

# Appendix 1 SHLAA 2008 Site Submission Form

## Newark and Sherwood District Council – Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment 2008 – Site Submission Form

This form should be used for submitting details of sites that are to be assessed as part of the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment 2008 (SHLAA).

If you would like your site to be considered for development, please complete and return this form to the Council by Friday 9<sup>th</sup> May 2008. Further copies of this form can be downloaded at [www.newark-sherwooddc.gov.uk/planningpolicy](http://www.newark-sherwooddc.gov.uk/planningpolicy) or you can fill in an online form at the same address. A separate form is required for each site submitted.

**Data protection:** The information collected in this response form will be used by the District Council to inform the SHLAA and our Local Development Framework. These response forms and the information within them will be made available to the public. By responding you are accepting that your response and the information within it will be made available to the public, including Parish Councils and District Councillors.

### Contact Details:

#### Your contact details:

Name:

Organisation:

Address:

Postcode:

Email Address:

Telephone:

#### If you have appointed someone to act on your behalf please enter their details here:

Name:

Organisation:

Address:

Postcode:

Email Address:

Telephone:

## Site Details

**You must include a plan showing the location and boundaries of the site.**

Site address (include Postcode if known):

OS Grid Reference (if known):

Site area (in Hectares):

If you are not the site owner (or their appointed representative) please provide details of land ownership:

What is the current site use?

What was the previous site use?

What use do you propose for the site? (e.g. residential, employment etc.):

**If any of the following issues apply to the site, please give details.**

## Site Constraints

Contaminated Land :  
(i.e. previous hazardous land uses):

Environmental Constraints:  
(e.g. Loss of woodland, Site of Special Scientific Interest etc.)

Flood Risk: Has the site flooded in the past?:

Is the site within an area at risk of Flooding?:

Topographical Constraints:  
(e.g. varying Site levels, steep slopes etc.)

Land Ownership Constraints:  
(e.g. multiple ownership, tenancies, operational requirements of land owners etc.)

Any other known constraints:  
(e.g. neighbouring uses, pylons or other technical equipment on site)

## Site Accessibility

Does the site have access to an adopted highway?

If yes, please include this on your plan.

Does the site have access to utility services?

(e.g. gas, electricity, water, sewerage)

Are you aware of any restrictive covenants on the site?

## Economic Viability

Has a Developer shown interest in this site?

Has the Developer already invested in the site?

(e.g. already secured an option)

Do you have a number/type of dwellings in mind?

(If so, please give details)

## Timescale - When do you consider the site will be available for development?

Within 5 years:

Within 5 to 10 years:

Within 10 to 15 years:

Beyond 15 years /Not known:

## Thank You

### Please return this form to:

Planning Policy  
Planning Services  
Newark and Sherwood District Council  
Kelham Hall,  
Newark  
Notts, NG23 5QX

Or via email to [planningpolicy@nsdc.info](mailto:planningpolicy@nsdc.info)

**By Friday 9<sup>th</sup> May 2008.**

## Appendix 2 SHLAA Site Assessment Protocol

Contact Applicant or Agent to see if an appointment will be required to access the site, arrange as necessary.

Organise suitable scale plan for taking on site to mark up with site features and adjacent features of note.

Check aerial photographs to flag up possible areas that will require special note, or identify possible issues on adjacent sites or nearby locations.

Check Constraints layers with the Uniform Spatial system to see if the site is: excluded by virtue of being entirely SSSI, Ancient Woodland etc.; or incorporates any constraint; or has one adjacent which may be affected by any development of the site (i.e. flood zones).

Check Local Plan for any designations not already identified through the constraints layer.  
Check the Minerals and Waste Local Plan.

Check Planning Application History of Site.

Always take digital camera and mobile phone on site visits.

### Site Inspection Record

| <b>Table 10</b>   |                           |
|---|---------------------------|
| <b>SHLAA Ref:</b>   | <b>Date of Site Visit</b> |
| Surveyor:   | Time of Site Visit:       |
| Character of Surrounding Area: Residential/Employment/Retail/Leisure/Mixed/Countryside<br>Other:                      |                           |
| Access to site: Direct from Classified Road/Direct from Unclassified Road/Indirect<br>(Please describe)               |                           |
| Boundaries(Mark on plan and note materials and approx height):<br>Wall/Fences/Hedges/Trees/Watercourse/Unmarked/Other |                           |
| Current Land Use:   |                           |

Evidence of Previous Land Use:

Topography: (including gradient, ground conditions and drainage)

Description of any existing buildings on site (mark on plan where not shown and indicate where buildings have been removed):

Natural Features within site (mark on plan): Trees/hedgerows/watercourses/standing water/ditches/ridge and furrow/other

Natural Features adjacent to the site (mark on plan):

Any utility apparatus on site (mark on plan): Telephone masts/telegraph poles/Pylons/electricity sub stations/ other (describe)

Adjacent to the site (mark on plan):

Hazardous/bad neighbouring uses? Noise/smell/pollution/traffic generation/other (specify)

Possible impact on views into/out of site? Describe:

Other Comments:

Information Provided by Parish Councils:

Evidence to Support this?

Date of further site visit if required?

Need to check information with other disciplines?

Highways Engineer

Environmental Health

Environment Agency

Severn Trent/Anghian Water

Landscape Architect

Trees and Woodlands Officer

Notts Biological Records Centre

English Nature

English Heritage

County Archaeologist

County Planning Minerals and Waste

Other Please Specify

## **Appendix 3 Settlements Identified for Initial Assessment**

Newark

Balderton

Fernwood\*

Ollerton/Boughton

Rainworth (part in Newark & Sherwood District)

Southwell

Edwinstowe

Blidworth

Clipstone

Bilsthorpe

Lowdham

Collingham

Farnsfield

Farndon

Sutton-on-Trent

Walesby

Coddington

North Muskham

Bleasby

Fiskerton cum Morton

Gunthorpe

Elston

Winthorpe

Norwell

Halam

Harby

*Source – Nottingham Outer Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment Methodology (July 2008) – paragraph 12.9.*

*Note. \* Fernwood Parish was not included in paragraph 12.9 as it was part of Balderton Parish until its designation as a separate Parish in April 2008.*

## Appendix 4 External Consultees to the SHLAA Process

1. Nottinghamshire County Council
  - Highways;
  - Transport;
  - Minerals and Waste;
  - Ecology; and
  - Archaeology.
2. Environment Agency - flooding
3. English Heritage
  - Ancient Monuments;
  - Listed Buildings; and
  - Conservation.
4. Natural England
5. Coal Authority
6. Nottinghamshire Biological and Geological Records Centre
7. National Grid Transco
8. Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust
9. Severn Trent Water
10. Anglian Water Services
11. Network Rail
12. Highways Agency

In addition the District Council's Environmental Health and Landscape Architect Sections were also contacted and asked for observations on the SHLAA sites in question.



## **Appendix 5 External Consultees - Disclaimers and General Issues Raised**

### **A) County Council (Highway Authority for non-Trunk Roads)**

1. Due to the limited timescale given to produce the comments, the exercise was carried out as a desktop study generally using broad brush principles and local knowledge.
2. From the scale and detail of the plans provided, it was not possible to accurately predict if the site was contiguous with the highway boundary. However, where the site was clearly divorced from the adopted highway this was stated on the response.
3. No account of public transport provision has been made as part of this process and the issues as to sustainability will need to be addressed.
4. It may be found on closer inspection that there will be a need for off-site highway works and/or the relocation of statutory undertakers' plant or street furniture in order to gain satisfactory access to the selected site; the cost of these works would be borne by the Applicant.
5. Sites larger than 0.4 of a hectare may attract a request for an Integrated Transport Contribution.
6. It should also be noted that the Highway Authority could not be held responsible for the comments/requirements of third parties i.e. Highways Agency and the appropriate rail authority.

### **B) Highways Agency (Highway Authority for Trunk Roads)**

1. The Highways Agency (HA) welcomes the opportunity to comment upon potential housing sites identified in the SHLAA process. It is the role of the HA to maintain the safe and efficient operation of the Strategic Road Network (SRN), this is set out in DfT Circular 02/2007: Planning and the Strategic Road Network, and to advise on the alternatives to car modes as set out by PPG13 Transport.
2. The Agency needs to be satisfied that proposals for housing development take account of the potential impacts on the SRN. In this respect the Agency's specific interest relates to the A1 and the A46, which are important regional routes providing links to the nearby Principal Urban Areas of Nottingham and Lincoln and surrounding regions.
3. SRN Context. With regard to possible housing sites, the Highways Agency focus is upon the A1 and A46 within Newark and Sherwood. The strategic capacity of these routes is measured in their level of 'stress', which relates to the daily flow divided by daily capacity on each route. This capacity is calculated by the maximum sustainable traffic flow in the peak hour. Where roads are congested for longer than the peak periods, it results in 'stress' levels which are more than 100%.

