms of access to the public highway.</p>
------	--	-----	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	--	---	---	---

V343	Inkerman Street, Selston	0.36	11	G	2	1	3	1	7	<p><u>Suitability</u> The site is in Green Belt and is currently unsuitable for residential development as it would be contrary to policy. No suitable access, third party land required.</p> <p><u>Availability</u> The landowner has indicated that the site is available for residential development.</p> <p><u>Achievability</u> Based on whole Plan viability evidence, development is considered to be achievable.</p>	<p><u>Positive Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential to accommodate up to 11 dwellings. • Site is within 500m of accessible open space and 800m of a GP, primary school, cash machine, bus stop. • Potential to deliver 25% affordable housing. • Development will help support local economy/employment. • Development will support Ashfield's town centres. <p><u>Negative Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of greenfield land • Within a minerals safeguarded area: coal measures • Negative impact on air quality • Moderate landscape impact 	<p><u>Highway / access</u> Access constraint. Third party land may be required.</p> <p><u>Topography</u> No constraints.</p> <p><u>Neighbour</u> No constraints.</p> <p><u>Flood Risk</u> No constraints.</p> <p><u>Contamination</u> No known contamination.</p> <p><u>Agricultural Land Quality</u> Unknown</p>	<p><u>Conclusion</u> The Council considers that this site should not be taken forward as an allocation within the Preferred Approach Local Plan.</p> <p>The site's primary constraint is its Green Belt designation. In response to paragraph 83 of the NPPF, the Council has undertaken a Green Belt Review to understand the contribution sites adjacent to the urban area make to the 5 purposes of Green Belt. The site scores 7 out of 20. Because there are sites which score similar in Green Belt terms, (sufficient to fulfil the District's housing requirements) which are considered to be more suitable; the Council does not believe it has the grounds to demonstrate '<i>exceptional circumstance</i>'.</p> <p>Whilst it is acknowledged that the site scores similar to sites taken forward in terms of meeting the five purposes of the Green Belt, the two sites being taken forward provide more certainty with regard to the delivery of development due to the fact that they have less severe physical constraints in terms of access to the public highway.</p>
------	--------------------------	------	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	--	--	---	---

V365a & V365b	Oak Tree Farm, Main Road, Underwood	4.4	99	G	4	1	5	1	11	<p><u>Suitability</u> The site is in Green Belt and development is contrary to planning policy. There are no major physical constraints.</p> <p><u>Availability</u> The landowner has indicated that the site is available for residential development.</p> <p><u>Achievability</u> The whole plan viability report indicates that development is likely to be viable.</p>	<p><u>Positive Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential to accommodate up to 100 dwellings. Site is within 500m of accessible open space and 800m of a GP, primary school, bus stop. Potential to deliver 25% affordable housing. Development would help support local economy/employment. Development would support Ashfield's town centres. <p><u>Negative Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of greenfield land Within a minerals safeguarded area: coal measures Negative impact on air quality Landscape impact 	<p><u>Highway / access</u> No constraints</p> <p><u>Topography</u> No constraints</p> <p><u>Neighbour</u> No constraints</p> <p><u>Flood Risk</u> No constraints</p> <p><u>Contamination</u> Contamination suspected. Further investigations would be required if taken forward.</p> <p><u>Agricultural Land Quality</u> Grade 4 (poor)</p>	<p><u>Conclusion</u> The Council considers that this site should not be taken forward as an allocation within the Preferred Approach Local Plan.</p> <p>The site's primary constraint is its Green Belt designation. In response to paragraph 83 of the NPPF, the Council has undertaken a Green Belt Review to understand the contribution sites adjacent to the urban area make to the 5 purposes of Green Belt. The site scores 11 out of 20. Because there are sites which score lower in Green Belt terms, (sufficient to fulfil the District's housing requirements) which are considered to be more suitable; the Council does not believe it has the grounds to demonstrate 'exceptional circumstance'.</p>
V366	Hall Green Farm, Stoney Lane, Selston	21.5	480	G	2	4	5	1	12	<p><u>Suitability</u> The site is in Green Belt and directly adjoins the settlement boundary of Selston. Development is unsuitable for this location as it would be contrary to Green Belt policy. The site is accessed via Stoney Lane which is a narrow, winding country lane. There are significant highway constraints and the upgrading of Stoney Lane would be required as part of any future scheme. It is unknown if this could feasibly be achieved.</p> <p><u>Availability</u> The landowner has indicated that the site is available for residential development.</p> <p><u>Achievability</u> The whole plan viability report indicates that development is likely to be viable.</p>	<p><u>Positive Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site would significantly increase the number of new dwellings (approx. 480). It has the potential to increase the number of affordable homes. The site lies within 500m of natural open space. Development would support town centre regeneration. Development would support employment growth and the local economy. <p><u>Negative Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of Greenfield Land. Poor access to services and facilities (GP, schools, shops, bus stop, formal open space) Negative impact on air quality. High impact on the landscape. Within a SSSI impact risk zone 	<p><u>Highway / access</u> Significant highway constraints – upgrading of Stoney Lane, 2 points of access required.</p> <p><u>Topography</u> Undulating site with ridgelines to the northern section of the farm.</p> <p><u>Neighbour</u> No issues identified.</p> <p><u>Flood Risk</u> Surface water flooding affecting the highway to the north eastern corner of the site. Outside Floodzones 2 & 3</p> <p><u>Contamination</u> No known contamination</p> <p><u>Agricultural Land Quality</u> Grade 3 (Good-moderate) Parts of the site are Grade 4 (Poor)</p>	<p><u>Conclusion</u> The Council considers that this site should not be taken forward as an allocation within the Preferred Approach Local Plan.</p> <p>The site's primary constraint is its Green Belt designation. In response to paragraph 83 of the NPPF, the Council has undertaken a Green Belt Review to understand the contribution sites adjacent to the urban area make to the 5 purposes of Green Belt. The site scores 12 out of 20. Because there are sites which score lower in Green Belt terms, (sufficient to fulfil the District's housing requirements) which are considered to be more suitable; the Council does not believe it has the grounds to demonstrate 'exceptional circumstance'.</p>

