

12 September 2013**Agenda Item:****REPORT OF THE CORPORATE DIRECTOR FOR POLICY, PLANNING AND
CORPORATE SERVICES****STRATEGIC PLANNING OBSERVATIONS ON A MIXED USE
DEVELOPMENT ON LAND AT TEAL CLOSE, GEDLING****Purpose of the Report**

1. To seek Committee ratification for comments set out in this report which were sent to Gedling Borough Council (GBC) in response to the request for strategic planning observations on the above planning application for a mixed use development on land at Teal Close, Gedling.

Information and Advice

2. Nottinghamshire County Council (NCC) has been asked for strategic planning observations on the application and this report compiles responses from Departments involved in providing comments and observations on such matters. On the basis of Committee's decision, comments will be sent to Gedling Borough Council in their role as determining planning authority for this application. A site plan is provided at Appendix 1.
3. The planning application is accompanied by an Environmental Statement, Design and Access Statement and a range of other supporting documents. This report is based on the information submitted with the application in the context of national, regional and local policy.

Description of the Proposal

4. The application site is located on largely agricultural land to the west and east of the A612 Colwick Loop Road, between Netherfield and Stoke Bardolph Sewage Treatment Works (STW), in Gedling Borough at the eastern extremity of the Nottingham built up area. The site can be described as largely formed by three parcels of land, bisected by the Loop Road.
5. The main part of the site lies to the east of the A612 on agricultural fields forming part of Severn Trent Waters' farming portfolio. The main fields are currently used to grow a maize energy crop to feed the Anaerobic Digester plant at the Stoke Bardolph Sewage Treatment Works (STW). Ouse Dyke and a public right of way runs along the southern boundary and the Victoria Retail Park is located

immediately south of this. Stoke Lane forms the northern boundary to the site, including where it forms a traffic light controlled junction with the A612. Directly off Stoke Lane is the extensive Stoke Bardolph STW and neighbouring Chettles Pet Food Plant. To the south-east is a new National Grid electricity sub-station.

6. The public right of way on the southern boundary then crosses the Loop Road and proceeds north-west along the perimeter of the playing fields towards Emerys Road, where it emerges next to the railway bridge.
7. On the western side of the A612 a further triangular block of agricultural land is included, bounded to the west by allotments to the rear of Emerys Road and to the south by a strip of woodland, beyond which is the Victoria Road Playing Fields.
8. The application site includes the Victoria Road Playing Fields as the third parcel of land. This area extends as a finger of land running north from the A612 and bounded by the former Gedling Colliery Railway Line and the old A612 to the west.
9. The proposed development can be described as residential led, comprising up to 830 residential units, however this is a mixed use development also including an employment area and a hotel, a new local centre and primary school to serve the new residents as well as extensive areas of open space in the form of replacement playing pitches for those at the Victoria Road Playing Fields which would be built on and an 'ecology park'.

The full schedule of development sought for consent is:

- Up to 830 residential units
 - Up to 18,000m² employment uses (B1/B2/B8)
 - A Local Centre comprising of: retail/ financial and professional services, food and drink uses, leisure and non-residential uses. Totalling up to 2,800m²
 - A 150 bed hotel
 - A 60 bed care home
 - A single form primary school
 - A community building of up to 500m²
 - Sports Pitches - a minimum of 4.2 hectares
 - Ecology Park – a minimum of 10 hectares
 - Other open space- including allotments, play areas and landscaping
 - New junctions on the A612 and Stoke Lane
10. The application is in outline form, however detailed consent is sought for new access arrangements off the Colwick Loop Road and Stoke Lane. The primary access would be a new traffic light controlled junction, with arms entering both the western and eastern sides of the site. A second left-in, left-out access would serve the western side between the new main junction and the existing Stoke Lane junction. The employment park element would be accessed from a new junction on Stoke Lane, thereby segregating commercial traffic from residential traffic.