4. At this strategic level the A1 in the District operates at between 0-90% 'stress' which indicates that there is spare capacity on the route. The section of the A46 between Newark (A1) and Lincoln has been improved to dual carriageway standard. South of Newark, the A46 operates at 90-100% 'stress' which increases to 100-110% 'stress' on the northern bound approach to the A1. (East Midlands Regional Network Report 2008).
5. The Government is seeking to accelerate delivery of a scheme to improve the single carriageway section of the A46 between Newark - Widmerpool to dual carriageway. This improvement could be completed within the next two and half to three years (subject to RFA funding being agreed) following the November 2008 announcement that 50% of the funding from central sources is in place.
6. The section of the A46 round Newark (Farndon Road roundabout to A1) is a wide single carriageway and includes sections of viaduct involving three rail crossings and bridging of the River Trent. It also includes a grade five leg roundabout junction with the A616 and A617 roads and a grade separated junction with the A1 which includes a dumbbell arrangement (four leg roundabouts each side of the A1) that is currently congested at peak times. There are currently no plans to improve the single carriageway section of the A46 round Newark or the A46/A1 junction.
7. This section of the A46 has been the subject of a Scheme Identification Study which reported in December 2007. This study concluded that, with the completion of the Newark to Widmerpool scheme which terminates at Farndon Road Roundabout, the existing Newark Relief Road would become a bottleneck on the A46 route and suffer from significant levels of congestion. In particular, the A46/A616 'Cattle Market' roundabout is currently near capacity in the evening peak. A further study was recommended to investigate options for improvement.
8. The Agency would not wish to see development in the Newark area eroding the benefits that arise from improving much of the A46 to dual carriageway standard. In addition, the Agency is particularly concerned over the potential impact of development in Newark on the single carriageway section of the A46 around Newark, as congestion on this section of the A46 could negate some of the benefits of the A46 improvements. However the Agency is aware of the housing requirements through the emerging East Midlands RSS and appreciates that the majority of the housing growth will need to take place in or adjacent to Newark within appropriate sustainable urban extension(s). It will be important to demonstrate that all possibilities have been explored through the process to identify the most sustainable option in terms of traffic generation and alternative transport modes.
9. Given the SRN context described above, it will be important to determine an appropriate transport strategy and infrastructure plan for the Newark area to support future housing growth in this key area of the District. Being integrated with the Core Strategy, this will need a strong focus on minimising the need to travel and sustainable modes in order to minimise future traffic generation, particularly on the SRN. The Agency have previously provided comments towards an Infrastructure Delivery Plan and welcome the approach that the authority is taking to the growth agenda.
10. The individual small sites within the confines of the built-up area are likely to have a minimal impact on the SRN, however their cumulative impact could be more significant. In

line with the requirements of PPS3 the Agency would advise that the sites within the urban area are brought forward prior to SUE, however in a scenario of stringent growth targets the Agency appreciates that SUE are likely to be brought forward on a shorter time frame.

11. It is difficult to comment on individual sites as a holistic approach is required for a robust assessment to be undertaken. The greatest concern to the Agency will arise where sites lie close to the SRN and are poorly served by sustainable modes, and are likely to generate local or longer distance commuter trips on the SRN. This can be ascertained only through a Transport Assessment coupled with a Travel Plan.
12. In the case of larger sites, the need for a transport assessment based on a Newark transport model is even more imperative, in that these larger developments have the greatest potential to adversely impact on the operation of the A46 and A1 in the Newark area. It is therefore not possible for the Agency to respond on these larger sites to the south and east of Newark in the absence of such an assessment, other than to flag up the strategic significance of transport as an issue for these SHLAA sites.
13. In the wider District a number of sites have been identified in or adjacent to villages. It is important that development within the District is sustainable in that the need to travel and reliance on the private car is reduced, where possible, in line with PPG13 on Transport. Development in smaller villages, where it will be difficult to provide and maintain attractive public transport, walk and cycle access to employment opportunities and other facilities may give rise to increased car dependency with a knock on effect on localised congestion. The Agency does however appreciate that new dwellings in these smaller settlements is required to retain the vitality and existence of the settlement.
14. Whilst the Agency would wish to see housing developments in those smaller towns and villages which already have (or which can realistically be served by) frequent bus services to a range of employment opportunities and wider facilities there is an appreciation that bus operators are often restricted by route viability and some services may not be feasible. However the justification for new housing in such locations would be enhanced if coming forward as part of an integrated approach which includes better local transport provision, local regeneration and safeguarding of sensitive areas.
15. Whilst the Agency would wish to see housing developments in those smaller towns and villages which already have (or which can realistically be served by) frequent bus services to a range of employment opportunities and wider facilities there is an appreciation that bus operators are often restricted by route viability and some services may not be feasible. However the justification for new housing in such locations would be enhanced if coming forward as part of an integrated approach which includes better local transport provision, local regeneration and safeguarding of sensitive areas. The Agency will also be keen to discuss the SHLAA further with the Council as part of the ongoing process of meetings associated with the Newark NGP.

### **C) The Coal Authority**

1. The District has a deep coal resource, some of which has been continuously mined for many decades and has resulted in many colliery sites across the District.

2. In terms of SHLAA assessments and eventual site allocations, it would be prudent to include a criterion which assessed the coal mining data. This would be a due diligence check to ensure that the site did not contain any mine entries or other coal related hazards which would require remediation or stabilisation prior to development. As many mines are younger, this can give rise to the potential for mine gases to be released over time, particularly when development takes place and disturbs the ground.
3. Former mining activities and related hazards are certainly not a strict constraint on development. Indeed it would be far preferable for appropriate development to take place in order to remove these public liabilities on the general tax payer. The Coal Authority would therefore not wish to suggest that any of the potential sites should be excluded from the assessment on the grounds of former mining legacy issues.

#### **D) Anglian Water Authority**

1. The presence of water assets within sites has not been assessed; this will be reported at the Preferred Option stage of consultation.
2. As part of the assessment, no account has been taken of any planning permissions within the sites.
3. A density assumption of 30 dwellings/hectare has been taken in the absence of any housing figure being given.
4. The response is only on an individual site basis and does not take into account the cumulative impact of sites.
5. Severn Trent Water Company has been identified in the spreadsheet comments for sites as being the Water and Wastewater provider though geographically the sites are within Anglia Water's statutory area.

#### **E) English Heritage**

1. English Heritage promotes a wide definition of the historic environment which includes not only those areas and buildings with statutory designated protection but also those which are locally valued and important, as well as the landscape and townscape components of the historic environment. The importance and extent of below ground archaeology is often unknown, although information the Nottinghamshire Historic Environment Record (HER) will indicate areas of known interest, or high potential where further assessment is required before decisions or allocations are made.
2. It should be noted that a number of historic environment studies exist for the District, including conservation areas appraisals, historic landscape characterisation (HLC) and extensive urban surveys (EUS) for places including Collingham and Southwell (which study urban archaeology). HLC and EUS data forms part of the HER and are managed by the county council. The various studies should be referenced to ascertain the impact of sites on the district's historic environment.

3. Please note that due to data issues, we have not been able to identify conservation areas when assessing every site. However, conservation areas are an important historic environment features and proper consideration must be given to the potential impacts on their character, appearance and setting. Furthermore, we have not considered areas of archaeological interest beyond scheduled monuments in most cases, nor have we looked at historic landscape issues beyond registered historic parks and gardens. However, wider archaeological and landscape impacts are important considerations and need to be factored into site assessment. The possible cumulative impact of a number of site allocations in one location could cause significant harm to the historic landscape.
4. All sites should be scoped for archaeological potential (including earthworks) before taking them forward to the next stage, as there is a high likelihood of archaeological sites not on the HER. Archaeological assessment and evaluation should be in line with PPG16 and best practice guidance so that impacts can be assessed at the earliest opportunity. Historic landscape character needs to be identified and assessed early on, using relevant data from the HER (such as Historic Landscape Characterisation) and other sources. Conservation and archaeology staff within the District and County Council should be consulted on matters relating to archaeology, landscape/townscape and the historic environment generally.
5. Finally, our comments on specific sites have been informed by desk-based analysis rather than site visits. We have not been able to judge the potential impacts more accurately on the ground and we have focussed on those sites with the greatest historic environment impact. This does not mean there are no issues with any other site and we therefore reserve the right to comment on any site as and when proposals develop. Notwithstanding this, the comments made in this letter should be taken in consideration when preparing the draft SHLAA and subsequent LDF documents.