V367	Poplar Terrace, Selston	3.6	99	G	3	1	4	2	10	<p><u>Suitability</u> The site directly adjoins the settlement boundary in Selston. It is in Green Belt and is currently unsuitable due to policy constraints. Development of the site would be severely constrained by poor access from the public highway. Third party land would be required to form a suitable access road into the site and this would be dependent on the consent of the landowners. Given that there are multiple landowners, it is unlikely that this could be easily resolved.</p> <p><u>Availability</u> The landowners have indicated that the sites are available. However, given the access constraints, it is unknown when development could be delivered.</p> <p><u>Achievability</u> Based on whole Plan viability evidence, development is considered to be achievable.</p>	<p><u>Positive Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential to accommodate up to 34 dwellings. • Site is within 500m of accessible open space and 800m of a GP, primary school, cash machine, bus stop. • Potential to deliver 25% affordable housing. • Development will help support local economy/employment. • Development will support Ashfield's town centres. <p><u>Negative Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of greenfield land • Within a minerals safeguarded area: coal measures • Negative impact on air quality • Moderate Landscape impact 	<p><u>Highway / access</u> Currently no access to the public highway - an area of land in multiple ownership would be required to establish a suitable access point.</p> <p><u>Topography</u> No issues identified.</p> <p><u>Neighbour</u> No issues identified</p> <p><u>Flood Risk</u> Outside Floodzone 2 & 3</p> <p><u>Contamination</u> No known contamination.</p> <p><u>Agricultural Land Quality</u> Grade 4 (Poor)</p>	<p><u>Conclusion</u> The Council considers that this site should not be taken forward as an allocation within the Preferred Approach Local Plan.</p> <p>The site's primary constraint is its Green Belt designation. In response to paragraph 83 of the NPPF, the Council has undertaken a Green Belt Review to understand the contribution sites adjacent to the urban area make to the 5 purposes of Green Belt. The site scores 10 out of 20. Because there are sites which score lower in Green Belt terms, (sufficient to fulfil the District's housing requirements) which are considered to be more suitable; the Council does not believe it has the grounds to demonstrate '<i>exceptional circumstance</i>'.</p> <p>Whilst it is acknowledged that the site scores similar to sites taken forward in terms of meeting the five purposes of the Green Belt, the two sites being taken forward provide more certainty with regard to the delivery of development due to the fact that they have less severe physical constraints in terms of access to the public highway.</p>
------	-------------------------	-----	----	---	---	---	---	---	----	--	--	--	--

V388	Wagstaff Lane/ Palmerston Street	8.5	191	G	4	4	5	1	14	<p><u>Suitability</u> The site is located adjacent to the settlement of Jacksdale and is currently designated Green Belt land. As such, it is currently unsuitable for residential development. A Green Belt Assessment is currently being undertaken the results of which will be taken into account should there be exceptional circumstances for Green Belt release.</p> <p><u>Availability</u> The site could be available in 5-10 years.</p> <p><u>Achievability</u> Based on whole Plan viability evidence, development is considered to be achievable.</p>	<p><u>Positive Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential to accommodate up to 191 dwellings. • Site is within 500m of accessible open space and 800m of a, primary school, bus stop. • Potential to deliver 25% affordable housing. • Development will help support local economy/employment. <p><u>Negative Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of greenfield land. • Within a minerals safeguarded area: coal measures. • Negative impact on air quality. • Moderate landscape impact. • Locally listed heritage building next to site. 	<p><u>Highway / access</u> No issues identified</p> <p><u>Topography</u> The site is gently sloping from north (highest point) to south.</p> <p><u>Neighbour</u> No issues identified</p> <p><u>Flood Risk</u> Outside Floodzones 2 & 3.</p> <p><u>Contamination</u> No known contamination</p> <p><u>Agricultural Land Quality</u> Grade 4 (Poor)</p>	<p><u>Conclusion</u> The Council considers that this site should not be taken forward as an allocation within the Preferred Approach Local Plan.</p> <p>The site's primary constraint is its Green Belt designation. In response to paragraph 83 of the NPPF, the Council has undertaken a Green Belt Review to understand the contribution sites adjacent to the urban area make to the 5 purposes of Green Belt. The site scores 14 out of 20. Because there are sites which score lower in Green Belt terms, (sufficient to fulfil the District's housing requirements) which are considered to be more suitable; the Council does not believe it has the grounds to demonstrate '<i>exceptional circumstance</i>'.</p>
------	-------------------------------------	-----	-----	---	---	---	---	---	----	---	---	--	--