11. The illustrative masterplan envisages the two western land parcels as exclusively for new residential development. This would include the entirety of the existing Victoria Road Playing Fields. Areas of woodland around the playing field site would largely be retained and a new landscaping buffer would be provided along the A612 frontage. Access would be from two new junctions on the A612, with the internal roads cutting through the wooded strip to access the playing field part of the site.
12. The main part of the proposed development is on the opposite, eastern side of the A612, where again a landscaping strip would provide a buffer. The north-western corner of the field would comprise a new employment park, in a roughly 'L' shape at the corner of Stoke Lane and the A612. To the south of this, also fronting the main A612 and providing a 'gateway' into the site, would be the new Local Centre and hotel/ pub. The new primary school and community building would be situated centrally, adjacent to the new Local Centre. A large part of the site behind these uses is then envisaged as further residential areas, however an area for new allotments would provide a buffer from Stoke Lane and the STW and Chettles plant beyond.
13. The southern portion of the field which is an area of marshy and semi-improved grassland is then set aside as open space, firstly for new playing fields in the south-west corner, replacing those on the opposite side of the A612. The proposed community building could also provide the replacement changing facilities for the users of the new pitches. The extreme south-east part of the site is proposed as an 'ecology park'.
14. Much of this open area of land is within the Green Belt and protected as public open space, with the built development area outside. However a large portion is located in 'safeguarded land' adjacent to the Green Belt and this is discussed further in the report. Furthermore the majority of the site is formally within Flood Zone 2, although this is contested by the applicant with new modelling evidence. The agricultural parts of the site are claimed to be sub-grade and therefore not the best and most versatile land type. This is due to the use of ex-sewage sludge being spread on the land meaning that only energy crops can be cultivated.

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

15. One of the core principles of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is to support and deliver economic growth to ensure that the housing, business and other development needs of an area are met. The NPPF looks to boost significantly the supply of housing. The principles and policies contained in the NPPF also recognise the value of and the need to protect and enhance the natural, built and historic environment, biodiversity and also include the need to adapt to climate change.
16. A key aspect of the NPPF is that it includes a presumption in favour of sustainable development which means that, for decision-taking, local planning authorities should approve development proposals that accord with the development plan without delay or where a development plan is absent, silent or out of date, grant

permission unless any adverse impacts of the proposal outweigh the benefits, or specific policies in the NPPF indicate that development should be restricted.

17. The NPPF also discusses the weight that can be given in planning determinations to policies emerging as the local authority's development plan is being brought forward. The weight given to these policies will be very dependant on; their stage of preparation, the extent to which there are unresolved objections and the degree of consistency with the NPPF.
18. The Government is committed to securing economic growth, with the planning system encouraging sustainable growth, as set out in paragraphs 18 and 19 of the NPPF.
19. Paragraphs 29-41 of the NPPF address the issue of sustainable transport. The NPPF requires all major planning applications to be supported by an appropriate Transport Assessment (TA) and concludes that new development proposals should only be refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts would be severe.
20. Paragraphs 47 and 49 of the NPPF state that local planning authorities should identify sufficient deliverable housing sites to provide five years worth of housing against their housing requirement with an additional buffer of either 5% (to ensure choice and competition) or 20% (where there has been a record of persistent under delivery) and that,

"...relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up to date if the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing sites".
21. The Green Belt remains protected under the NPPF, with 'very special circumstances' being required to be present in order to allow 'inappropriate development' on Green Belt land (paragraph 87). Green Belt boundaries are only to be revised in 'exceptional circumstances' (paragraph 83).

Gedling Local Plan 2005

22. The application site is identified, at Policy H5 for mixed use development in the adopted Gedling Local Plan with the south western extent of the site being allocated as Green Belt. It should be noted that no built development is proposed within the Green Belt.

Greater Nottingham Aligned Core Strategy Publication Version 2012

23. Spatial Strategy Policy 2 seeks to ensure that new development is steered towards the urban area and adjoining Nottingham urban area.

Strategic Planning Issues

Green Belt

24. What constitutes acceptable development within the Green Belt is set out in the NPPF, and the onus lies with the applicant to demonstrate that there are very special circumstances to justify such inappropriate development in such a location.
25. The south western extent of the site, east of the A612, is allocated Green Belt. Within this part of the site, the application proposes the creation of playing pitches and other recreational facilities, and parkland accommodating an ecology park. This will predominantly include landscaping only, but will also likely entail engineering operations (e.g. the creation of ponds). No buildings are proposed to be constructed in this part of the site.
26. Under the terms of the NPPF (paragraph 90) such works would constitute appropriate development provided they preserve openness and do not conflict with the purpose of including land in Green Belt.
27. Therefore, it is considered that the proposals are in accordance with and cause no harm to the Green Belt.