## **F) National Grid**

### **Notes for sites crossed by National Grid's High Pressure Gas Pipeline**

1. Local authorities have a statutory duty to consider applications for development in the vicinity of high pressure (above 7 bar) pipelines and to advise the developer on whether the development should be allowed on safety grounds on rules provided by HSE. In order to enable Local Authorities to discharge this duty and also to ensure that National Grid's pipelines are protected from uncontrolled development in the vicinity of the pipeline please read the following guidance:
  - Specification for Safe Working in the Vicinity of National Grid High Pressure Gas Pipelines and Associated Installations - Requirements for Third Parties  
[Safe Working in the Vicinity of National Grid Pipelines and Installations](#)
  - Gas Transmission Underground Pipelines – Guidance  
[Gas Transmission Underground Pipelines](#)
2. Should these be taken forward as housing sites, the developers should be made aware of the above issues.

**Notes for sites crossed by or in close proximity to National Grid's high voltage overhead electricity transmission lines**

3. National Grid does not own the land over which the overhead lines cross, and it obtains the rights from individual landowners to place our equipment on their land. Potential developers of the sites should be aware that it is National Grid policy to seek to retain our existing overhead lines in-situ, because of the strategic nature of our national network. Therefore we advise developers and planning authorities to take into account the location and nature of existing electricity transmission equipment when planning developments.
4. National Grid prefers that buildings are not built directly beneath its overhead lines. This is for two reasons, the amenity of potential occupiers of properties in the vicinity of lines and because National Grid needs quick and easy access to carry out maintenance of its equipment to ensure that it can be returned to service and be available as part of the national transmission system. Such access can be difficult to obtain without inconveniencing and disturbing occupiers and residents, particularly where properties are in close proximity to overhead lines.
5. The statutory safety clearances between overhead lines, the ground, and built structures must not be infringed. To comply with statutory safety clearances the live electricity conductors of National Grid's overhead power lines are designed to be a minimum height above ground. Where changes are proposed to ground levels beneath an existing line then it is important that changes in ground levels do not result in safety clearances being infringed. National Grid can, on request, provide to developers detailed line profile drawings that detail the height of conductors, above ordnance datum, at a specific site.
6. National Grid seeks to encourage high quality and well planned development in the vicinity of its high voltage overhead lines. Land beneath and adjacent to the overhead line route should be used to make a positive contribution to the development of the site and can for example be used for nature conservation, open space, landscaping areas or used as a parking court. National Grid, in association with David Lock Associates has produced 'A Sense of Place' guidelines, which look at how to create high quality development near overhead lines and offers practical solutions which can assist in avoiding the unnecessary sterilisation of land in the vicinity of high voltage overhead lines.
7. 'A Sense of Place' is available from National Grid and can be viewed at:  
<http://www.nationalgrid.com/uk/senseofplace>
8. Further information regarding development near overhead lines and substations is available here:  
[http://www.nationalgrid.com/uk/LandandDevelopment/SC/devnearohl\\_final/](http://www.nationalgrid.com/uk/LandandDevelopment/SC/devnearohl_final/)

## Appendix 6 Financial Viability Assessment

1. The Practice Guidance for SHLAA identifies that an important part of assessing the 'achievability' of sites is that a judgement is made about all aspects of viability including financial. The Guidance suggests that there are a number of methods available to assist in determining whether housing is an economically viable prospect for a particular site. These range from canvassing the opinions of housebuilders and local property agents to more technical approaches such as the method of 'residual valuation.'

### SHLAA Financial Viability Appraisal Caveat

2. The Financial Viability Assessment component of the SHLAA has been carried out as required by Government Guidance (Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessments – Practice Guidance Communities and Local Government , July 2007) in accordance with the agreed Nottingham Outer SHLAA Methodology (July 2008). The purpose of the financial viability appraisal is to arrive at a broad conclusion on viability and not a specific valuation of the site. The appraisals were carried out with limited information and will therefore be subject to further amendment as and when new information is obtained. No responsibility can be taken for any of the findings of the study being utilised for any purpose other than this study.
3. The 'residual value' of a site is arrived at by undertaking a process based on the following equation;
4. ***The Gross Development Value of the Site – Cost of the Development - Developers Profit = Residual Land Value***
5. As the name suggests the 'residual' value is what is left after development costs (e.g. build and abnormal costs) and the developers profit or return has been deducted for the overall value of the development or gross development value (GDV).
6. Residual valuations allow property owners to compare the value of their land for housing with alternate or existing uses and can help in determining whether a site will be brought to the market.
7. However, it should be noted that although the residual valuation equation and methodology appears reasonably straightforward there are a number of underlying factors that need to be taken into account:
  - Residual valuations can vary enormously in complexity normally due to the number of variables taken into account. The amount and quality of information available for individual sites can make a significant difference to a site's potential value and therefore corresponding viability.
  - Residual valuations are fixed at a certain point in time and are highly sensitive to changing market conditions and/or changes in development costs.
  - Basic residual valuations do not reflect the timing of income and expenditure

over longer periods of time and therefore fail to reflect the timing of income and expenditure or 'cash flow'. Under these circumstances a 'cash flow' approach would normally be adopted. However, adopting this type of approach requires much more substantial and detailed information on flows of incomes and expenditure over time.

8. The assessment undertaken by the Council as prescribed by the Government SHLAA Practice Guidance is only a basic approach which assumes a number of broad assumptions and uses generic information.

## **THE ASSUMPTIONS USED IN FINANCIAL VIABILITY ASSESSMENT**

### **Current Market Conditions**

9. The current situation in the global and national financial markets and subsequent restrictions on credit/lending must be regarded as exceptional and without precedent. It is very difficult to judge how long this situation might continue. However, the house price data has been derived from The Three Dragons consultancy as part of the on-going Affordable Housing Viability Assessment and has been adjusted to reflect the changes in the housing market.

### **Housing Capacity and Density**

10. An important part of the SHLAA Process involves estimating the potential housing density for identified sites. Where the promoter of a site does not suggest a density it is necessary to make a judgement about how many dwellings could potentially be accommodated on a particular SHLAA site. This is important as the housing density will directly impact on the number of houses that can be delivered on a set area of land. The measure of housing density is usually expressed as 'dwellings per hectare' or DPH.
11. The Government has a minimum national density requirement of 30 DPH. This was introduced originally as part of Planning Policy Guidance Note 3 on Housing and has been carried on to the current guidance PPS3 Housing. Prior to this the density of new residential development averaged around 25 DPH. There has been much debate around housing density with many calling for the more efficient use of land as typified in Government guidance. However, it is important that a site's potential housing capacity reflects its setting and is in character with the surrounding area. Good design can help deliver higher density schemes which are in-keeping with their localities.
12. One way of establishing the appropriate density for a site is by carrying out 'area assessments'. These assessments seek to identify typical patterns and forms of development characteristic to a particular area so that any proposed development is 'in keeping' with its surroundings. Other factors that also have to be considered in regards to density are the availability and capability of the local infrastructure to support the proposed number of dwellings and their inhabitants.



13. As part of the Newark and Sherwood Urban Capacity Study, an area assessment of Newark was undertaken. This identified a range of densities from flats in Newark Town centre at 300 DPH, to Victorian terraces at 50-70 DPH and an outer suburban area of 20-30 DPH.
14. An important starting point in estimating what potential densities are characteristic to and capable of being achieved in a particular area is to see what has been previously permitted. As part of the Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) process the density of new developments granted permission forms part of the monitoring process. The data recorded as part of the AMR process goes back to 2001 and was analysed to determine the average density of new development permitted. The settlements identified were those making up the main Housing Market Areas within the previous Housing Needs Assessment and the settlements identified as being more sustainable locations in the SHLAA Methodology (para 12.9).
15. The attached table shows the densities for new residential developments ranked from the highest to the lowest densities by settlement.
16. Newark was excluded from the analysis as it was felt that the work carried out in the Urban Capacity Study still stood up as a good indication of density potential of sites in the main Newark Urban area.