Hucknall sites – not selected

SHLAA Ref.	Location	Area (ha)	No. Dwellings	Greenfield (G) / Brownfield (B)	Green Belt Review Scores					Suitability, Availability, Achievability	Sustainability Appraisal Summary	Known Physical Constraints	Conclusion
					Unrestricted sprawl	Prevent merging	Safeguard from encroachment	Preserve historic settlements	Total Score				
H1	North of Wood Lane	0.52	16	G	2	1	3	1	7	<p><u>Suitability</u> The site is in Green Belt and directly adjoins Hucknall. Development is unsuitable as it would be contrary to Green Belt policy Suitability is also constrained by a lack of highway access with no obvious mitigation.</p> <p><u>Availability</u> The site is available – beyond 5 years.</p> <p><u>Achievability</u> Based on whole Plan viability evidence, development is considered to be achievable.</p>	<p><u>Positive Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase number of new dwellings. • Increase in the number of affordable homes. • Good access to key services and facilities. • Good access to open green spaces. • Improvement in health and social inclusion. • No loss of designated wildlife sites. • No impact on heritage assets. • Supports regeneration of Hucknall Town Centre. <p><u>Negative Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of Greenfield land and BMV agricultural land. • Negative impact on air quality. • The land has mature trees and hedgerows surrounding it and several TPOs to the south. • Highways access to the site could be problematic. 	<p><u>Highways / Access</u> Highways assessment suggests insufficient capacity for proposed level of development, with no apparent possibility for mitigation.</p> <p><u>Topography</u> No issues identified</p> <p><u>Neighbour</u> No issues identified</p> <p><u>Flood Risk</u></p> <p><u>Contamination</u> No Known contamination</p> <p><u>Agricultural Land Quality</u> Grade 3 (Good-moderate)</p>	<p><u>Conclusion</u> The Council considers that this site should not be taken forward as an allocation within the Preferred Approach Local Plan.</p> <p>One of the site's primary constraint is its Green Belt designation. In response to paragraph 83 of the NPPF, the Council has undertaken a Green Belt Review to understand the contribution sites adjacent to the urban area make to the 5 purposes of Green Belt. The site scores 7 out of 20. Whilst this site scores similar in Green Belt terms to the sites chosen to be allocated for housing, it is considered that this site also requires major infrastructure requirements, which will potentially impact on viability and timescale for development. Furthermore, it is considered that there are sites (sufficient to fulfil the District's housing requirements) which are more suitable.</p> <p>Whilst it is acknowledged that the site scores similar to the site being taken forward in terms of meeting the five purposes of the Green Belt, the site being taken forward provides more certainty with regard to the delivery of development due to the fact that it has much less severe physical constraints in terms of access to the public highway.</p>
H2	Common Lane,	30.0	150	G	5	2	4	1	12	<p><u>Suitability</u> The site is severely</p>	<p><u>Positive Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase number of new 	<p><u>Highways / Access</u> Highways assessment suggests</p>	<p><u>Conclusion</u> The Council considers that this site</p>

	Hucknall				3 5	1 3	5 5	1 1	10 14	<p>topographically constrained; the landscape raises from the urban area and is steeply sloping and highly prominent. Additionally the site is designated Greenbelt. Consequently the majority of the site is considered unsuitable. A small part of the site may be suitable (approx. 6.5 Ha) if Green Belt policy changes.</p> <p><u>Availability</u> This site is available – beyond 5 years.</p> <p><u>Achievability</u> Based on whole Plan viability evidence, development is considered to be achievable.</p>	<p>dwelling.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase in the number of affordable homes. • Good access to key services and facilities. • Good access to open green spaces. • Improvement in health and social inclusion. • No loss of designated wildlife sites. • No impact on heritage assets. • Supports regeneration of Hucknall Town Centre. <p><u>Negative Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of Greenfield land. • Negative impact on air quality. • The land has mature hedgerows surrounding and within it. • The site's placement within the Green Belt requires policy changes for this site to come forward. 	<p>sufficient capacity for proposed level of development - Potential for access off extensive Common Lane frontage.</p> <p><u>Topography</u> Severe level changes throughout site.</p> <p><u>Neighbour</u> No issues identified.</p> <p><u>Flood Risk</u> EA Maps suggest area at no risk from Flooding.</p> <p><u>Agricultural Land Quality</u> Grade 3 (Good-moderate)</p>	<p>should not be taken forward as an allocation within the Preferred Approach Local Plan.</p> <p>The site's primary constraint is its Green Belt designation. In response to paragraph 83 of the NPPF, the Council has undertaken a Green Belt Review to understand the contribution sites adjacent to the urban area make to the 5 purposes of Green Belt. The site scores 10, 12 and 14 out of 20. Because there are sites which score lower in Green Belt terms, (sufficient to fulfil the District's housing requirements) which are considered to be more suitable; the Council does not believe it has the grounds to demonstrate 'exceptional circumstance'.</p> <p>Due to the size of this site, 3 separate Green Belt assessments have been undertaken. This is because the Green Belt assessment process identified sites using defined physical features such as roads, railways and woodlands. The Green Belt assessment sites may not necessarily be the same as the sites submitted for consideration to the SHLAA.</p>
H4	Stubbing Wood Farm	8.73	197	G	2 2	1 1	5 5	1 1	9 9	<p><u>Suitability</u> The site is constrained by the site's Greenbelt status and highway works required to access the site. Consequently this site is considered currently unsuitable with any future suitability dependent on whether there are exceptional circumstances for Green Belt release and the mitigation of access constraints.</p> <p><u>Availability</u> This site is available – beyond 5 years.</p> <p><u>Achievability</u> Based on whole Plan viability evidence, development is considered to be achievable.</p>	<p><u>Positive Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase number of new dwellings. • Increase in the number of affordable homes. • Good access to open green spaces. • Improvement in health and social inclusion. • No loss of designated wildlife sites. • No impact on heritage assets. • Supports regeneration of Hucknall Town Centre. <p><u>Negative Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of Greenfield land. • Negative impact on air quality. • The land has mature hedgerows 	<p><u>Highways / Access</u> Highways assessment suggests major infrastructure works required, potentially impacting on viability and timescale for development - Access via Watnall Road could potentially be suitable subject to extensive infrastructure upgrades.</p> <p><u>Topography</u> No issues identified.</p> <p><u>Neighbour</u> No issues identified.</p> <p><u>Flood Risk</u> EA Maps suggest area at no risk from flooding - The Level 1 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment for Ashfield identifies part of the site (North West</p>	<p><u>Conclusion</u> The Council considers that this site should not be taken forward as an allocation within the Preferred Approach Local Plan.</p> <p>One of the site's primary constraint is its Green Belt designation. In response to paragraph 83 of the NPPF, the Council has undertaken a Green Belt Review to understand the contribution sites adjacent to the urban area make to the 5 purposes of Green Belt. The site scores 9 out of 20. Whilst this site scores similar in Green Belt terms to the site chosen to be allocated for housing, it has severe access constraints. Whilst this could be mitigated, it would potentially</p>

