

Teversal Skegby and Stanton Hill Neighbourhood Forum

Planning and Environment Sub Group

Following a meeting of the Sub Group at which Christine Sarris and Ian Hewitt of ADC Planning Department were invited to discuss cooperation, the developers of major sites at Beck Lane and at Brand Lane were invited to discuss their proposed developments with members of the Group. As a result, we were able to offer our comments on these developments to ADC.

The Beck Lane development has been delayed due to a lack of information from NCC relating to the manner in which they will provide for the educational needs arising from the new housing population. We were able to determine from NCC that they propose to build a new school at Lowmore Road, Kirkby, but were also delaying matters until they have heard whether their application for a grant to develop their land at Beck Lane has been resolved. The Brand Lane development has caused us concern in relation to the physical ability of Brand Lane to take the additional traffic generated by the new estate.

The planning applications received by ADC each week are passed to the chairman of the sub group, who abstracts those relating to the Neighbourhood Group area and circulates these to group members. This has enabled us, in liaison with the Heritage Sub Group, to pass a number of concerns to ADC, predominantly in regard to heritage matters.

Our major concern however, in association with the Stanton Hill Sub Group, is the manner in which the Section 106 money in relation to the Brand Lane proposal has been allocated. This would seem to be allocated to areas that would not necessarily be influenced by the development. Attached hereto is the email sent to Christine Sarris expressing our concerns, along with her (eventual) reply. It is felt that the Forum should discuss the implications arising from this email exchange to determine how best to proceed. If necessary, a further meeting of the planning and environment sub group will be convened to discuss the Forum's conclusions.

Richard Goad

May, 2018

Email to Christine Sarris, 13th February, 2018:-

Dear Christine,

Thank you for sparing the time to speak with me the other day when I was in the ADC offices and also, via Neil Oxby, for providing the links to download the Section 106 agreement for the proposed Brand Lane Development and the Unilateral Undertaking for the Mansfield Road Development.

As you may be aware, the Forum is currently engaged in a consultation exercise to try to gain a picture of the social and economic issues that concern the people of Stanton Hill. From that it is intended to work up an over-arching strategy to deliver change. The Forum's Regeneration Group decided that the worst approach would be to go in with preconceived ideas that will, at best, have only limited success.

The Group has discussed that initiatives are likely to require the introduction of considerable sums of new money but it's essential that money is targeted wisely. Most large sums that are available from outside agencies are project based and require matched funding so the main focus is likely to be on designing a series of co-ordinated projects and applying for grants once the ground work is complete.

The Group believe that the Section 106 money could form a fundamental part of this strategy and if put to proper use will help it attract the sums that will be needed. What would be a betrayal of the people of Stanton Hill would be for this approach to be defeated by a lack of flexibility on the part of all those involved in the initiative, including Ashfield District Council who have so far played a constructive role.

The Group currently fail to see the logic behind some of the Section 106 spends. It will be asking the people of Stanton Hill what facilities, changes to the built environment and other initiatives they think will make their lives better, so consider that it be better to wait for the outcome of these consultations before committing the large sums of money involved in the Section 106. From our discussion with the developer, who were not involved in the determination of the Section 106 initially, they have no problem in the money involved being redirected towards what might be considered most appropriate for the area.

To give just an example. One of the likely outcomes of the Group's work will be to suggest improvements to the public realm and the High Street in particular. Substantial sums are allocated in the Section 106 agreement for this. There is a conversation therefore to be had on how that money is best targeted. The Group can't currently see the point in offering shop-keepers money to improve their shop fronts if they aren't providing the goods and services people in Stanton Hill and elsewhere want or if any improvement isn't reflected internally. One of the questions the Group will be asking residents is what goods and services they would like to see in Stanton Hill and therefore what establishments they are likely to support. Wouldn't it therefore be better for S106 money to be used as part of an evidence-based approach?

What the Group feel is needed is dialogue with the appropriate people at ADC and a willingness to work together to reverse Stanton Hill's decline. This Section 106 money is a once and for all opportunity that needs to be used wisely to provide the greatest benefit to the people who live and work in Stanton Hill. The Group therefore think that the Forum needs to be part of the decision-making process before any S106 money is spent and we think it would be useful for dialogue with ADC on this to begin as soon as possible.

As we also discussed, we are keen to be involved at this early stage in the determination of the section 106 agreement in relation to the Beck Lane development. By the direct involvement of the people in the neighbourhood, the determination of this money could be directed to those issues that are most appropriate and of concern to the residents nearby.

I look forward to your response to this rather long, I'm afraid, email which reflects the view of the members of the Forum.

Best wishes,

Richard

Email from Christine Sarris, 13th April, 2018

Dear Mr Goad,

I apologise for the delay in responding to your query in relation to the provision of appropriate infrastructure within the neighbourhood forum area. I have now had the opportunity to meet with colleagues to discuss the questions you have raised.

You firstly asked about existing S106 agreements in place within the area and the opportunity to revisit those agreements. You have been provided with copies of all the S106s you requested. Those agreements are based on the decision of the authority and relate to the policies in place at that time. They were carefully considered and do still meet infrastructure requirements. It would not be in our gift to revisit those agreements unless requested to do so by the applicant. Applicants cannot insist on amendments to S106 within 5 years, Council's do have the discretion to consider amendments but there is no right of appeal except after 5 years if amendments are not accepted.

In relation to the discussion of infrastructure for future applications and those currently being considered in the Teversal neighbourhood forum area. The Teversal Neighbourhood Plan is a consideration of all applications that are now received within the area. We are consulting with you on all applications received and will be more than happy to attend the Neighbourhood Forum as appropriate. We welcome the forum's input into the priorities for infrastructure and will work with you to secure appropriate contributions.

There is intended to be two strands to this which we can discuss further. My colleagues from the Locality team are attending Forum meetings and will support you to develop a prioritised list of projects for the neighbourhood plan. This can then feed into the second strand which is managed through the planning process where as a consultee you would feed in your comments in relation to your prioritised list of infrastructure for a given site. This will be taken into account through the formal consideration of the application and officers will negotiate with the developer to ensure compliance with all policy and viability discussions in the round. There will be ongoing liaison with the Forum during any processing of an application that requires contributions as is the case with colleagues at the County and with other sections of the council.

Obviously, we will encourage any developers that approach us for pre-application advice to engage with you at the earliest opportunity. In any event we will hopefully be able to identify from your prioritised list some likely projects that relate to a proposal and require contributions. It would be useful to discuss the above

suggested approach with you and timelines that we would each need to operate within.

I look forward to hearing from you.

*Regards
Christine*