**Table 1 - Average Dwelling Density per Ha./Acre for New Permissions by Settlement Derived from AMR Data 2001 – Present**

| <b>Settlement</b> | <b>AV DPH</b> | <b>Dwelling/Acre</b> |
|-------------------|---------------|----------------------|
| Balderton         | 41            | 17                   |
| Boughton          | 38            | 15                   |
| Edwinstowe        | 35            | 14                   |
| Ollerton          | 35            | 14                   |
| Clipstone         | 32            | 13                   |
| Bilsthorpe        | 30            | 12                   |
| Blidworth         | 27            | 11                   |
| Farndon           | 27            | 11                   |

| <b>Settlement</b>    | <b>AV DPH</b> | <b>Dwelling/Acre</b> |
|----------------------|---------------|----------------------|
| Rainworth (N&S part) | 27            | 11                   |
| Gunthorpe            | 26            | 10.5                 |
| Southwell            | 26            | 10.5                 |
| Farnsfield           | 25            | 10                   |
| Collingham           | 23            | 9                    |
| Coddington           | 20            | 8                    |
| Lowdham              | 20            | 8                    |
| Sutton on Trent      | 20            | 8                    |
| Walesby              | 19            | 7.5                  |
| Harby                | 18            | 7                    |
| Norwell              | 18            | 7                    |
| North Muskham        | 14            | 5                    |
| Fiskerton cum Morton | 12            | 4.5                  |
| Bleasby              | 10            | 4                    |
| Caunton              | 9             | 3.5                  |
| Elston               | 8             | 3                    |
| Halam                | 7             | 2                    |
| Winthorpe            | 7             | 2                    |

17. Although past performance in relation to housing densities for settlements should not wholly dictate what is desirable for the future it obviously gives a strong steer on what might be deemed acceptable from a design and development control point of view. However, Planning Policy Statement 3 (PPS3) Paragraph 47 establishes a

minimum density of 30 dwellings per hectare as a national indicative minimum and as such it will be treated as the minimum density in the appraisal model.

18. Within the appraisal model, net figures have been utilised for sites following the guidance given by the District Council’s Parks and Amenities Department for Public Open Space (POS):
- i. Small sites less than 0.25 ha (9 dwellings) - 100% of site;
  - ii. Sites between 0.25ha and 0.75ha (10-29 dwellings) - 100% of site;
  - iii. 0.75ha-2ha under 2ha.(30-79 houses) - 94% of site (6% POS);
  - iv. 2ha- 2.5ha (80-99 houses) - 86% (14% POS);
  - v. 2.5ha—5ha (100-199 houses) - 86% (14% POS);
  - vi. 5ha+ - 70% (30% POS).
19. In addition to the Public Open Space (POS) requirement for a site, a County transportation contribution is also required. This requires a contribution on residential sites in excess of 0.4ha or 50 bedrooms whichever is lower (see table below).

**Table 2 - Section 106 County Transport Contributions for Newark & Sherwood**

|  | Size   | Within and edge of central areas such as District or Local Centres | Within village envelopes & named settlements, within & adjoining main urban areas and along Public Transport Corridors | Elsewhere |
|--|--|--|--|-----------|
| Residential per net developable hectare (or per 125 bedrooms for developments greater than 125 bedrooms per hectare) (e.g. apartments) | 50 bedrooms or 0.4 Net developable hectares (whichever is smaller) | £7,500   | £15,000  | £22,500   |

### House Prices/Values

20. For an assessment to be made of viability, it is important to determine what sales values could be achieved by new properties on a particular development. This figure is usually arrived at by housebuilders undertaking a survey of the prices per sq ft /sq m being achieved by other comparable new and second hand properties in the vicinity. The house price data generated for this study has been collated by the Three Dragons consultancy for use in the Affordable Housing Viability Study. The data was

obtained is based on Land Registry figures for 2006, 2007, and 2008 which have been adjusted to today's prices. These prices have then been adjusted to take into account new to second hand premiums.

| Sub-Market                 | Average Value |          |          |          |                    |          |          |          |
|----------------------------|---------------|----------|----------|----------|--------------------|----------|----------|----------|
|                            | Detached      |          |          | Semi     | Town House/Terrace |          | Flats    |          |
|                            | 5 Bed         | 4 Bed    | 3 Bed    | 3 Bed    | 3 Bed              | 2 Bed    | 2 Bed    | 1 Bed    |
| Rural South & Southwell    | £465,000      | £405,000 | £345,000 | £245,000 | £240,000           | £210,000 | £200,000 | £140,000 |
| Rural North & Heart of N&S | £365,000      | £315,000 | £270,000 | £190,000 | £185,000           | £160,000 | £155,000 | £110,000 |
| Newark & Balderton         | £315,000      | £275,000 | £235,000 | £165,000 | £160,000           | £140,000 | £135,000 | £95,000  |
| North West N&S             | £260,000      | £230,000 | £195,000 | £140,000 | £135,000           | £120,000 | £115,000 | £80,000  |

\*Data Source Three Dragons Affordable Housing Viability Study

## Housing Mix

21. The following housing mix was derived for use within the financial appraisal model.

|                          | Density (Dwellings Per Hectare) % |        |        |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------|--------|
|                          | 30 DPH                            | 40 DPH | 50 DPH |
| 1 Bed Flat               |                                   | 5      | 10     |
| 2 Bed Flat               | 10                                | 15     | 20     |
| 2 Bed Terrace/Town House | 10                                | 15     | 20     |
| 3 Bed Terrace/Town House | 15                                | 15     | 15     |
| 3 Bed Semi Detached      | 20                                | 15     | 15     |
| 3 Bed Detached           | 25                                | 20     | 15     |
| 4 Bed Detached           | 15                                | 10     | 5      |
| 5 Bed Detached           | 5                                 |        |        |
| Percentage               | 100%                              | 100%   | 100%   |

## Build Costs

22. The build costs to be utilised in the viability model reflects a £ per sq m cost for gross internal floor space of all proposed dwellings.
23. These figures are based on the Royal Institute of Chartered Surveyors Building Cost Information Service (2007) data.
24. The building costs are as follows:
- **Flats** (less than 5 storeys) at £1,120 per sq m. (This is a higher cost level as it includes parts of the buildings that are not within the dwelling unit e.g. communal hallways, stairwells etc).
  - **Houses** <75sqm at £884 per sq m

- **Houses**> 75 sq m at £800 per sq m

### Dwelling Size

25. The following average dwelling sizes obtained from the Valuation Office Agency have been utilised in the viability study.

| Dwelling Type            | Square Metres | Square Foot |
|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|
| 1 Bed Flat               | 45 sq.m.      | 484 sq.ft.  |
| 2 Bed Flat               | 60 sq. m.     | 646 sq.ft.  |
| 2 Bed Terrace/Town House | 65 sq.m.      | 700 sq.ft.  |
| 3 Bed Terrace/Town House | 80 sq.m.      | 861 sq.ft.  |
|                          | 90 sq.m.      | 969 sq.ft.  |
| 3 Bed Detached House     | 120 sq.m.     | 1292 sq.ft. |
| 4 Bed Detached           | 150 sq.m.     | 1614 sq.ft. |
| 5 Bed Detached           | 160 sq.m.     | 1722 sq.ft. |

### Allowances and Adjustments within the Viability Model

26. As previously stated, the viability work is only based on very limited data and therefore a number of allowances and adjustments have had to be taken into account when developing the financial appraisal model. These are detailed below: -
- **Contingencies** - this is a percentage of the building costs set aside to meet unanticipated building problems and is set at a figure of 5% for new build developments.
  - **Professional Fees** - provision has been made for the fees of architects, quantity surveyors and other misc. professional fees, marketing, overheads, finance costs and margin these are set at 12%.
  - **Section 106 Costs** - a number of Section 106 costs contributions towards public transport, public opens space etc are factored into the viability assessment.
  - **Interest Rates** - Interest rates charges will vary depending on the perceived risk (risk would be regarded as being very high at present) and the experience of the developer. This model assumes an interest rate at above 3% above

base rates.

- **Marketing Fees** - The Industry Standard for marketing new residential site is typically 3% of the value of the development.
- **Legal Fees** - there have been charged at around £600 per unit which represents an industry average.
- **Contamination Costs** - these costs are site specific and it is impossible to ascertain the actual costs without ground investigation works being undertaken. Some studies do not include any abnormal costs for contamination in the assessment. However, other financial viability studies have included an albeit notional cost of £1000/housing unit for those sites that are known to be contaminated.
- **Demolition Costs** - this also varies between sites; some sites will have zero demolition costs whilst others will have to bear substantial demolition costs.
- **Build Period** - the effects of this factor will be felt on larger sites to a greater extent.

