

**MATTER 24: ARE THE RANGE OF INFRASTRUCTURE REQUIREMENTS IN  
POLICY SHAP2 (ROLE OF OLLERTON & BOUGHTON)  
DELIVERABLE?**

- 24.1 This Matter Statement has been prepared by Tetlow King Planning on behalf of David Sparks of the Minster Veterinary Centre in relation to his land interests to the east of Southwell.
- 24.2 Policy ShAP 2 seeks to promote the role of Ollerton & Boughton as a sustainable settlement for its residents and the wider Sherwood area through promoting new housing and employment opportunities, providing new and improved community infrastructure including primary and secondary school places and healthcare facilities, securing the resolution of traffic and transport issues including those identified in the IDP such as the A614/A6075/A616 Ollerton Roundabout junction, and improved public transport linkages between Ollerton Town Centre and the surrounding Sherwood Area.
- 24.3 The deliverability of these infrastructure improvements is not supported by the accompanying evidence base and is undermined by the longstanding nature of a number of these, including the need for expansion of the GP surgery and Ollerton Roundabout, as well as the need to secure the majority of infrastructure improvement funding through Section 106 planning obligations.
- 24.4 The evidence set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (**INF.01**) identifies need at Ollerton and Boughton for a range of key infrastructure, and the scale of funding required to deliver these, as summarised in figure 24.1 below.

Figure 24.1: Key Infrastructure at Ollerton and Boughton

| Infrastructure  |   | Estimated Cost | Funding Source            |
|---|---|----------------|---------------------------|
| GP Surgery: two new FTE GPs                                 | Likely new site required for expansion              | £0.9m          | S106 planning obligations |
| Primary Education: new one-form entry school                | 196 additional places                               | £2.2m          | S106 planning obligations |
| Secondary Education: expansion of existing Dukeries Academy | 444 additional places                               | £7.7m          | CIL                       |
| A614/A616/B6075 Ollerton Roundabout                         | Resolve existing queuing and delays at peak periods | £5m            | S106 planning obligations |

24.5 This statement raises concerns with the deliverability of each planned infrastructure.

#### Healthcare Facilities: GP Surgery

24.6 The evidence in **INF.01** suggests (at Table 28) a cost of £0.9m for a new or expanded GP surgery at Ollerton, based on NHS England costs of £950 per dwelling. This is concerning as the Whole Plan Viability Assessment (**INF.06, paragraphs 4.27 - 4.28**) indicates a total S106 planning obligation package assumption of just £1,000 per dwelling. The use of a lower than historic average of planning obligation contributions (£1,249 per dwelling) is arbitrary and unjustified, and fails to reflect the true scale of planning obligations expected to be funded over the new plan period.

24.7 The evidence suggests (**INF.01, paragraph 5.2.14**) that the existing GP surgery, Middleton Lodge Practice, is sustainably located within Ollerton, but under pressure and in need of new premises; *“a new Practice to meet future demands is therefore considered likely at this location”*. As the site is physically constrained there is a need to assess the potential to relocate the practice alongside assessing the ability and timescales involved in redeveloping the site to accommodate a new practice building. The Council has not undertaken such an assessment.

## Education Facilities

### Primary School Places

- 24.8 The projected increase in primary school places is expected to require provision of a new single form entry school and to be funded wholly through S106 planning contributions (**INF.01**). However, **INF.02** indicates that CIL funding may be more appropriate as:

*“There is a significant risk of the ‘S106 Pooled Contributions’ limit being exceeded if this approach is adopted across the District.” (Paragraph 3.3.1, page 11).*

- 24.9 No robust justification has been provided as to why the new primary school at Ollerton is not to be funded through CIL. With just £1,000 per dwelling assumed to cover the plan’s various financial obligations for site specific mitigation, of which £950 may be required to fund the redevelopment or extension of the GP surgery at Ollerton, it is not clear that the true viability impacts have been factored into the whole plan viability assessment (**INF.06**).

### Secondary School Places

- 24.10 The Council’s recently adopted updated CIL Charging Schedule was implemented on 1 January 2018 and seeks to secure infrastructure funding of approximately £25m towards a total shortfall of £27.7m. This is based on total infrastructure costs of £110.4m; most of which, as set out in the Regulation 123 List, are for specific highway projects. The 123 List does not specify funding for specific infrastructure at Ollerton & Boughton town, though the Levy is to secure funding generally towards secondary school improvements across the District.

- 24.11 **INF.01** ‘assumes’ that the projected increased need in secondary school places outside Newark-on-Trent, for 444 additional places, can be accommodated through an expansion of existing facilities at the Dukeries Academy at Ollerton. The evidence base provides no basis for this assumption, nor is there a costed plan for the development of the academy to accommodate additional students.

- 24.12 It is also notable that there is a shortfall in the level of funding that is expected to be raised from the adopted CIL charge and the total costs of infrastructure for this plan period. The new charge is expected to raise approximately £25m up to 2033 towards

highway and education infrastructure needs, but there is no indication as to where the shortfall of £2.7m funding will be found. This raises a serious question as to the deliverability of the infrastructure to be funded by CIL over the Plan period.

