

Greater Nottingham - Broxtowe Borough, Gedling Borough and Nottingham City Aligned Core Strategies Publication Version June 2012

Response of **Linby Parish Council & Papplewick Parish Council** to
Inspector's Matters, Issues and Questions

MATTER 7: INFRASTRUCTURE AND DELIVERY (Q. 2 & 5)

Background

- .1 The representations made here, which build on earlier representations made to the Broxtowe Borough, Gedling Borough and Nottingham City Aligned Core Strategies on behalf of Linby Parish Council & Papplewick Parish Council ("the Parish Councils") are made specifically in respect of the policies and proposals relating to Gedling Borough, unless otherwise stated.

Questions 2 & 5

Response

- .2 The NPPF [para. 177] advises that it is important to ensure that there is a reasonable prospect that planned infrastructure is deliverable in a timely fashion and it is important that local planning authorities understand the district-wide development costs at the time Local Plans are drawn up. Infrastructure and development policies should be planned at the same time.
- .3 Part 1, paragraph 1 of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) sets out the infrastructure capacity, constraints and requirements associated with the ACS¹ development proposals. Part 1, paragraph 2 sets out the joint working arrangements for the IDP with other local authorities comprising the Greater Nottingham Area (including Ashfield in respect of Hucknall) and Notts County Council. The IDP explains that: "*ADC is not included in the IDP as Ashfield is at an earlier stage of plan preparation*". It goes on to say "*As the Hucknall wards of Ashfield have a close functional relationship with the area covered by the IDP, broad assumptions regarding the future levels of growth and potential strategic sites within Hucknall have been made.*"
- .4 It is clear from the above that the IDP does not provide detailed infrastructure capacity, constraints and requirements associated with the proposed SUE allocations of Top Wighay Farm and land North of Papplewick Lane in terms of their cumulative impacts with ADC's development proposals in Hucknall. This is significant insofar as the two SUE sites will be completely reliant upon the services and facilities in Hucknall. The Parish Councils share the concerns previously expressed by ADC in this respect and raise similar objections to the soundness of the IDP and ACS on this basis.

¹ The Greater Nottingham – Broxtowe Borough, Gedling Borough and Nottingham City Aligned Core Strategies Publication Version June 2012

- .5 With regard to Top Wighay Farm, despite the Appraisal of Sustainable Urban Extensions Study undertaken by Tribal in 2008 (CD/KEY/08) identifying that Top Wighay was potentially suitable for mixed-use development subject to a tram extension, the IDP contains no requirement, let alone mechanism, for this to happen. The County Council is of the opinion that this no longer needs to happen relying instead on a “link” bus service, but the pressure this would place on the existing tram station at Hucknall and the need for additional parking, etc., does not appear to have been properly considered or at least set out in the ACS. The IDP does not therefore present credible evidence that the ACS meets the requirements of the NPPF (Para’s 173 and 174) for sites to be viable and deliverable.
- .6 In addition, the IDP is also now out of date in respect of the Gedling Colliery/Chase Farm site, which by virtue of recent progress in respect to the funding of the Gedling Access Road, is now likely to come forward for development within the plan period. Priority should now be given to the development of this site before the release of greenfield sites in the countryside/Green Belt and the full IDP implications investigated, understood and planned for. In this connection, the IDP (on p21) explains that: *“Delivery of Gedling Access Road is also outside of the plan period but could be accelerated subject to funding, in which case further modelling would be undertaken to review the wider transport impacts of the site and other infrastructure requirements.”*
- .7 The developments with regard to the funding of the Gedling Access Road and the implications this has on the site being developed during the plan period (with the additional opportunity to develop Mapperley Park Golf Course) has shifted the basis upon which GBC has set out its spatial strategy for Gedling Borough, such that the ACS and the IDP in their present form do not provide the most sustainable basis upon which to develop the area. As a result, the ACS and IDP are not sound.

Relevant hearing session: Week 2 – Wednesday 6th November: Day 5 (10am)²

Word count: 737

Date: 18th September 2013

² Examination hearing session as per draft programme dated 22 August 2013