### Other Costs

27. Many assumptions have been made when arriving at the appraisal model. There will be other substantial costs to be included in the appraisal such as site surveys, ground investigations, asbestos surveys, planning fees, building regulations, Section 38 and Section 104. However, this exercise is only to give an indication of a site's potential financial viability and not carry out a full and functional appraisal/valuation.



## Appendix 7 Schedule of Material Changes to SHLAA Site Assessments

### CHANGE TO ASSESSMENT CONCLUSION

| SHLAA REF:   | OLD ASSESSMENT CONCLUSION  | NEW ASSESSMENT CONCLUSION   | REASONS FOR CHANGE                             | NEW YIELD |
|--|--|---|--|-----------|
| 08_0018<br>6 Barkstone<br>Close, Balderton                     | <b>The site May be Suitable.</b><br>Potential contamination issues in the locality would need to be investigated and mitigated if necessary. Sewage works nearby, therefore mitigation measures may be required. If the Urban Boundary is changed through the Development Plan process, this site could be considered suitable subject to appropriate mitigation works. The site is both Available and Achievable. | <b>The site is not suitable.</b><br>Potential contamination issues in the locality would need to be investigated and mitigated if necessary. Sewage works nearby, therefore mitigation measures may be required. Information provided as part of the consultation has highlighted the serious flooding issues in this location. This, along with other considerations, makes the site not suitable for development. | Information provided in consultation response. | N/A       |
| 08_0022<br>Land to south of<br>Manners Road,<br>Balderton      | <b>The site May be Suitable.</b><br>Sewage works nearby, therefore mitigation measures may be required. If the Urban Boundary designation is changed through the Development Plan process, this site could be considered suitable subject to appropriate mitigation works. The site is both Available and Achievable.  | <b>The site is not suitable.</b><br>Sewage works nearby, therefore mitigation measures may be required. Information provided as part of the consultation has highlighted the serious flooding issues in this location. This, along with other considerations, makes the site not suitable for development.  | Information provided in consultation response. | N/A       |
| 08_0039<br>Land off<br>Caythorpe Road,<br>Caythorpe<br>Lowdham | <b>The site May be Suitable.</b><br>Potential contamination issues at the site would need to be investigated and mitigated if necessary. Potential flooding issues. Further information would need to be provided to justify development in this   | <b>The site is not suitable.</b><br>Potential contamination issues at the site would need to be investigated and mitigated if necessary. Potential flooding issues. Flooding issues in this location, in conjunction with other considerations,   | Information provided in consultation response. | N/A       |

| SHLAA REF:  | OLD ASSESSMENT CONCLUSION  | NEW ASSESSMENT CONCLUSION   | REASONS FOR CHANGE  | NEW YIELD |
|---|--|---|---|-----------|
|   | location. Any possible development would need to mitigate against any detrimental impact of being adjacent to the Railway along the northern boundary of the site. If the Green Belt Boundary designation is changed through the Development Plan process, this site could be considered suitable if subject to appropriate mitigation works. The site is both Available and Achievable.               | make this site unsuitable for development.  |   |           |
| 08_0085<br>Land South of<br>Bilsthorpe,<br>Bilsthorpe | <b>The site is not suitable.</b><br>Topography issues. Highway access constraints in this location. This site is not appropriate for development in isolation. However, the site is adjacent to other SHLAA sites, which may be considered suitable for development and provide access. See Site 08_0261.  | <b>The site May be Suitable.</b><br>Topography issues. Possible on and off site highways mitigation works may be required. If the Village Envelope designation is changed through the Development Plan process, this site could be considered suitable subject to appropriate mitigation works. The site is Achievable and it is considered that it could be developed within 5 - 10 years.   | Information provided in consultation response. Highways Engineer re-consulted and comments amended. | 170       |
| 08_0102<br>Land off Denton<br>Close,<br>Balderton     | <b>The site May be Suitable.</b><br>Potential contamination issues in the locality would need to be investigated and mitigated if necessary. Any possible development would need to mitigate against any detrimental impact from the adjacent sewage works and to the adjacent Site of Interest for Nature Conservation. Although the presence of Trees with Preservation Orders could prevent part of | <b>The site is not suitable.</b><br>Potential contamination issues in the locality would need to be investigated and mitigated if necessary. Any possible development would need to mitigate against any detrimental impact from the adjacent sewage works and to the adjacent Site of Interest for Nature Conservation. The presence of Trees with Preservation Orders could prevent part of | Information provided in consultation response.  | N/A       |

| SHLAA REF:                                     | OLD ASSESSMENT CONCLUSION  | NEW ASSESSMENT CONCLUSION  | REASONS FOR CHANGE  | NEW YIELD |
|--|--|--|---|-----------|
|  | the site from being developed, some areas could accommodate development. If the Urban Boundary designation is changed through the Development Plan process, this site could be considered suitable subject to appropriate mitigation works. The site is both Available and Achievable. As the site is in multiple ownership, the timescale for development has been placed in the 5 to 10 year category. | the site from being developed.<br>Information provided as part of the consultation has highlighted the serious flooding issues in this location. This, along with other considerations, makes the site not suitable for development.   |   |           |
| 08_0106<br>Land off Retford Road,<br>Walesby   | <b>The site is not suitable.</b><br>Potential contamination issues at the site would need to be investigated and mitigated if necessary. Possible highway constraints in this location, in conjunction with other considerations, make this site unsuitable for development.   | <b>The site May be Suitable.</b><br>Potential contamination issues at the site would need to be investigated and mitigated if necessary. Possible highway constraints in this location would limit development to a maximum of 50 dwellings off each of Brackendale Drive and Central Avenue. If the Village Envelope designation is changed through the Development Plan process, this site could be considered suitable subject to appropriate mitigation works. The site is Achievable and it is considered that it could be developed within 5 - 10 years. | Information provided in consultation response. Highways Engineer re-consulted and comments amended. | 43        |
| 08_0159<br>Land Rear of Manor Close<br>Bleasby | <b>The site May be Suitable.</b><br>Potential contamination issues in the locality would need to be investigated and mitigated if necessary. Potential flooding issues. Further information would need to be provided to justify development in this   | <b>The site is not suitable.</b><br>Potential contamination issues in the locality would need to be investigated and mitigated if necessary. Potential flooding issues. Further information would need to be provided to justify development in this   | Information provided in consultation response. Highways Engineer re-consulted and comments amended. | N/A       |

| SHLAA REF:  | OLD ASSESSMENT CONCLUSION   | NEW ASSESSMENT CONCLUSION  | REASONS FOR CHANGE  | NEW YIELD |
|---|---|--|---|-----------|
|   | location. Possible highway constraints in this location. Possible off site highways mitigation works may be required. If the Village Envelope designation is changed through the Development Plan process, this site could be considered suitable subject to appropriate mitigation works. The site is both Available and Achievable.   | location. Possible highway constraints in this location, in conjunction with other considerations, make this site unsuitable for development.  |   |           |
| 08_0164<br>Gypsy Lane<br>Bleasby                    | <b>The site May be Suitable.</b><br>Potential flooding issues. Further information would need to be provided to justify development in this location. Possible highway constraints in this location. Possible off site highways mitigation works may be required. If the Village Envelope designation is changed through the Development Plan process, this site could be considered suitable subject to appropriate mitigation works. The site is both Available and Achievable. | <b>The site is not suitable.</b><br>Flooding issues and possible highway constraints in this location, in conjunction with other considerations, make this site unsuitable for development.  | Information provided in consultation response.                                      | N/A       |
| 08_0202<br>Land East of<br>Wycar Road<br>Bilsthorpe | <b>The site is not suitable.</b><br>Highway access constraints in this location. This site is not appropriate for development in isolation. However, the site is adjacent to other SHLAA sites, which may be considered suitable for development and provide access. See Site 08_0284 or 08_0452.   | <b>The site May be Suitable.</b><br>If the Village Envelope designation is changed through the Development Plan process, this site could be considered suitable in all other respects. The site is Achievable and it is considered that it could be developed within 5 - 10 years. | Information provided in consultation response. Highways Engineers comments amended. | 138       |