Transport

28. The applicant has submitted a Transport Assessment (TA) in support of the current proposed mix of uses on the application site. The content of the TA is currently being examined by the County Council as local highway authority. The transport implications of this development are being carefully considered and it is not possible at this time to advise as to the acceptability of the application in transport terms.
29. The County Council has previously indicated to Gedling Borough Council i.e. when preparing the 2005 Adopted Development Plan that no occupation of development on the proposed Teal Close / North of Victoria Park development site is acceptable until the A612 Gedling Major Transport Scheme Link Road has been constructed. In addition if for any reason the Gedling Access Road has not already been constructed in conjunction with the proposed Gedling Colliery / Chase Farm redevelopment then the Teal Close / North Of Victoria Park developments would be expected to fund and construct a Gedling Village Relief Road (similar to the Gedling Access Road) before first occupation. In summary the timing of development was seen as critical in securing the necessary transport infrastructure to support development so as not to make traffic conditions unacceptable in Gedling village and surrounds. This policy position was supported by elected Members of the County Council.
30. Although the A612 Gedling Major Transport Scheme was constructed by the County Council and opened to traffic in 2007 (and enables the access to the Teal Close development site to be taken directly from it) the Gedling Access Road has not been constructed. As highway authority therefore the County Council needs to be satisfied over the concerns regarding the network wide transport impacts of the current proposed Teal Close development in the absence of the Gedling Access Road. As part of this assessment it will be necessary to judge the likelihood of the Gedling Access Road being delivered and if there are any delays to the

completion of this road then the likely significance of the impacts of the release of development land at Teal Close could have in Gedling, Colwick and Netherfield. These matters are still being considered by the local highway authority.

31. Detailed Highways comments are contained at Appendix 2.

Landscape and Visual Impact

32. Although the existing open land east of Victoria park is a welcome expanse after the sprawling industrial and retail developments along Colwick Loop Road, the proposals are in line with the Greater Nottingham Landscape Character Assessment. (GNLCA) policy and if implemented as shown on the master plan, will provide a positive contribution to landscape character and have some beneficial visual impact. Consequently there are no grounds for objection at this stage.

33. Detailed Landscape and visual impact comments are contained at Appendix 3.

Developer Contributions

34. Should the application proceed, then Nottinghamshire County Council will seek developer contributions relating to County responsibilities in line with the Council's adopted Planning Contributions Strategy. Such contributions, in the case of residential development, could for example cover provision for education and integrated transport measures and the Developer Contributions teal will work with the applicant and Gedling Borough Council to ensure all requirements are met.

Ecology

35. A range of mitigation measures are proposed, and these should be secured through conditions (with the submission of detailed measures where required).

36. It appears likely that the development will give rise to increased visitor pressure on the Netherfield Lagoons Local Nature Reserve (LNR) (despite the Ecology Park absorbing some of this). On that basis, it can be expected that there will be increased wear and tear on site infrastructure (path surfaces, access control furniture etc), it is therefore suggest that it may be appropriate to require this development to provide a commuted sum to Gedling Conservation Trust (who manage the LNR) to account for this.

37. Detailed ecology comments are contained at Appendix 4.

Archaeology

38. The proposed development site is known to contain extensive archaeological deposits which date to the Iron Age and Roman periods. There is a high likelihood that any development at the site will severely impact the survival of any archaeological remains.

39. Due to the archaeological interest of this site, as well as the nature and extent of the proposed development it is the County's recommendation that if planning permission is to be granted appropriate conditions should be attached to the planning permission.

40. Detailed archaeology comments are contained at Appendix 5.

Overall Conclusions

41. No built development would occur within the Green Belt, as such the proposal would not cause harm to the Green Belt designation.

42. The transport implications of this development are being carefully considered and it is not possible at this time to advise as to the acceptability of the application in transport terms.

43. Nottinghamshire County Council raise no objections to the proposal on landscape and visual impact grounds.

44. A range of mitigation measures are proposed, and these should be secured through conditions in relation to ecology and archaeology.

