



DISCLAIMER

This document or some parts of it may not be accessible when using adaptive technology.

If you require assistance with accessing the content of the document, please contact us and quote the document name and the web page you found it on:

- email: Forward planning – localplan@ashfield.gov.uk
- telephone: 01623 457381

From:
To: [localplan](#)
Cc: [programme.officer](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL]:Ashfield Local Plan Modifications Consultation
Date: 30 July 2026 11:55:06

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Sirs, we refer to our earlier email regarding the proposed modifications and this email should be read as additional comments, now that Matthew Peenycok MP's letter of 15th July to the Planning Inspectorate has been published.

Main Modifications should be made to achieve an adoptable Plan. The Main Modifications in this case do not achieve that aim. Many of the issues raised in the Hearings will not be addressed by the proposed modifications. As a result, we firmly believe that the Plan cannot be found to be sound, justified or effective.

The Modifications do not resolve the serious failings exposed in evidence given to the Inspectors (both in writing and orally during the Hearings). For clarity it is inevitable that we illustrate the failings of the Modifications by reference below to matters discussed at the Hearings and as presented by others and ourselves through Bob Woollard of Planning & Design Group.

It is by no means clear that the Modifications will provide for the much-needed Market and Affordable Housing required in the district as a whole. Whether enough housing land is provided is still in doubt.

The "spatial strategy" remains unjustified (and unclear) and does not provide an appropriate strategy to meet the needs of the area, especially in respect of the Hucknall area which as has been seen is one of the most sustainable towns in Ashfield. Growth is needed in Hucknall and which this Plan, even with the proposed modifications, fails to meet.

The Plan as modified does not grapple with the need to release land from the Green Belt (which effectively strangles the town). It is inevitable that the Green Belt boundary will need to be redrawn. The "additional sites" do nothing to reduce that need. None would serve the needs of Hucknall.

Additional allocations are necessary in Hucknall, or at the least, sufficient "white land" should be provided to avoid further Green Belt release at (or more likely before) the end of the Plan period. Our site at Comon Lane has now received a planning permission, on appeal, as a grey belt site ([APP/W3005/W/25/3369440](#)). Further land is needed and the promoted part of the "blue land" to our application site would help to meet some of that need, either as an allocation for housing or as "White Land". See SHELAA SITE HK003 Site C:- (<https://www.ashfield.gov.uk/media/yw4dayxz/shelaa-sites-in-hucknall-2025.docx>).

The Council appear to remain wedded to the fallacy that sites within Gedling Borough, close to Hucknaall, will provide the housing growth needed in Hucknall. That is bad planning.

It has been noted that the "allocation" proposed in the draft Greater Nottingham Strategic Plan for housing close to Hucknall (but in Gedling Borough) has been withdrawn from the GNSP, following Gedling's withdrawal from that Plan. Whether that former GNSP draft

allocation is brought forward by Gedling will remain uncertain its own Plan is adopted. As the Inspectors have heard, Gedling wishes to meet its housing needs in full under the current standard method rather than hide behind the transitional arrangements which the GNSP and Ashfield Plan seek to do. It has also been made clear that that Gedling will meet only its own housing needs and not those of Ashfield

Even with the Main Modifications, it will remain the case that Ashfield is planning for less housing than the area requires under the current method of calculating its need, irrespective of whether its housing numbers meet , which we doubt in any event, the methodology of the 2023 NPPF.

The additional housing sites added to Ashfields supply have been questioned by a number of participants to the Hearings. At best, even if all can be delivered, which is doubted, there is very little headway built into the numbers and every likelihood the supply will not be sufficient. A larger buffer against inevitable supply failures is needed.

Having regard to the Governments desire for Plan Inspectors to take a “pragmatic view” we feel that even with that in mind, the proposed modifications the Plan, without further modification to provide more land for housing, must be found to be unsound, unjustified and ineffective,

Yours,

Wayne Scholter

Aldergate Properties Limited