| SHLAA REF:   | OLD ASSESSMENT CONCLUSION   | NEW ASSESSMENT CONCLUSION   | REASONS FOR CHANGE  | NEW YIELD |
|--|---|---|---|-----------|
| 08_0287<br>Land at School Lane<br>Norwell                    | <p><b>The site May be Suitable.</b><br/>Potential contamination issues at the site would need to be investigated and mitigated if necessary. Possible highway access constraints in this location. Possible on and off site highways mitigation works may be required. Any possible development would need to mitigate against any detrimental impact on the nearby Scheduled Ancient Monument. If the Village Envelope designation is changed through the Development Plan process, this site could be considered subject to appropriate mitigation works.</p> | <p><b>The site is not suitable.</b><br/>Potential contamination issues at the site would need to be investigated and mitigated if necessary. Any possible development would need to mitigate against any detrimental impact on the nearby Scheduled Ancient Monument. Possible highway constraints in this location, in conjunction with other considerations, make this site unsuitable for development.</p> | Information provided in consultation response. Highways Engineer re-consulted and comments amended. | N/A       |
| 08_0296<br>Land of Station Close and Dykes End<br>Collingham | <p><b>The site May be Suitable.</b><br/>Possible highway constraints in this location. Potential contamination issues in the locality would need to be investigated and mitigated if necessary. If the Village Envelope designation is changed through the Development Plan process, this site could be considered suitable subject to appropriate mitigation works. The site is both Available and Achievable.</p>   | <p><b>The site is not suitable.</b><br/>Possible highway constraints in this location. Potential contamination issues in the locality would need to be investigated and mitigated if necessary. Potential flooding issues. Flooding issues in this location, in conjunction with other considerations, make this site unsuitable for development</p>  | Information provided in consultation response.  | N/A       |
| 08_0305<br>Land to rear of Beacon Hill Road<br>Newark        | <p><b>The site May be Suitable.</b><br/>Potential contamination issues in the locality would need to be investigated and mitigated if necessary. Possible off site highways mitigation works may be</p>   | <p><b>The site is not suitable.</b><br/>Site Boundary Amended. Potential contamination issues in the locality would need to be investigated and mitigated if necessary. Any possible development</p>  | Site split at request of owners. This part of the site no longer has access to the public highway.  | N/A       |

| SHLAA REF:  | OLD ASSESSMENT CONCLUSION   | NEW ASSESSMENT CONCLUSION   | REASONS FOR CHANGE  | NEW YIELD |
|---|---|---|---|-----------|
|   | required. Any possible development would need to mitigate against any detrimental impact on the Notts Wildlife Trust Nature Reserve adjacent to the site and Tree Preservation Order on the boundaries. If the Urban Boundary designation is changed through the Development Plan process, this site could be considered suitable subject to appropriate mitigation works. The site is both Available and Achievable.   | would need to mitigate against any detrimental impact on the Notts Wildlife Trust Nature Reserve adjacent to the site and Tree Preservation Order on the boundaries. Highway access constraints in this location. This site is not appropriate for development in isolation. However, the site is adjacent to other SHLAA sites, which may be considered suitable for development and provide access. See Site 08_0694 and 08_0381. | Site 08_0694 is a new site formed from the remaining area.  |           |
| 08_0315A<br>Land to the rear of Orchard Close Bleasby     | <b>The site May be Suitable.</b><br>Potential contamination issues in the locality would need to be investigated and mitigated if necessary. Possible highway constraints in this location. Potential flooding issues in the north west corner of the site - development would not appropriate on this portion of the site. If the Village Envelope designation is changed through the Development Plan process, this site could be considered suitable subject to appropriate mitigation works. The site is both Available and Achievable. | <b>The site is not suitable.</b><br>Potential contamination issues in the locality would need to be investigated and mitigated if necessary. Potential flooding issues in the north west corner of the site - development would not appropriate on this portion of the site. Possible highway constraints in this location, in conjunction with other considerations, make this site unsuitable for development.                    | Information provided in consultation response. Highways Engineer re-consulted and comments amended. | N/A       |
| 08_0402<br>Land at Billericay, 124 High Street Collingham | <b>The site is not suitable.</b><br>Highway access constraints in this location. This site is not appropriate for development in isolation. However, the site is adjacent to other SHLAA sites, which may be considered suitable for development and provide access. See Site 08_0002.  | <b>The site May be Suitable.</b><br>Possible off site highways mitigation works may be required. If the Main Open Area designation is changed through the Development Plan process subject to appropriate mitigation works. The site is Achievable and it is considered that it   | Information provided in consultation response. Highways Engineers comments amended.                 | 17        |

| SHLAA REF:  | OLD ASSESSMENT CONCLUSION  | NEW ASSESSMENT CONCLUSION   | REASONS FOR CHANGE   | NEW YIELD |
|---|--|---|--|-----------|
|   |  | could be developed within 5 - 10 years.   |  |           |
| 08_0539<br>North of<br>Epperstone Road<br>Lowdham | <b>The site is not suitable.</b><br>Potential contamination issues at the site would need to be investigated and mitigated if necessary. Possible highway constraints in this location, in conjunction with other considerations, make this site unsuitable for development.     | <b>The site May be Suitable.</b><br>Potential contamination issues at the site would need to be investigated and mitigated if necessary. Possible highway constraints in this location, in conjunction with other considerations, make this site unsuitable for development. Any possible development would need to mitigate against any detrimental impact on the Site of Interest for Nature Conservation adjacent to the site. If the Green Belt Boundary designation is changed through the Development Plan process, this site could be considered suitable subject to appropriate mitigation works. The site is Achievable and it is considered that it could be developed within 5 - 10 years. | Information provided in consultation response. Site area is larger and allows access to be provided. | 150       |
| 08_0560<br>North of<br>Ossington Road<br>Norwell  | <b>The site is not suitable.</b><br>Potential contamination issues in the locality would need to be investigated and mitigated if necessary. Possible highway constraints in this location, in conjunction with other considerations, make this site unsuitable for development. | <b>The site May be Suitable.</b><br>Potential contamination issues in the locality would need to be investigated and mitigated if necessary. Possible major off site highways mitigation works may be required. If the Village Envelope designation is changed through the Development Plan process, this site could be considered suitable subject to appropriate mitigation works. The site is Achievable and information supplied is that it could be developed within 5 - 10 years.   | Information provided in consultation response. Highways Engineer re-consulted and comments amended.  | 29        |

| SHLAA REF:                                       | OLD ASSESSMENT CONCLUSION   | NEW ASSESSMENT CONCLUSION   | REASONS FOR CHANGE  | NEW YIELD |
|--|---|---|---|-----------|
| 08_0563<br>Off School Lane<br>Norwell            | <b>The site May be Suitable.</b><br>Potential contamination issues in the locality would need to be investigated and mitigated if necessary. Possible off site highways mitigation works may be required. If the Village Envelope designation is changed through the Development Plan process, this site could be considered suitable subject to appropriate mitigation works. The site is Achievable and it is considered that it could be developed within 5 - 10 years.  | <b>The site is not suitable.</b><br>Potential contamination issues in the locality would need to be investigated and mitigated if necessary. Possible highway constraints in this location, in conjunction with other considerations, make this site unsuitable for development.  | Information provided in consultation response. Highways Engineer re-consulted and comments amended.   | N/A       |
| 08_0694<br>Land at Beacon<br>Hill Road<br>Newark | <b>The site May be Suitable.</b><br>Potential contamination issues in the locality would need to be investigated and mitigated if necessary. Possible off site highways mitigation works may be required. Any possible development would need to mitigate against any detrimental impact on the Notts Wildlife Trust Nature Reserve adjacent to the site and Tree Preservation Order on the boundaries. If the Urban Boundary designation is changed through the Development Plan process, this site could be considered suitable subject to appropriate mitigation works. The site is both Available and Achievable. | <b>The site is Suitable.</b><br>Potential contamination issues in the locality would need to be investigated and mitigated if necessary. Possible off site highways mitigation works may be required. Any possible development would need to mitigate against any detrimental impact on the Notts Wildlife Trust Nature Reserve adjacent to the site and Tree Preservation Order on the boundaries. Subject to appropriate mitigation, this site could be considered suitable. The site is both Available and Achievable. | Site split at request of owners. This part of the site is within the Urban Boundary.<br><br>Site 08_0305 was the original reference and is shown above. This site is also shown in the new sites list | 178       |