											<div>surrounding and within it.</div> <div><div><div></div><div>The site’s placement within the Green Belt requires policy changes for this site to come forward.</div><div>Access for the development could make scheme unviable.</div><div>Service provision in the area is not rated highly.</div></div></div>	<div>of Conway Road) as having been subject to surface water flooding in the past.</div> <div><div>Contamination</div><div>No issues identified.</div></div> <div><div>Agricultural Land Quality</div><div>Grade 3 (Good-moderate)</div></div>	<div>impact on the timescale for development. Furthermore, it is considered that the proposed allocation at Broomhill Farm has better access to services and facilities as it is located closer to Hucknall town centre and a range of public transport services.</div> <div>Due to the size of this site, 2 separate Green Belt assessments have been undertaken. This is because the Green Belt assessment process identified sites using defined physical features such as roads, railways and woodlands. The Green Belt assessment sites may not necessarily be the same as the sites submitted for consideration to the SHLAA.</div>
H12	Charnwood Grove	2.83	76	G	2	1	3	1	7	<div><div>Suitability</div><div>The site is currently in Green Belt and is unsuitable. It is also Grade 2 agricultural land and would be limited to a maximum of 50 dwellings by access constraints. Consequently this site is considered currently unsuitable with any future suitability dependent on the outcome of any Green Belt review.</div></div> <div><div>Availability</div><div>This site is available – beyond 5 years.</div></div> <div><div>Achievability</div><div>Based on whole Plan viability evidence, development is considered to be achievable.</div></div>	<div><div>Positive Impacts</div><div><div><div></div><div>Increase number of new dwellings.</div></div><div><div></div><div>Increase in the number of affordable homes.</div></div><div><div></div><div>Good access to key services and facilities.</div></div><div><div></div><div>Good access to open green spaces.</div></div><div><div></div><div>Improvement in health and social inclusion.</div></div><div><div></div><div>No loss of designated wildlife sites.</div></div><div><div></div><div>No impact on heritage assets.</div></div><div><div></div><div>Supports regeneration of Hucknall Town Centre.</div></div></div><div><div>Negative Impacts</div><div><div><div></div><div>Loss of Greenfield land and BMV agricultural land.</div></div><div><div></div><div>Negative impact on air quality.</div></div><div><div></div><div>The land has mature trees and hedgerows surrounding it.</div></div><div><div></div><div>Highways access to the site could be problematic if the development exceeds 50 dwellings.</div></div><div><div></div><div>The site’s placement within the Green Belt requires policy changes for this site to come forward.</div></div></div></div></div>	<div><div>Highways / Access</div><div>No issues identified.</div></div> <div><div>Topography</div><div>No issues identified.</div></div> <div><div>Neighbour</div><div>No issues identified.</div></div> <div><div>Flood Risk</div><div>EA Maps suggest area at no risk from Flooding.</div></div> <div><div>Contamination</div><div>No known contamination</div></div> <div><div>Agricultural Land Quality</div><div>Grade 2 (Very Good)</div></div>	<div><div>Conclusion</div><div>The Council considers that this site should not be taken forward as an allocation within the Preferred Approach Local Pan.</div></div> <div>One of the site’s primary constraint is its Green Belt designation. In response to paragraph 83 of the NPPF, the Council has undertaken a Green Belt Review to understand the contribution sites adjacent to the urban area make to the 5 purposes of Green Belt. The site scores 7 out of 20. Whilst this site scores similar in Green Belt terms to the sites chosen to be allocated for housing, it is considered that access constraints would impact on the timescale for delivery of development and there is less certainty that the constraints could be mitigated. Furthermore, Broomhill Farm is considered to be a more suitable site as it forms a logical rounding off of the settlement and there is more certainty that access constraints can be mitigated.</div>

H14	Land at Forest View Drive	0.28	10	G	2	1	3	1	7	<p><u>Suitability</u> Suitability is constrained by the site's Green Belt status and its Grade 2 agricultural land status, Consequently this site is considered currently unsuitable.</p> <p><u>Availability</u> This site is available – beyond 5 years.</p> <p><u>Achievability</u> Achievability is compromised by severe access constraints with no apparent possibility for mitigation.</p>	<p><u>Positive Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase number of new dwellings. • Increase in the number of affordable homes. • Good access to key services and facilities. • Good access to open green spaces. • Improvement in health and social inclusion. • No loss of designated wildlife sites. • No impact on heritage assets. • Supports regeneration of Hucknall Town Centre. <p><u>Negative Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of Greenfield land and BMV agricultural land. • Negative impact on air quality. • The land has mature trees and hedgerows surrounding it. • Highways access to the site could be unviable. • The site's placement within the Green Belt requires policy changes for this site to come forward. 	<p><u>Highways / Access</u> Highways assessment suggests major infrastructure works required, potentially impacting on viability and timescale for development - Currently observed as only accessible from neighbouring site. Extensive infrastructure works to the bypass would be required.</p> <p><u>Topography</u> Minor topographical constraints – Gently sloping from South to North.</p> <p><u>Neighbour</u> Slight adverse effects from adjacent occupiers or development of the site for housing - Adjacent to Bypass.</p> <p><u>Flood Risk</u> EA Maps suggest area at no risk from flooding.</p> <p><u>Contamination</u> No known contamination.</p> <p><u>Agricultural Land Quality</u> Grade 2 (Very Good)</p>	<p><u>Conclusion</u> The Council considers that this site should not be taken forward as an allocation within the Preferred Approach Local Pan.</p> <p>The site's primary constraint is its Green Belt designation. In response to paragraph 83 of the NPPF, the Council has undertaken a Green Belt Review to understand the contribution sites adjacent to the urban area make to the 5 purposes of Green Belt. The site scores 7 out of 20. Whilst this site scores similar in Green Belt terms to the sites chosen to be allocated for housing, it is considered that this site also requires major infrastructure requirements, which will potentially impact on timescale for development. A new access route would be required from the A611. This is not considered to be a feasible option as it is very unlikely that this could be achieved.</p> <p>Given the uncertainty with regard to the delivery of development, the site is not considered to be suitable to be taken forward as an allocation.</p>
H15	Westholme, Forest View drive	1.87	64	G	2	1	3	1	7	<p><u>Suitability</u> Suitability is constrained by the site's Green Belt status and its Grade 2 agricultural land status. Consequently this site is considered currently unsuitable.</p> <p><u>Availability</u> This site is available – beyond 5 years.</p> <p><u>Achievability</u> Achievability is compromised by severe access constraints with no apparent possibility for mitigation.</p>	<p><u>Positive Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase number of new dwellings. • Increase in the number of affordable homes. • Good access to key services and facilities. • Good access to open green spaces. • Improvement in health and social inclusion. • No loss of designated wildlife sites. • No impact on heritage assets. • Supports regeneration of Hucknall Town Centre. <p><u>Negative Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of Greenfield land and BMV agricultural land. • Negative impact on air quality. • The land has mature trees and 	<p><u>Highways / Access</u> Highways assessment suggests major infrastructure works required, potentially impacting on viability and timescale for development - Current observed access is very awkward; A narrow lane, directly accessed off A611 roundabout. Extensive infrastructure works to the bypass would be required.</p> <p><u>Topography</u> Minor topographical constraints – Gently sloping from North down to South.</p> <p><u>Neighbour</u> No issues identified.</p> <p><u>Flood Risk</u> EA Maps suggest area at no risk from Flooding.</p>	<p><u>Conclusion</u> The Council considers that this site should not be taken forward as an allocation within the Preferred Approach Local Pan.</p> <p>The site's primary constraint is its Green Belt designation. In response to paragraph 83 of the NPPF, the Council has undertaken a Green Belt Review to understand the contribution sites adjacent to the urban area make to the 5 purposes of Green Belt. The site scores 7 out of 20. Whilst this site scores similar in Green Belt terms to the sites chosen to be allocated for housing, it is considered that this site also requires major infrastructure requirements, which will potentially impact on timescale for development. A new access</p>

