

Ashfield District Local Plan Examination

Additional Matters, Issues and Questions identified by the Inspectors

Notes

1. After the pause in the examination to allow the Council to respond to the Inspectors following the initial hearing sessions, the Council has now submitted its further evidence and proposed additional site allocations for consideration. As such, the Inspectors are content to move forward with the hearing sessions to consider the remaining soundness matters.
2. The Inspectors' initial Matters, Issues and Questions (MIQs) were issued in September 2024, which have been published on the examination webpages. Hearing statements based on these MIQs for matters 1,2 and 3 were received from the Council and other participants and hearing sessions held. Inspectors have already received written and oral evidence in respect of the Duty to Cooperate and Legal Compliance under Matter 1, meeting housing needs under matter 2 and the spatial strategy under Matter 3.
3. The Inspectors do not propose to revisit Matter 1 again. However, the Inspectors intend to partially revisit Matters 2 and 3 in the forthcoming hearings with a particular focus on the implications of the proposed additional sites on the Spatial Strategy and overall housing to be provided over the plan period. The Inspectors will also consider the implications of any additional sites on whether exceptional circumstances would justify altering the Green Belt boundary.
4. Statements for Matters 4 to 12 were not received at that time due to the postponement of those hearing sessions. Hearing statements are now required for matters 4-12 inclusive. Other participants may also wish to prepare and submit accompanying hearing statements on these matters.
5. The Inspectors do not propose reissuing the full MIQs and instead, the existing version [INS03] should be used to prepare hearing statements for matters 4 to 12. In addition, the Inspectors' additional questions set out in this document below should also be addressed in statements as they form an addendum to the existing MIQs.
6. The question numbers shown below follow on from the relevant numbered section of document INS03, and therefore, should be covered in the appropriate part of each hearing statement.
7. Further information about the Examination, hearing sessions and the format for written statements is provided in the accompanying Guidance Note, and the Planning Inspectorate's Procedural Guide which should be read alongside the MIQs.
8. It is reminded that hearing statements are not an opportunity to introduce additional points not previously raised in your representations on the Plan, broaden the scope of your representations or comment on new matters. Furthermore, no additional information or information should be submitted to the examination unless specifically asked for by the Inspectors. Any unsolicited documents will be returned to the sender.

Inspectors additional Questions

Matter 2 – Meeting Ashfield’s Housing Needs

Issue 1

Whether the Local Plan has been positively prepared and whether it is justified, effective and consistent with national policy in relation to meeting housing needs.

Questions

- 2.7.1 Would the proposed additional sites put forward by the Council provide sufficient capacity to address the housing shortfall over the plan period?

Matter 3 – The Spatial Strategy and the distribution of development

Issue

Whether the Spatial Strategy and the distribution of development are justified, and can be accommodated without releasing land from the Green Belt? If not, do exceptional circumstances exist that would justify altering the Green Belt boundary?

Questions

- 3.1.1 What effect would the proposed additional sites have on the distribution of new housing development across the plan area?
- 3.1.2 Is the Spatial Strategy effective having regard to the scale and location of the proposed additional sites?

Green Belt

- 3.19 Is the Spatial Strategy effective if any further proposed sites would be required to be released from the Green Belt?
- 3.20 Is the release of Green Belt land necessary to address the shortfall in housing across the plan period?

Matter 10 – Site allocations

Issue - Whether the proposed site allocations are justified and deliverable/ developable at the point envisaged

Questions

Kirkby area site allocations

H1KI – Central Avenue, Kirkby

- 10.40.1 Is the proposed allocation justified?

H1Km – Abbey Road, Kirkby

- 10.40.2 Proposed additional site reference H1Km would be located within the Green Belt. Do exceptional circumstances exist that would justify amending the Green Belt in this location?

H1Kn – Southwell Lane, Kirkby

- 10.40.3 Is the proposed allocation justified?

H1Ko – Former Kirkland’s Care Home, Fairhaven, Kirkby

10.40.4 Is the proposed allocation justified?

H1Kp – Pond Hole, Kirkby and H1Kr – Ellis Street, Kirkby

10.40.5 Proposed additional site allocations referenced H1Kp and H1Kr fall within the Kirkby development opportunity site area as shown on page 78 of the plan. Have these sites already been accounted for elsewhere in the proposed housing trajectory having regard to their status under policy S11?

H1Kq – Former Wyvern Club site, Lane End, Kirkby

10.40.6 Is the proposed allocation justified?

H1Kr – Ellis Street, Kirkby

10.40.7 Is the proposed allocation justified?

Sutton area site allocations

H1Sai – Pendean Way, Sutton

10.67.1 Is the proposed allocation justified?

H1Saj – Between Redcliffe Street and Leyton Avenue, Sutton

10.67.2 Is the proposed allocation justified?

H1Sak – Rookery Lane, Sutton

10.67.3 Is the proposed allocation justified?

H1Sal – Newark Road/ Coxmoor Road

10.67.4 Is the proposed allocation justified?

H1Sam – Beck Lane South, Skegby

10.67.5 Would the proposed additional site have any effects on the Teversal Pastures SSSI? If so, what mitigation measures would be required to avoid harm to the designated site? How would these be secured?

H1San – Radford’s Farm, Dawgates Lane, Skegby

10.67.6 Would the proposed additional site have any effects on the Teversal Pastures SSSI? If so, what mitigation measures would be required to avoid harm to the designated site? How would these be secured?

Philip Mileham and Graham Wyatt

INSPECTORS

3 October 2025