**CHANGE TO ASSESSMENT YIELD**

| <b>SHLAA REF:</b>  | <b>OLD YIELD</b> | <b>NEW YIELD</b> | <b>REASONS FOR CHANGE</b>  |
|--|------------------|------------------|--|
| 08_0028<br>Land at Hemplands Lane,<br>Sutton on Trent                  | 87               | 69               | Agent's suggestion.  |
| 08_0052<br>Land behind Janandra, Lansdowne & Enfield<br>House<br>Harby | 61               | 30               | Reduced by Sewage<br>Treatment Works<br>capacity. Limits total<br>development in Harby to<br><b>30 dwellings in Total.</b> |
| 08_0151<br>Land at Primrose End, Woodhouse Road<br>Norwell             | 44               | 25               | Agent's suggestion.  |
| 08_0158<br>Land to North of Collingham Cricket Club<br>Collingham      | 31               | 13               | Amend error.   |
| 08_0197<br>Rear of High Gables, Lower Kirklington Road<br>Southwell    | 18               | 4                | Access limitations.  |
| 08_0209<br>Cavendish Park<br>Clipstone                                 | 118              | 100              | Agent's suggestion.  |
| 08_0292<br>Land at Oaklands Close<br>Collingham                        | 52               | 25               | Access limitations.  |
|  |                  |                  |  |

| SHLAA REF:  | OLD YIELD | NEW YIELD | REASONS FOR CHANGE   |
|---|-----------|-----------|--|
| 08_0299<br>Land at Clay Lane/Barnby Road<br>Newark    | 2000      | 1600      | Amended in discussion with developers.   |
| 08_0318<br>Land South of Newark<br>Hawton             | 6000      | 3100      | Amended in discussion with developers.   |
| 08_0556<br>Land at Trent Farm<br>North Muskham        | 29        | 34        | Site 08_0083 amalgamated with this site at the owner's request.                              |
| 08_0577<br>North of Orchard Close<br>Southwell        | 77        | 62        | Developable area reduced to take account of shape of site.                                   |
| 08_0579<br>Off Nursery End<br>Southwell               | 9         | 5         | Access limitations.  |
| 08_0588<br>North of Pocklington Crescent<br>Winthorpe | 84        | 55        | New yield limit for sites off Hargon Lane. Limit for these sites will be <b>55 in total.</b> |
| 08_0589<br>North of Hargon Lane<br>Winthorpe          | 57        | 55        | New yield limit for sites off Hargon Lane. Limit for these sites will be <b>55 in total.</b> |
|   |           |           |  |

| SHLAA REF:  | OLD YIELD | NEW YIELD | REASONS FOR CHANGE   |
|---|-----------|-----------|--|
| 08_0590<br>East of Winthorpe House<br>Winthorpe     | 106       | 55        | New yield limit for sites off Hargon Lane. Limit for these sites will be <b>55 in total.</b>                   |
| 08_0612<br>Pitomy Farm,<br>Low Street<br>Collingham | 28        | 12        | Amend error.   |
| 08_0626<br>Low Street<br>Harby                      | 61        | 30        | Reduced by Sewage Treatment Works capacity.<br>Limits total development in Harby <b>30 dwellings in Total.</b> |
| 08_0631<br>Barnby Gate, Mastercare<br>Newark        | 52        | 100       | Defined by Planning Permission.  |
| 08_0637<br>Bowbridge Road<br>Newark                 | 51        | 89        | Defined by Planning Permission.  |
| 08_0648<br>Potterdike,<br>Lombard Street<br>Newark  | 89        | 61        | Defined by Planning Permission.  |

| SHLAA REF:                                  | OLD YIELD | NEW YIELD | REASONS FOR CHANGE                                    |
|---|-----------|-----------|---|
| 08_0650<br>Millgate<br>Newark               | 53        | 69        | Defined by Planning Permission.                       |
| 08_0652<br>North Gate<br>Newark             | 33        | 189       | Defined by Planning Permission.                       |
| 08_0655<br>North of Maltkiln Lane<br>Newark | 196       | 60        | Amended information – defined by Planning Permission. |

**MATERIAL CHANGE IN SITE AREA**

| SHLAA REF:                                   | OLD SITE AREA | NEW SITE AREA | OLD ASSESSMENT CONCLUSION  | NEW ASSESSMENT CONCLUSION  | REASON FOR CHANGE                                       | YIELD |
|--|---------------|---------------|--|--|---|-------|
| 08_0077<br>Land at Fiskerton Road, Southwell | 5.32          | 1.03          | <b>The site is not suitable.</b><br>Potential contamination issues at the site would need to be investigated and mitigated if necessary. Possible highway constraints in this location, in conjunction with other considerations, make this site unsuitable for development. | <b>The site is not suitable.</b><br>Site area reduced as a result of consultation response. Potential contamination issues at the site would need to be investigated and mitigated if necessary. Not presently suitable due to level of separation from existing settlement. | Site area reduced as a result of consultation response. | N/A   |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

| SHLAA REF:   | OLD SITE AREA | NEW SITE AREA | OLD ASSESSMENT CONCLUSION   | NEW ASSESSMENT CONCLUSION  | REASON FOR CHANGE  | YIELD |
|--|---------------|---------------|---|--|--|-------|
| 08_0305<br>Land to rear of Beacon Hill Road Newark | 9.52          | 3.25          | <b>The site May be Suitable.</b><br>Potential contamination issues in the locality would need to be investigated and mitigated if necessary. Possible off site highways mitigation works may be required. Any possible development would need to mitigate against any detrimental impact on the Notts Wildlife Trust Nature Reserve adjacent to the site and Tree Preservation Order on the boundaries. If the Urban Boundary designation is changed through the Development Plan process, this site could be considered suitable subject to appropriate mitigation works. The site is both Available and Achievable. | <b>The site is not suitable.</b><br>Site Boundary Amended. Potential contamination issues in the locality would need to be investigated and mitigated if necessary. Any possible development would need to mitigate against any detrimental impact on the Notts Wildlife Trust Nature Reserve adjacent to the site and Tree Preservation Order on the boundaries. Highway access constraints in this location. This site is not appropriate for development in isolation. However, the site is adjacent to other SHLAA sites, which may be considered suitable for development and provide access. See Site 08_0694 and 08_0381. | Site split at request of owners. This part of the site no longer has access to the public highway.<br><br>Site 08_0694 is a new site formed from the remaining area. | N/A   |
| 08_0539<br>North of Epperstone Road Lowdham        | 4.23          | 7.28          | <b>The site is not suitable.</b><br>Potential contamination issues at the site would need to be investigated and mitigated if necessary. Possible highway constraints in this location, in conjunction with other considerations, make this site unsuitable for development.  | <b>The site May be Suitable.</b><br>Potential contamination issues at the site would need to be investigated and mitigated if necessary. Possible highway constraints in this location, in conjunction with other considerations, make this site unsuitable for development. Any   | Information provided in consultation response. Site area is larger and allows access to be provided.<br>This site also appears in the                                | 150   |

| SHLAA REF:                                       | OLD SITE AREA | NEW SITE AREA | OLD ASSESSMENT CONCLUSION   | NEW ASSESSMENT CONCLUSION  | REASON FOR CHANGE                                       | YIELD |
|--|---------------|---------------|---|--|---|-------|
|  |               |               |   | possible development would need to mitigate against any detrimental impact on the Site of Interest for Nature Conservation adjacent to the site. If the Green Belt Boundary designation is changed through the Development Plan process, this site could be considered suitable subject to appropriate mitigation works. The site is Achievable and it is considered that it could be developed within 5 - 10 years.             | Change to Assessment Conclusion Schedule                |       |
| 08_0578<br>East of Kirklington Road<br>Southwell | 3.60          | 1.00          | <b>The site May be Suitable.</b><br>Possible off site highways mitigation works may be required. If the Village Envelope designation is changed through the Development Plan process, this site could be considered suitable subject to appropriate mitigation works. The site is Achievable and it is considered that it could be developed within 10- 15 years. | <b>The site May be Suitable.</b><br>Developable area reduced as a result of consultation response. Possible off site highways mitigation works may be required. If the Village Envelope designation is changed through the Development Plan process, this site could be considered suitable subject to appropriate mitigation works. The site is Achievable and it is considered that it could be developed within 10- 15 years. | Site area reduced as a result of consultation response. | 28    |

| SHLAA REF:                                  | OLD SITE AREA | NEW SITE AREA | OLD ASSESSMENT CONCLUSION  | NEW ASSESSMENT CONCLUSION   | REASON FOR CHANGE                                     | YIELD |
|---|---------------|---------------|--|---|---|-------|
| 08_0655<br>North of Maltkiln Lane<br>Newark | 2.96          | 2.00          | <p><b>The site is suitable.</b><br/>Potential contamination issues at the site would need to be investigated and mitigated if necessary. Potential flooding issues. Further information may need to be provided. Although the site appears to have no connection to the public highway, permission has already been granted for this site with an access agreed. Any possible development would need to mitigate against any detrimental impact on the Site of Interest for Nature Conservation adjacent to the site. Work on this site has already commenced for 49 houses and 147 flats.</p> | <p><b>The site is suitable.</b><br/>Site assessment amended as a result of consultation response. This site is to the north of the site on which housing has commenced. Potential contamination issues at the site would need to be investigated and mitigated if necessary. Potential flooding issues. Further information may need to be provided. Permission has already been granted for this site with an access agreed. Any possible development would need to mitigate against any detrimental impact on the Site of Interest for Nature Conservation adjacent to the site. The site is Achievable and it is considered that it could be developed within 5 years.</p> | Amended information – defined by Planning Permission. | 60    |