Other Options Considered

45. This report considers all of the relevant issues in relation to the above planning applications which have led to the recommendations, as set out below. Alternative options considered could have been to express no or full support for the application.

Reason/s for Recommendation/s

46. Further work is required to satisfy the County Council with regards to highways.

47. Mitigation measures, in relation to ecology and archaeology, are required to ensure the proposed development

Statutory and Policy Implications

48. This report has been compiled after consideration of implications in respect of finance, the public sector equality duty, human resources, crime and disorder, human rights, the safeguarding of children, sustainability and the environment and those using the service and where such implications are material they are described below. Appropriate consultation has been undertaken and advice sought on these issues as required.

Statutory and Policy Implications

49. This report has been compiled after consideration of implications in respect of finance, the public sector equality duty, human resources, crime and disorder, human rights, the safeguarding of children, sustainability and the environment and those using the service and where such implications are material they are

described below. Appropriate consultation has been undertaken and advice sought on these issues as required.

Financial Implications

50. There are no direct financial implications.

Implications for Sustainability and the Environment

51. There are no direct implications for Sustainability and the Environment

RECOMMENDATION/S

- 1) That Gedling Borough Council be advised that the principle of housing development in terms of strategic, national housing and economic growth is supported. The County Council has no significant concerns over the impact of the proposal of this scale and in this location on the landscape and openness of the Green Belt, and consequently does not raise any objections in landscape terms.
- 2) The transport implications of this development are being carefully considered and it is not possible at this time to advise as to the acceptability of the application in transport terms
- 3) It is considered that inadequate and insufficient information has been provided with the application to properly assess its acceptability in ecology and archaeology, therefore mitigation measures should be secured through appropriate planning conditions.
- 4) That if Gedling Borough Council are minded to approve the application, then the County Council request that they consult with the Developer Contributions Team to assess the need for developer contributions in line with the Council's adopted Planning Contributions Strategy.

Jayne Francis-Ward

Corporate Director, Policy, Planning and Corporate Services

For any enquiries about this report please contact: Nina Wilson, Principal Planning Officer, Planning Policy Team, ext 73793

Constitutional Comments (SHB.23.07.13)

52. Committee have power to decide the Recommendation.

Financial Comments (TMR 05/08/2013)

53. The financial implications are set out in paragraph **Error! Reference source not found..**

Background Papers and Published Documents

Except for previously published documents, which will be available elsewhere, the documents listed here will be available for inspection in accordance with Section 100D of the Local Government Act 1972.

Electoral Division(s) and Member(s) Affected

Councillor Nicki Brooks and Councillor John Clarke - Carlton East

Appendix 1 – Site Location Plan

Appendix 2 – Detailed Highways Comments

The Gedling Unitary Development Plan which was adopted on 12th July 2005 it contains policy (H5) for a proposed mixed use development at Teal Close / North of Victoria Park to include 400 dwellings, employment (17 Ha) and recreation uses (9 Ha). Following a review of these policies in 2008 Gedling Borough Council have 'saved' a number of these policies (including H5) which will remain until future development documents supersede them. The current outline application is for a mixed use development comprising 830 dwellings, 18,000m² gross floor area (GFA) of employment uses, a hotel, care home, primary school and local retail centre. The applicant has submitted a Transport Assessment (TA) in support of the current proposed mix of uses on the application site. The content of the TA is currently being examined by the County Council as local highway authority. The transport implications of this development are being carefully considered and it is not possible at this time to advise as to the acceptability of the application in transport terms.

The County Council has previously indicated to Gedling Borough Council i.e. when preparing the 2005 Adopted Development Plan that no occupation of development on the proposed Teal Close / North of Victoria Park development site is acceptable until the A612 Gedling Major Transport Scheme Link Road has been constructed. In addition if for any reason the Gedling Access Road has not already been constructed in conjunction with the proposed Gedling Colliery / Chase Farm redevelopment then the Teal Close / North Of Victoria Park developments would be expected to fund and construct a Gedling Village Relief Road (similar to the Gedling Access Road) before first occupation. In summary the timing of development was seen as critical in securing the necessary transport infrastructure to support development so as not to make traffic conditions unacceptable in Gedling village and surrounds. This policy position was supported by elected Members of the County Council.