											<p>hedgerows surrounding it.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Highways access to the site could be unviable.The site's placement within the Green Belt requires policy changes for this site to come forward.	<p><u>Contamination</u> No known contamination.</p> <p><u>Agricultural Land Quality</u> Grade 2 (Very Good)</p>	<p>route would be required from the A611. This is not considered to be a feasible option as it is very unlikely that this could be achieved.</p> <p>Given the uncertainty with regard to the delivery of development, the site is not considered to be suitable to be taken forward as an allocation.</p>
H16	Forest View drive	0.07	2	G	2	1	3	1	7	<p><u>Suitability</u> Suitability is constrained by the site's Green Belt status and its Grade 2 agricultural land status. Consequently this site is considered currently unsuitable.</p> <p><u>Availability</u> This site is available – beyond 5 years.</p> <p><u>Achievability</u> Achievability is compromised by severe access constraints with no apparent possibility for mitigation.</p>	<p><u>Positive Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Increase number of new dwellings.Good access to key services and facilities.Good access to open green spaces.Improvement in health and social inclusion.No loss of designated wildlife sites.No impact on heritage assets.Supports regeneration of Hucknall Town Centre. <p><u>Negative Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Loss of Greenfield land and BMV agricultural land.Negative impact on air quality.The land has mature trees and hedgerows surrounding it.Highways access to the site could be unviable.The site's placement within the Green Belt requires policy changes for this site to come forward.	<p><u>Highways / Access</u> Highways assessment suggests major infrastructure works required, potentially impacting on viability and timescale for development - Current observed access is very awkward; A narrow lane, directly accessed off A611 roundabout. Extensive infrastructure works to the bypass would be required.</p> <p><u>Topography</u> No issues identified.</p> <p><u>Neighbour</u> Slight adverse effects from adjacent occupiers or development of the site for housing - Adjacent to Bypass.</p> <p><u>Flood Risk</u> EA Maps suggest area at no risk from Flooding.</p> <p><u>Contamination</u> No known contamination.</p> <p><u>Agricultural Land Quality</u> Grade 2 (Very Good)</p>	<p><u>Conclusion</u> The Council considers that this site should not be taken forward as an allocation within the Preferred Approach Local Pan.</p> <p>The site's primary constraint is its Green Belt designation. In response to paragraph 83 of the NPPF, the Council has undertaken a Green Belt Review to understand the contribution sites adjacent to the urban area make to the 5 purposes of Green Belt. The site scores 7 out of 20. Whilst this site scores similar in Green Belt terms to the sites chosen to be allocated for housing, it is considered that this site also requires major infrastructure requirements, which will potentially impact on timescale for development. A new access route would be required from the A611. This is not considered to be a feasible option as it is very unlikely that this could be achieved.</p> <p>Given the uncertainty with regard to the delivery of development, the site is not considered to be suitable to be taken forward as an allocation.</p>
H17	Lynwood, Forest View Drive	0.02	7	G	2	1	3	1	7	<p><u>Suitability</u> Suitability is constrained by the site's Green Belt status and its Grade 2 agricultural land status. Consequently this site is considered currently unsuitable.</p> <p><u>Availability</u> This site is available – beyond 5 years.</p> <p><u>Achievability</u> Achievability is compromised by</p>	<p><u>Positive Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Increase number of new dwellings.Good access to key services and facilities.Good access to open green spaces.Improvement in health and social inclusion.No loss of designated wildlife sites.No impact on heritage assets.	<p><u>Highways / Access</u> Highways assessment suggests major infrastructure works required, potentially impacting on viability and timescale for development - Current observed access is very awkward; A narrow lane, directly accessed off A611 roundabout. Extensive infrastructure works to the bypass would be required.</p> <p><u>Topography</u> No issues identified.</p>	<p><u>Conclusion</u> The Council considers that this site should not be taken forward as an allocation within the Preferred Approach Local Pan.</p> <p>The site's primary constraint is its Green Belt designation. In response to paragraph 83 of the NPPF, the Council has undertaken a Green Belt Review to understand the contribution sites adjacent to the urban area make to the 5</p>