## NEW SITES INCLUDED IN SHLAA ASSESSMENT

| SHLAA REF:                                       | NEW ASSESSMENT   | REASON FOR NEW SITE   | NEW SITE AREA | YIELD |
|--|--|---|---------------|-------|
| 08_0692<br>Land around<br>Fernwood<br>Fernwood   | <p><b>The site May be Suitable.</b></p> <p>Potential contamination issues at the site would need to be investigated and mitigated if necessary. Potential flooding issues. Further information would need to be provided to justify development in this location. Any possible development would need to mitigate against any detrimental impact from the Oil and Gas Pipelines running beneath the site and would also need to mitigate against any detrimental impact on thre adjacent Site of Interest for Nature Conservation. Possible off site highways mitigation works may be required. If the Urban Boundary designation is changed through the Development Plan process, this site could be considered suitable subject to appropriate mitigation works. The site is Achievable and information supplied is that it could be developed within 5 years.</p> | <p>As a result of consultation responses the small sites in Fernwood have now been amalgamated to produce one large site which is the same as the Strategic Site NAP 2C proposed for inclusion in the Core Strategy DPD.</p> <p>The original sites have now been removed from the study and are listed below.</p> | 247.71        | 3200  |
| 08_0693<br>Land off<br>Southwell Road<br>Lowdham | <p><b>The site May be Suitable.</b></p> <p>Potential contamination issues at the site would need to be investigated and mitigated if necessary. Potential flooding issues, further information would need to be provided to justify development in this location. Part of the site lies within Environment Agency Flood Zone 3 where residential development should be resisted. Although part of the site could not be developed, if the Green Belt Boundary designation is changed through the Development Plan process, part of this site could be considered suitable subject to appropriate mitigation works. The site is Achievable and it is considered that it could be developed within 5 - 10 years.</p>   | <p>Site split at request of owners. This site was originally a small part of site 08_0214 which is Assessed as Not Suitable due to its location within Flood Zone 3.</p>  | 0.94          | 15    |



| SHLAA REF:                                 | NEW ASSESSMENT  | REASON FOR NEW SITE  | NEW SITE AREA | YIELD |
|--|---|--|---------------|-------|
| 08_0694<br>Land at Beacon Hill Road Newark | <b>The site is suitable.</b><br>Potential contamination issues in the locality would need to be investigated and mitigated if necessary. Possible off site highways mitigation works may be required. Any possible development would need to mitigate against any detrimental impact on the Notts Wildlife Trust Nature Reserve adjacent to the site and Tree Preservation Order on the boundaries. Subject to appropriate mitigation, this site could be considered suitable. The site is both Available and Achievable. | Site split at request of owners. This part of the site no longer has access to the public highway.<br><br>Site 08_0694 is a new site formed from the remaining area. | 6.28          | 178   |

#### SITES REMOVED FROM SHLAA

| SHLAA REF:  | REASONS FOR REMOVAL FROM STUDY  |
|---|---|
| 08_0083<br>Manor Cottages,<br>Main Street, North Muskham  | Site now amalgamated with site 08_0556 in accordance with consultation response.  |
| 08_0218<br>Land off Claypole Lane, Fernwood               | Site is now part of the larger Fernwood site referenced 08_0692.                  |
| 08_0248<br>Land at Cavendish Avenue, Newark               | This land is no longer in the same ownership and has been removed from the Study. |
| 08_0298<br>Land at Great North Road,<br>South of Fernwood | Site is now part of the larger Fernwood site referenced 08_0692.                  |

| <b>SHLAA REF:</b>   | <b>REASONS FOR REMOVAL FROM STUDY</b>   |
|---|---|
| 08_0316<br>Land to east of Oaklands Close,<br>Collingham    | At the owner's request, this site has now been removed from the Study. See Site 08_0292.  |
| 08_0365<br>RHP Sports Ground,<br>Elm Avenue, Newark         | This site forms part of site 08_0384 and development should be considered on a comprehensive basis with an allowance for the provision of sports facilities. This site has therefore now been removed from the Study. However the site still forms part of the larger site which is assessed as Suitable. |
| 08_0382<br>Land to North and East of<br>Balderton           | Site is now part of the larger Fernwood site referenced 08_0692.  |
| 08_0383<br>Land to North of Balderton<br>Hospital, Fernwood | Site is now part of the larger Fernwood site referenced 08_0692.  |
| 08_0411<br>Land off School Lane, Halam                      | It should be noted that as a result of the consultation process, Halam is no longer a settlement prioritised for assessment.  |
| 08_0412<br>School Playing Field off School<br>Lane, Halam   | It should be noted that as a result of the consultation process, Halam is no longer a settlement prioritised for assessment.  |
| 08_0413<br>Land off The Turnpike, Halam                     | It should be noted that as a result of the consultation process, Halam is no longer a settlement prioritised for assessment.  |
| 08_0414<br>Land off Halam Hill, Halam                       | It should be noted that as a result of the consultation process, Halam is no longer a settlement prioritised for assessment.  |
| 08_0415<br>Land Adjacent to Halam Orchard,<br>Halam         | It should be noted that as a result of the consultation process, Halam is no longer a settlement prioritised for assessment.  |

| SHLAA REF:  | REASONS FOR REMOVAL FROM STUDY   |
|---|--|
| 08_0416<br>Land off Halam Hill, Halam                     | It should be noted that as a result of the consultation process, Halam is no longer a settlement prioritised for assessment. |
| 08_0417<br>Land at 9 Halam House Farm, Halam              | It should be noted that as a result of the consultation process, Halam is no longer a settlement prioritised for assessment. |
| 08_0418<br>Rear of Ashdene, Halam                         | It should be noted that as a result of the consultation process, Halam is no longer a settlement prioritised for assessment. |
| 08_0419<br>East of Radley Road, Halam                     | It should be noted that as a result of the consultation process, Halam is no longer a settlement prioritised for assessment. |
| 08_0420<br>Adjacent Manor House, Halam                    | It should be noted that as a result of the consultation process, Halam is no longer a settlement prioritised for assessment. |
| 08_0421<br>North of Radley Road, Halam                    | It should be noted that as a result of the consultation process, Halam is no longer a settlement prioritised for assessment. |
| 08_0422<br>South of Manor Fields, Halam                   | It should be noted that as a result of the consultation process, Halam is no longer a settlement prioritised for assessment. |
| 08_0423<br>Off St Michaels Close, Halam                   | It should be noted that as a result of the consultation process, Halam is no longer a settlement prioritised for assessment. |
| 08_0424<br>Land off Gray Lane, Halam                      | It should be noted that as a result of the consultation process, Halam is no longer a settlement prioritised for assessment. |
| 08_0512<br>Land South of Fernwood Business Park, Fernwood | Site is now part of the larger Fernwood site referenced 08_0692.   |

| <b>SHLAA REF:</b>                                | <b>REASONS FOR REMOVAL FROM STUDY</b>                            |
|--|--|
| 08_0513<br>East of the A1, Fernwood              | Site is now part of the larger Fernwood site referenced 08_0692. |
| 08_0593<br>South of Hollowdyke Lane<br>Fernwood  | Site is now part of the larger Fernwood site referenced 08_0692. |
| 08_0601<br>Land South of Station Road<br>Bleasby | No comments received. Remove from study.                         |