- 24.13 It is further concerning that the Statement of Common Ground (**INF.07**) produced by the County Council and District Council appears to misunderstand the collection of CIL and S106 financial contributions. Paragraph 3.5 of **INF.07** states that the County Council will request CIL funding towards secondary education from those housing development schemes that will result in a shortfall of capacity, implicitly stating that those that will not result in a shortfall will not be charged. As CIL is a non-negotiable element, this is patently not true and should be addressed.
- 24.14 Whilst funding through CIL may be the most appropriate source of funding, collection of the levy is slow; if the planned development of the four main extension sites around Newark and Edwinstowe fail to come forward in a timely fashion the delivery of additional school places at Ollerton will be threatened. The timing and projected shortfall of the fund undermines the deliverability of the additional school places at Ollerton, potentially leaving a substantial shortfall in places for local children. This undermines the strategy to allocate residential growth at Ollerton and Boughton and neighbouring Edwinstowe.

### **Traffic and Transport Issues in and Around the Town**

#### A614/A6075 Ollerton Roundabout

- 24.15 The allocation of the Thoresby Colliery site for mixed use development indicates that a substantial upgrade of significant infrastructure improvements, including at the Ollerton Roundabout “*will be particularly important to ensure that future development can be accommodated*” (**paragraph 6.98, CS.02**). The most recent published assessment of potential improvements to the Ollerton Roundabout is set out in the 2010 District-Wide Transport Study, at which time a preferred improvement option costing £3.1m had recently been scrapped.
- 24.16 Insufficient evidence has been provided to support the emerging Core Strategy in determining the type and scale of improvements now required to the roundabout, and whether such improvements are capable of resolving not only the existing traffic pressure (as set out at **INF.01**), but also the growth in traffic volumes arising from the

planned development at the town and at Thoresby Colliery. The cumulative impact of this planned growth should be addressed in the evidence base.

- 24.17 As well as failing to set out a plan for improvements to the roundabout, funding is not identified in the Regulation 123 List and therefore will have to be met through individual S106 planning obligations. As those obligations can only fund works to directly mitigate the impact of individual developments additional funding may have to be sought to make up the shortfall; identifying a costed programme of works to the roundabout will assist in defining this. The absence of such a programme undermines the case for growth at the town as the pressure on the roundabout is already causing excessive use of unsuitable routes on the surrounding highway network<sup>1</sup>.

#### Public Transport Links

- 24.18 While Policy ShAP2 states that the Council will secure improved public transport links between Ollerton Town Centre and the surrounding Sherwood Area, neither the Policy nor the supporting evidence set out a mechanism for achieving this. This specific aim has been carried forward from Core Policy 11 of the adopted 2011 Core Strategy, aiming through “*strong and effective partnerships with service providers and the County Council*” to deliver improvements.
- 24.19 The NPPF is clear in stating that local plans should be “*aspirational but realistic*” and be based on co-operation with a range of stakeholders, including private sector organisations (paragraphs 154 and 157). The evidence base supporting this review of the Core Strategy does not provide any comfort that such partnerships already exist or will bring forward public transport link improvements. Indeed, the evidence acknowledges (**paragraph 4.7.26, INF.01**) that a recent review of subsidised bus services within the District led to a reduction in the number of buses between Newark-on-Trent and Ollerton, reducing the town’s sustainable transport links. We do not consider this aspect of the policy to be deliverable in any meaningful way.

---

<sup>1</sup> As acknowledged at paragraph 3.2.4 of the 2010 District-Wide Transport Study.

24.20 The evidence set out in support of this plan does not adequately support the proposed level of infrastructure expected to be required following development of Ollerton and Boughton, nor does it sufficiently explain how that infrastructure is to be delivered over the Plan period to meet the demands of the town's growth. Paragraph 173 of the NPPF requires that plans be deliverable, ensuring that obligations and policy burdens do not threaten the viability of the developments identified in the plan.

24.21 Paragraph 177 reminds local planning authorities to ensure that:

*"It is equally important to ensure that there is a reasonable prospect that planned infrastructure is deliverable in a timely fashion."*

24.22 Whilst the PPG cautions that LPAs should pay:

*"careful attention to providing an adequate supply of land, identifying what infrastructure is required and how it can be funded and brought on stream at the appropriate time"* (Paragraph: 018 Reference ID: 12-018-20140306)

24.23 As the evidence has not fully considered the scale of planning obligation costs likely to be required to mitigate the impacts of development at Ollerton, nor set out any likely timetable for the delivery of each key piece of infrastructure, we do not consider Policy ShAP2 to be deliverable.

24.24 Under-provision of the infrastructure required at Ollerton and Boughton will reduce the sustainability of the policy, and the wider growth strategy for the district, by creating an unsustainable growth pattern and exacerbating existing shortfalls in important service infrastructure. This includes placing unacceptable pressure on the local GP surgery and on Ollerton Roundabout.

24.25 It is important for the Core Strategy to implement a growth strategy based on fully funded infrastructure improvements and to focus growth efforts on those areas which are already well supported by high quality services and facilities. The Core Strategy expects to deliver a significant level of growth on a small number of strategic urban extensions early in the plan period. Failure to achieve this will lead to over-reliance on a small number of Opportunity Sites later on in the plan period; this is contrary to the Government's expectation that local plans seek to boost significantly the supply of housing and to deliver sustainable development.

24.26 The range of infrastructure requirements set out in Policy ShAP2 are not considered deliverable, and therefore undermine the Core Strategy's growth strategy. In line with our other Matter Statements we recommend that the Council and Inspector look to allocate additional Opportunity Sites to ensure that an appropriate growth strategy, capable of being delivered, can be implemented across the district to support a vibrant and viable economy.

Prepared by Tetlow King Planning