										severe access constraints with no apparent possibility for mitigation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports regeneration of Hucknall Town Centre. <p><u>Negative Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of Greenfield land and BMV agricultural land. Negative impact on air quality. The land has mature trees and hedgerows surrounding it. Highways access to the site could be unviable. The site's placement within the Green Belt requires policy changes for this site to come forward. 	<p><u>Neighbour</u> Slight adverse effects from adjacent occupiers or development of the site for housing - Adjacent to Bypass.</p> <p><u>Flood Risk</u> EA Maps suggest area at no risk from Flooding.</p> <p><u>Contamination</u> No known contamination.</p> <p><u>Agricultural Land Quality</u> Grade 2 (Very Good)</p>	<p>purposes of Green Belt. The site scores 7 out of 20. Whilst this site scores similar in Green Belt terms to the sites chosen to be allocated for housing, it is considered that this site also requires major infrastructure requirements, which will potentially impact on timescale for development. A new access route would be required from the A611. This is not considered to be a feasible option as it is very unlikely that this could be achieved.</p> <p>Given the uncertainty with regard to the delivery of development, the site is not considered to be suitable to be taken forward as an allocation.</p>
H24	Linby Road Former Allotments	0.68	24	G	N /A	N /A	N/ A	N/ A	N/ A	<p><u>Suitability</u> The site is currently allocated for housing in the Ashfield Local Plan Review (2002). As such, it is generally suitable.</p> <p><u>Availability</u> The site is potentially available – beyond 15 years.</p> <p><u>Achievability</u> Achievability is severely compromised by a lack of access. Consequently the site is currently considered undeliverable. It may be developable.</p>	<p><u>Positive Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase number of new dwellings. Increase in the number of affordable homes. Good access to key services and facilities. Good access to open green spaces, with a SINC to the north west of the site. Improvement in health and social inclusion. No loss of designated wildlife sites. No impact on heritage assets. Supports regeneration of Hucknall Town Centre. <p><u>Negative Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of Greenfield land and allotment space. Negative impact on air quality. Highways access to the site could be unviable. There is a surface water flooding issue on the site. 	<p><u>Highways / Access</u> Highways assessment suggests insufficient capacity for proposed level of development, with no apparent possibility for mitigation - All the road structures surrounding the site are unsuitable for accommodating increased traffic generation. St Marys Way is too narrow and Carlingford Road has restricted road width due to on street parking.</p> <p><u>Topography</u> No issues identified.</p> <p><u>Neighbour</u> No issues identified.</p> <p><u>Flood Risk</u> EA Maps suggest area at no risk from Flooding.</p> <p><u>Contamination</u> No known contamination.</p>	<p><u>Conclusion</u> The Council considers that this site should not be taken forward as an allocation within the Preferred Approach Local Pan.</p> <p>The site has been allocated for housing since 2002 and there has never been a planning application submitted to the Council. There are severe access constraints which would require third party land to overcome. The site also has multiple landowners which adds to the constraints.</p> <p>Given the constraints and uncertainty with regard to the deliverability of development, the Council does not consider the site to be suitable for allocation.</p>
H83	Land off Wood Lane	1.86	56	G	2	1	3	1	7	<p><u>Suitability</u> This site is in Green Belt and adjoins the urban area. There are access constraints which could potentially be overcome. However, there is a Local Wildlife Site adjacent to the site which may be the only suitable point of</p>	<p><u>Positive Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase number of new dwellings. Increase in the number of affordable homes. Good access to key services and facilities. Good access to open green 	<p><u>Highways / Access</u> Unknown.</p> <p><u>Topography</u> Minor topographical constraints.</p> <p><u>Neighbour</u> No issues identified.</p>	<p><u>Conclusion</u> The Council does not believe this site should be taken forward as an allocation in the Local Pan.</p> <p>One of the site's primary constraint is its Green Belt designation. In response to paragraph 83 of the</p>

										<p>access. The site may be suitable if there are exceptional circumstances for Green Belt release and if access issues can be overcome.</p> <p><u>Availability</u> The site is available – beyond 5 years.</p> <p><u>Achievability</u> Based on whole Plan viability evidence, development is considered to be achievable.</p>	<p>spaces.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improvement in health and social inclusion. No loss of designated wildlife sites. No impact on heritage assets. Supports regeneration of Hucknall Town Centre. <p><u>Negative Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of Greenfield land and BMV agricultural land. Negative impact on air quality. The land has mature trees and hedgerows surrounding it. Highways access to the site could be problematic The site's placement within the Green Belt requires policy changes for this site to come forward. 	<p><u>Flood Risk</u> EA Maps suggest area at no risk from Flooding.</p> <p><u>Contamination</u> No known contamination.</p> <p><u>Agricultural Land Quality</u> Grade 2 (Very Good).</p>	<p>NPPF, the Council has undertaken a Green Belt Review to understand the contribution sites adjacent to the urban area make to the 5 purposes of Green Belt. The site scores 7 out of 20. Whilst this site scores similar in Green Belt terms to the sites chosen to be allocated for housing, it is considered that access constraints would impact on the timescale for delivery of development and there is less certainty that the constraints could be mitigated. Furthermore, Broomhill Farm is considered to be a more suitable site as it forms a logical rounding off of the settlement and there is more certainty that access constraints can be mitigated at Broomhill Farm.</p>
H91	Brickyard Drive	0.73	20	G	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	<p><u>Suitability</u> The site is currently allocated for housing in the Ashfield Local Plan Review (2002). However, the site can only be accessed via an unmade road and a level crossing. The Highway Authority has indicated that this would not be a satisfactory arrangement for access into this site. With regard to the level crossing, a safety audit would also need to be undertaken. The site is currently considered unsuitable for residential development.</p> <p><u>Availability</u> The land owner has indicated that the site is available. However, there are severe access constraints due to the level crossing. A new bridge would be required. This would impact on the timescale for delivery of development.</p> <p><u>Achievability</u> Based on whole Plan viability evidence, development is considered to be achievable.</p>	<p><u>Positive Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase number of new dwellings. Increase in the number of affordable homes. Good access to open green spaces. Good access to local services and facilities. Improvement in health and social inclusion. Supports regeneration of Hucknall Town Centre. Supports employment and the local economy. <p><u>Negative Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of Greenfield land. Negative impact on air quality. Small risk of surface water flooding. 	<p><u>Highways / Access</u> Current information suggests insufficient capacity, no detailed assessment made - The road structures surrounding this sites are unsuitable for accommodating increased traffic generation. In addition, there is the difficulty of crossing the rail lines.</p> <p><u>Topography</u> No issues identified.</p> <p><u>Neighbour</u> Significant adverse effects from adjacent or development of the site for housing - Railway line and employment units adjacent to the site</p> <p><u>Flood Risk</u> EA Maps suggest area at no risk from Flooding.</p> <p><u>Contamination</u> Likely existence of contamination, no detailed assessment made - Historic landfill site - Brickyard excavations</p>	<p><u>Conclusion</u> The Council does not believe this site should be taken forward as an allocation in the Local Pan.</p> <p>The site has been allocated for housing since 2002 and has never been brought forward. There are severe access constraints as it can only be accessed via a level crossing. Network Rail has indicated that a new bridge would be required to serve the site. Given the constraints, there is a significant level of uncertainty with regard to the sites potential to bring forward development within the Plan period. As such, the site is not considered to be suitable for allocation.</p>