Although the A612 Gedling Major Transport Scheme was constructed by the County Council and opened to traffic in 2007 (and enables the access to the Teal Close development site to be taken directly from it) the Gedling Access Road has not been constructed. As highway authority therefore the County Council needs to be satisfied over the concerns regarding the network wide transport impacts of the current proposed Teal Close development in the absence of the Gedling Access Road. As part of this assessment it will be necessary to judge the likelihood of the Gedling Access Road being delivered and if there are any delays to the completion of this road then the likely significance of the impacts of the release of development land at Teal Close could have in Gedling, Colwick and Netherfield. These matters are still being considered by the local highway authority.

I trust that these initial observations will be of assistance to you in formulating a response to the consultation.

Kind regards
David Pick
Environment and Resources

Appendix 3 – Detailed Landscape and Visual Impact Comments

Existing Site

The application site lies to east of the Nottingham conurbation, abutting the Victoria Retail Park and spanning the Colwick Loop Road. The two parcels of land lie within Policy Zone TW05 Stoke Bardolph of the Greater Nottingham Landscape Character Assessment.

Comments are based on the document '*Environmental Statement – Volume 3: Chapter 11, Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment*', May 2013. The document outlines the visual baseline and the location of the viewpoints, whose siting was informed by a Zone of Visual Influence. The assessment states that the methodology used is that outlined in the Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (Landscape Institute, Second Edition).

Impact on Landscape Character

The landscape action for this policy zone is '*Create*'; landscape condition is very poor and sensitivity low. Suburban development, industry and transport infrastructure have fragmented the landscape of the area, which lies on the eastern fringes of the conurbation.

Key actions are:

- seek opportunities to restore the historic field pattern and create visual unity
- through small scale tree and woodland planting
- focus development around the settlement of Stoke Bardolph
- contain urban development with advance woodland planting

Visibility is generally considered moderate within the policy zone as a whole, but the development site comprises open agricultural land which facilitates long sweeping views between Colwick and the Trent valley.

The masterplan shows a configuration of structure planting, ie. woodland and hedging containing the various uses proposed and providing buffer zones between the different land uses. The area designated flood plain is to be retained and enhanced for sport, amenity and habitat use. These proposals are generally consistent with the landscape policy and although the long views will be lost, a more coherent landscape should be created as long as the design of employment sites and housing is sympathetic and makes a positive contribution to a local vernacular.

Overall, it is considered that the proposals, although reducing the area of open space within the policy zone, would have a **neutral**, or possibly **minor beneficial impact** on landscape character; the creation of a new landscape matrix would offset and compensate for the loss of other characteristics, and create some screening and containment for the industrial and retail sites on the periphery of the development site.

Visual Impact

The LVIA outlines the process underlying the selection of viewpoints and provides a systematic assessment for each viewpoint. However, the methodology appears to deviate from that outlined in the LI guidelines, adding additional processes, terminology and information to the assessment for no apparent reason. The matrices referred to in the Appendix, which apparently support the final scoring are not actually matrices for deployment in the assessment, but merely a list of definitions. It is unclear how the 'Nature of Effect' assessment feeds into the process or informs the conclusion.

Consequently, each viewpoint has been assessed using standard methodology and the results outlined below. (Receptor sensitivity for each point is as per the report).

Viewpoint	Receptor Sensitivity	Magnitude of Change	Significance
1	High	Medium beneficial	Moderate beneficial
2	Low	Low beneficial	Negligible
3	Unseen from viewpoint		
4	Medium/high	Medium beneficial (once woodland established)	Moderate beneficial
5	High	Medium beneficial (once woodland established)	Moderate beneficial
6	High	Medium beneficial (once woodland established)	Moderate beneficial
7	High	Medium beneficial (once woodland established)	Moderate beneficial
8	Medium/high	Medium beneficial (once woodland established)	Moderate beneficial
9	Low/medium	No discernible change	Negligible
10	Medium	Low Adverse	Slight Adverse
11	Medium/low	Low Adverse	Negligible/slight
12	Unseen from viewpoint		
13	Unseen from		

	viewpoint		
--	-----------	--	--

The assessment depends very heavily upon the presumption that the detailed design of the site will allow sufficient space for woodland buffer zones and substantial hedgerows to contain and screen the development; concept and masterplans regularly show viable woodland and planting strips that then become severely reduced in extent at detail design stage, often to a degree that they become nothing more than a few token trees. The woodland planting around the employment site is shown at 30m on the master plan; I recommend that these dimensions are carried forward should the scheme receive outline approval.