Appendix 1 – Discounted sites

SHLAA Ref.	Location	Reason discounted
K4	Matley Avenue, Kirkby Woodhouse	No Green Belt release in Kirkby or Annesley
K24	Land at Derby Road, Kirkby in Ashfield	No Green Belt release in Kirkby or Annesley
K27	Beacon Farm, Kirkby in Ashfield	No Green Belt release in Kirkby or Annesley
K29	Abbey Road, Kirkby in Ashfield	Green Belt - Scores 5 for urban sprawl. No Green Belt release in Kirkby or Annesley.
K31	Crich View Smallholding, Kirkby in Ashfield	No Green Belt release in Kirkby or Annesley
K32	Pinxton Lane, Kirkby in Ashfield	Excluded from SHLAA process - detached from settlement
K34	Thoresby Avenue, Kirkby in Ashfield	No Green Belt release in Kirkby or Annesley
K36	Annesley Cutting, Annesley	No Green Belt release in Kirkby or Annesley
K38	Beauvale Road, Kirkby Woodhouse	No Green Belt release in Kirkby or Annesley
K39	Land rear of 273 Nuncargate Road, Kirkby Woodhouse	No Green Belt release in Kirkby or Annesley
K40	Land between Nottingham Road and Nuncargate Road, Kirkby Woodhouse	No Green Belt release in Kirkby or Annesley
K41	Land rear of 141, 143, 145 Main Road, Kirkby Woodhouse	No Green Belt release in Kirkby or Annesley
K58	Birchwood Grange, Kirkby in Ashfield	Assessed as 'Unsuitable' in SHLAA
K80	Land off Church Lane, Kirkby in Ashfield	No Green Belt release in Kirkby or Annesley. Assessed as 'unsuitable' in the SHLAA. Green Belt - Scores highest points for preserving the setting of historic settlements in the Green Belt assessment.
K109	Forest Road, Annesley Woodhouse	Assessed as 'Unsuitable' in SHLAA
K113	Derby Road, Kirkby in Ashfield	No Green Belt release in Kirkby or Annesley
K139	Campfields Farm, Land off Derby Road, Kirkby in Ashfield	No Green Belt release in Kirkby or Annesley
K329	Blidworth Road, Kirkby	No Green Belt release in Kirkby or Annesley and assessed as 'unsuitable' in SHLAA
K331	Laburnum Avenue, Kirkby in Ashfield	No Green Belt release in Kirkby or Annesley and assessed as 'unsuitable' in SHLAA
K332	Recreation Road, Annesley	No Green Belt release in Kirkby or Annesley
K341	Derby Road, Kirkby in Ashfield	No Green Belt release in Kirkby or Annesley
K360	Half Moon Farm, Kingsway, Kirkby in Ashfield	No Green Belt release in Kirkby or Annesley
K372	Kirkby Delivery Office, Ashfield Precinct, Kirkby in Ashfield	The site is below the threshold for allocation (10 dwellings).
K386	Diamond Avenue/Derby Road, Kirkby in Ashfield	No Green Belt release in Kirkby or Annesley
K387	East of Derby Road, Kirkby in Ashfield	Excluded from SHLAA process (detached from settlement). No Green Belt release in Kirkby or Annesley
K398	Land rear of 64 Forest Road, Annesley Woodhouse	The site is below the threshold for allocation (10 dwellings).