Layout – Open Space

There does not seem to be any information provided regarding proposed design of the buildings, or layout. Having said that, there are no obvious conflicts in the broad use allocations shown and the open space and habitat areas are necessarily located adjacent to Ouse Dyke.

Conclusion

Although the existing open land east of Victoria park is a welcome expanse after the sprawling industrial and retail developments along Colwick Loop Road, the proposals are in line with the GNLCA policy and if implemented as shown on the master plan, will provide a positive contribution to landscape character and have some beneficial visual impact. Consequently there are no grounds for objection at this stage.

Appendix 4 – Detailed Ecology Comments

I have now had a look at the Ecology Chapter and other relevant information submitted in support of this planning application, and have the following comments:

1. The proposals do not directly affect any statutorily or locally designated nature conservation sites. The nearest SSSI, Colwick Cutting (designated for its geological interest) lies approximately 2.7km km to the south-west, whilst the nearest SINCLWS, Netherfield Dismantled Railway Sidings 5/210, abuts the site to the south-east.

2. The planning application is supported by up-to-date and fairly comprehensive ecological information.

3. Overall, it is evident that the site is of relatively limited nature conservation value, being dominated by intensively farmed arable fields, although small areas of higher-value habitat do exist.

4. In terms of (protected) species, the results of a number of surveys are outstanding (relating to great crested newts, bat emergence and breeding bird surveys), and therefore final comment on these surveys and associated mitigation (see below) is reserved until the results of these surveys have been submitted. In addition, it should be noted that no bat activity survey has been carried out).

5. An impact assessment has been carried out, and having reviewed this, I am content that the impacts have been assessed correctly (but see below in relation to public access impacts on Netherfield Lagoons LNR)

6. A range of mitigation measures are proposed, and these should be secured through conditions (with the submission of detailed measures where required). These in particular relate to:

- The production of a CEMP (see section 15.103 of the Ecology Chapter)
- The implementation of 'Actionable Mitigation Measures' (section 15.104) to include:
- The creation of an Ecology Park area, and production and implementation of a detailed
- management plan (based on the draft management plan submitted as Appendix 15.4)
- The submission of a detailed landscaping scheme to include details of species mixes,
- establishment methods and maintenance regimes.
- Opportunities for nesting birds and roosting bats, to include where possible the incorporation of nesting/roosting features into the fabric of buildings
- Signposting to control access in and around Netherfield Lagoons LNR
- The setting up and support of a local community group

7. In addition to the mitigation measures proposed, I would request that a condition is also used to require the submission of a lighting scheme, which should seek to minimise impacts on nocturnal wildlife (particularly bats).

8. Of particular note is the proposed creation of an Ecology Park, which has the potential to be an important wildlife feature. In previous contact with the applicant's ecologist I had requested that Defra's Biodiversity Offsetting metric be used to demonstrate that the value of this proposed area would be sufficient to mitigate against the impact of habitat loss elsewhere on site, and I again request that this is done, to give confidence in the proposals. I am happy to advise and assist in this process.

9. Following on from this, I query whether the layout of the Ecology Park could be altered slightly, such that the area with more public access and the attenuation ponds is sited on the western part of the Park, and the main habitat area on the eastern part (i.e. flipping the two around). This would have the benefit of bringing the main habitat area in closer proximity to Netherfield Lagoons LNR, and moving the main focus of public activity away from the LNR.

10. It appears likely that the development will give rise to increased visitor pressure on the Netherfield Lagoons LNR (despite the Ecology Park absorbing some of this). On that basis, it can be expected that there will be increased wear and tear on site infrastructure (path surfaces, access control furniture etc), and I would suggest that it may be appropriate to require this development to provide a commuted sum to Gedling Conservation trust (who manage the LNR) to account for this.

I hope these comments are of use, but if you have any queries please get back in touch.

Kind regards,

Nick Crouch
Senior Practitioner Nature Conservation
Nottinghamshire County Council

Appendix 5 – Detailed Archaeology Comments

The proposed development site is known to contain extensive archaeological deposits which date to the Iron Age and Roman periods. There is a high likelihood that any development at the site will severely impact the survival of any archaeological remains.

Due to the archaeological interest of this site, as well as the nature and extent of the proposed development it is my recommendation that if planning permission is to be granted this should be conditional upon two things.

Firstly, upon the applicants submitting for your approval and prior to development commencing details of an **archaeological scheme of treatment** of the site and secondly, upon the subsequent implementation of that scheme to your satisfaction. A condition such as the following may be appropriate:

"No development shall take place within the application site until details of an **archaeological scheme of treatment** has been submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA."

"Thereafter, the scheme shall be implemented in full accordance with the approved details."

The scheme should begin with further **post determination evaluation** in the form of a geophysical survey and possible trial trenching, followed by open area excavations and/or strip map and sample excavations. Any archaeological scheme should be drawn up and implemented by a professional archaeologist or archaeological organisation

I will be happy to advise on the nature and extent of such a scheme, or to provide further advice or comment as required.

I would also be grateful if I can be notified as to the outcome of the application.

Dr Chris Robinson
Archaeological Officer
Nottinghamshire County Council
Tel (0115) 9696524

Appendix 6 – Detailed Libraries Comments

1. Background

The County Council has a statutory responsibility, under the terms of the 1964 Public Libraries and Museums Act, to provide “a comprehensive and efficient library service for all persons desiring to make use thereof”.

In Nottinghamshire, public library services are delivered through a network of 60 library buildings and 7 mobiles. These libraries are at the heart of our communities. They provide access to books, CDs and DVDs; a wide range of information services; the internet; and opportunities for learning and leisure.

The County Council has a clear vision that its libraries should be:

- modern and attractive;
- located in highly accessible locations
- located in close proximity to, or jointly with, other community facilities, retail centres and services such as health or education;
- integrated with the design of an overall development;
- of suitable size and standard for intended users.

Our libraries need to be flexible on a day-to-day basis to meet diverse needs and adaptable over time to new ways of learning. Access needs to be inclusive and holistic.

In (and only in) situations where a new development will create an additional need for library provision, the County Council will expect the developer to make a financial contribution towards the cost of that additional provision. Such financial contributions will relate in scale and kind only to the proposed development. The developer will not be liable for any charges relating to any inadequacies in library provision that already existed prior to the development taking place.

2. Land off Teal Road

The proposed development looks at building up to 830 new dwellings over the next few years. At an average of 2.4 people per dwelling this would mean a “new” population of 1992 people.

From **a buildings perspective**, it is possible that the occupiers of this development could use several different NCC libraries, e.g. Carlton, Burton Joyce or Gedling.

We consider that the buildings have adequate space to accommodate this population.

From a **stock perspective**, however, the new development would impact upon the library service. The guidelines recommend a library stock based on 1,532 items per 1,000 population. It is clear that a further 1992 people will create additional strain on the stock.

We would, thus, look for a developer contribution in respect of the additional stock we would need to purchase to meet the needs of the 4,080 population. This can be calculated at 1992 (people) x 1,532 (stock items) x £12.75 (av. cost per item) = £38,909.

Linda Turner
June 2013

Appendix 7 – Detailed Development Management Comments

I respond on behalf of NCC Development Control. As discussed, DC would have no reason to object to the proposed development, however it should be noted that the development is in close proximity to Stoke Bardolph Sewage Works, a strategically important sewage treatment works for Nottingham on which NCC has a responsibility for processing planning applications.

As you will be aware, sewage sites have potential to generate odour releases resulting in potential for complaints from future residents of the properties. It is also noted that the houses would be close to 'Chettles' an animal rendering plant which generates odour releases (although not controlled by NCC planning). The other item of note is the history of use of the land in connection with sewage disposal and the question of whether ground contamination would be a planning constraint?

Mike Hankin
Planning Applications Senior Practitioner
Nottinghamshire County Council