K400	Van Elle, Pinxton Lane, Kirkby in Ashfield	Excluded from SHLAA process - detached from settlement
SM43	Oak View Rise, Harlow Wood	Excluded from SHLAA process - detached from settlement
SM45	Land south of the MARR, Sutton in Ashfield	Excluded from SHLAA process - detached from settlement
SM46	Land south of the MARR, Sutton in Ashfield	Excluded from SHLAA process - detached from settlement
S64	Land rear of Coxmoor House, Sutton in Ashfield	Assessed as 'Unsuitable' in SHLAA
S65	Brackenfield, Cauldwell Road, Sutton in Ashfield	Excluded from SHLAA process - detached from settlement
S101	Penniment Lane, Sutton in Ashfield	Excluded from SHLAA process - detached from settlement
S115	Land off Chesterfield Road, Huthwaite	Assessed as 'Unsuitable' in SHLAA
S321	Whiteborough Farm, Chesterfield Road, Huthwaite	Excluded from SHLAA process - detached from settlement
S328	Land at Skegby Bottoms, Mansfield Road, Skegby	Assessed as 'Unsuitable' in SHLAA
S330	Land off Leamington Drive, Sutton in Ashfield	Assessed as 'Unsuitable' in SHLAA
S336	Land off Beristow Lane, near Huthwaite	Assessed as 'Unsuitable' in SHLAA
S362	Land rear of Station Farm, Teversal	Assessed as 'Unsuitable' in SHLAA
S368	Wild Hill, Teversal	Excluded from SHLAA process - detached from settlement
S373	Sutton Delivery Office, Langton Road, Sutton in Ashfield	The site is below the threshold for allocation (10 dwellings).
S384	Stoneyford Road, Sutton in Ashfield	Assessed as 'Unsuitable' in SHLAA
S395	Tibshelf Road, Teversal	Assessed as 'Unsuitable' in SHLAA
S396	Sharradoba, Silverhill Lane, Teversal	Assessed as 'Unsuitable' in SHLAA
S399	Land at Coxmoor Golf Club, Sutton in Ashfield	Excluded from SHLAA process - detached from settlement
V1	Alfreton Road, Jubilee	Excluded from SHLAA process - detached from settlement
V2	Alfreton Road, Jubilee	Excluded from SHLAA process - detached from settlement
V3	Alfreton Road, Jubilee	Excluded from SHLAA process - detached from settlement
V11	Westwood Gardens, Westwood	Excluded from SHLAA process - detached from settlement
V13	Land rear of 55 Wagstaff Lane, Jacksdale	Assessed as 'Unsuitable' in SHLAA
V14	Land adjacent to 282 Main Road, Westwood	Assessed as 'Unsuitable' in SHLAA
V21	Land between 106 and 132 Main Road, Underwood	Green Belt - The site scores the highest points for preserving the historic settlement (Lower Bagthorpe). Consequently it has been discounted from the site selection process.
V35	Land off Felley Mill Lane, Underwood	Assessed as 'Unsuitable' in SHLAA
V86	Land adjacent to 149 Stoney Lane, Selston	The site is below the threshold for allocation (10 dwellings).

V88	Land between 191 243 Nottingham Road, Selston	Assessed as 'Unsuitable' in SHLAA
V90	Station Road, Selston	Excluded from SHLAA process - detached from settlement
V102	Land at the Triangle, Felley Mill Lane, Underwood	Assessed as 'Unsuitable' in SHLAA
V104	Land off Main Road, Jacksdale	The site is below the threshold for allocation (10 dwellings).
V338	Land off Inkerman Road, Selston	The landowner has withdrawn the site. As such, it is unavailable.
V339	Westwood Gardens, Westwood	The site is below the threshold for allocation (10 dwellings).
V340	Westwood Gardens, Westwood	Excluded from SHLAA process - detached from settlement
V349	Winter Closes and Cordy Lane, Underwood	Green Belt - The site scores the highest points for checking the unrestricted sprawl of built up areas. Consequently it has been discounted.
V352	Cordy Lane, Underwood	Excluded from SHLAA process - detached from settlement
V353	Cordy Lane, Underwood	Excluded from SHLAA process - detached from settlement
V354	Cordy Lane, Underwood	Excluded from SHLAA process - detached from settlement
V355	Cordy Lane, Underwood	Excluded from SHLAA process - detached from settlement
V356	Cordy Lane, Underwood	Excluded from SHLAA process - detached from settlement
V357	Cordy Lane, Underwood	Excluded from SHLAA process - detached from settlement
V361	Westwood Gardens, Westwood	Excluded from SHLAA process - detached from settlement
V364	Land adjacent to 358 Nottingham Road, Selston	Assessed as 'Unsuitable' in SHLAA. Green Belt - scores highest for preventing merging in Green Belt assessment.
V365c	Oak Tree Farm, Jacksdale (whole site)	Assessed as 'Unsuitable' in SHLAA. Green Belt - The site scores the highest points for checking the unrestricted sprawl of built up areas. Consequently it has been discounted.
V369	Vehicle Dismantling Yard, Winter Closes, Underwood	Excluded from SHLAA process - detached from settlement
V370	Winter Closes, Underwood	Excluded from SHLAA process - detached from settlement
V377	Station Road, Selston Common	Excluded from SHLAA process - detached from settlement
V389	Land off Nottingham Road, Jubilee	Excluded from SHLAA process - detached from settlement
V391	Land off Nottingham Road, Jubilee	Excluded from SHLAA process - detached from settlement
V392	Land off Nottingham Road, Jubilee	Excluded from SHLAA process - detached from settlement
V397	Land off Pye Hill Road, Jacksdale	Assessed as 'Unsuitable' in SHLAA

V402	Knightsbridge House and Garage, Pye Hill Road, Jacksdale	Assessed as 'Unsuitable' in SHLAA
V403	Paradise Windows, Pye Hill Road, Jacksdale	Assessed as 'Unsuitable' in SHLAA
H3	Land off Badger Close, Hucknall	Assessed as 'Unsuitable' in SHLAA. The site scores the highest points for checking the unrestricted sprawl of built up areas. Consequently it has been discounted.
H6	Linby Boarding Kennels, Church Lane, Hucknall	Green Belt - The site scores the highest points for preventing the merger of settlements. Consequently it has been discounted.
H7	Brickyard, Hucknall	Assessed as 'Unsuitable' in SHLAA
H8	Mill Lane, Bestwood	Assessed as 'Unsuitable' in SHLAA
H10	Butlers Hill, Hucknall	Assessed as 'Unsuitable' in SHLAA
H11 (now includes former H18)	Land off Nottingham Road, Hucknall	Assessed as 'Unsuitable' in SHLAA
H13	Whyburn Farm, Hucknall	Green Belt - The site scores the highest points for checking the unrestricted sprawl of built up areas. Consequently it has been discounted.
H19	Land off Moor Road, Bestwood	Excluded from SHLAA process - detached from settlement
H22	Land off Nottingham Road, Hucknall	Assessed as 'Unsuitable' in SHLAA