

WORK IN PROGRESS DOCUMENT – may be subject to change.

Item/Policy	Detail/requirement	Developer proposes	RBC comment	Trigger sought by consultees
<b>Primary School Contribution</b>	<p>A development of up to 210 dwellings on this site and the neighbouring allocation of up to 235 dwellings would generate a requirement for an additional 77 places at <b>£17,613</b> per place towards the current deficiency in primary places available in the planning area. However, this site would only generate a need for <b>21 additional spaces</b> based on 100 dwellings. This site, along with other sites which are proposed for allocation in the Local Plan, mean that</p>	<p>Accept the principle and the proposed pro-rate breakdown suggested by the County Council</p>	<p>Pro-rata approach seems fairest allocation of the existing capacity in the system and therefore officers agree with the approach adopted by the County Council.</p>	<p>TBC</p>

	<p>additional education provision will be required, either through extensions to existing provision. No feasibility study has been undertaken to understand the scope to expand provision at Candleby Lane School and it is not expected that additional provision can be delivered at Cotgrave CofE School. It is therefore requested that the Section 106 Agreements provide sufficient flexibility to enable the County Council to expend the contributions at another local primary school outside of the Cotgrave Planning Area if subsequent feasibility studies demonstrate that expansion of the Cotgrave Schools is unviable.</p>			
<p><b>Secondary School Provision</b></p>	<p>In relation to Secondary Education, they advise that the two allocated sites would generate a need for an additional 70 new</p>		<p>Agreed that this request is covered by the Authority's Community Infrastructure Policy (CIL).</p>	

	<p>secondary places and there is a deficiency in places available. As a result, the County Council would be seeking a total contribution across the two allocations of £1,697,570 (70 x <b>£24,251 per place</b>).</p>			
<p><b>A52 Improvements Contribution</b></p>	<p>Highways England state that they take responsibility for delivering infrastructure improvements required to support growth on the A52, whilst seeking appropriate local contributions proportional to the scale of impact through a developer contribution strategy. This approach is supported in Rushcliffe Core Strategy Policy 18. As part of the contribution strategy for this proposed development a sum of <b>£955.82</b> per-dwelling basis has been identified by Highways England in consultation with Rushcliffe Borough Council. This will be required by way of developer contributions.</p>	<p>Agrees to the principle of the request</p>	<p>The requested contributions from Highways England accord with the A52/A606 Improvement Package Developer Contributions Strategy Memorandum of Understanding and Policy 18 Rushcliffe Core Strategy. The applicant has agreed to provide them on a pro rata basis and the timing of the payment need to be considered and confirmed as part of the S106A discussions.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 20% of the A52 Improvements Contribution on first occupation</li> <li>• 80% of the A52 Improvements Contribution prior to Occupation of 75% of the Dwellings and not to allow Occupation of more than 75% of the Dwellings</li> </ul>

<p><b>Highway Improvements</b></p>	<p>A contribution (TBC) towards 30% of the cost of improving the A606 Melton Road/Cotgrave Road junction</p>	<p>Matter is being considered</p>	<p>Officers note the impact is arising in part from this, and the other developments proposed on the allocations within Cotgrave and that any improvement works to this junction do not appear to be covered by the MoU.</p>	<p>TBC</p>
<p><b>Green Spaces</b></p>	<p>A contribution of <b>£66,550</b> to expand the existing car Cotgrave Country Park parking facility is requested.</p>	<p>The applicant does not accept the request.</p>	<p>Officers agree that residents of this development are unlikely to place additional pressure on the car parking facility, which is already insufficient to accommodate the current traffic requirements and therefore the request does not relate to the “harm” generated by this proposal. <b>Request is not justified</b></p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p><b>The Bus Stop Improvements Contribution</b></p>	<p>Improvements to the two bus stops sought by planning condition:  RU0891 High Hazles Road  RU0892 High Hazles Road  New Eastbound Bus Stop – Real time bus stop pole &amp;</p>		<p>Officers note a degree of overlap with the works being sought by condition on this permission but by S106 for the application for up to 210 dwellings on the north side of Hollygate Lane.</p>	<p>TBC</p>

	<p>displays including associated electrical connections, polycarbonate bus shelter including lighting, raised boarding kerbs and a suitable lowered crossing point. New Westbound Bus Stop – Real time bus stop pole &amp; displays including associated electrical connections, polycarbonate bus shelter including lighting, raised boarding kerbs and a suitable lowered crossing point. Appropriate pedestrian access (footway) is required from the site entrance without the requirement to cross Hollygate Lane.</p>			
<p><b>Waste Collection</b></p>	<p>No request made, but officers note that for the site on the north of Hollygate Lane as contribution of <b>68.13 per dwelling</b> was sought.</p>		<p>Clarification should be sought from NCC re the need for a waste contribution.</p>	

<p><b>Sustainable Travel Contribution</b></p>	<p><b>None sought</b> as part of this application; however, a travel plan is requested to be conditional on the grant of ant permission. however the application on the North side of Hollygate Lane attracted a contribution request of £36,000 towards sustainable travel which may include, but not exclusively, the use of taster tickets for travel on public transport.</p>		<p>Clarification should be sought from NCC re the need for a sustainable travel contribution.</p>	
<p><b>Affordable Housing</b></p>	<p>Core Strategy Policy 8 requires 10% affordable housing:</p> <p>42% should be intermediate housing, 39% should be affordable rent and 19% should be social rent. Table of the breakdown on house types also provided in the comments from the affordable housing officer.</p> <p><b>Since applications are being determined post</b></p>		<p>The applicant has agreed in principle of providing 10% of affordable housing in accordance with Core Strategy Policy 8. As part of the S106A.</p> <p>The details of securing the affordable housing scheme would be included as part of the S106A. It is agreed that an affordable housing scheme could provide the necessary details of tenure</p>	<p>Provide details of affordable housing in an affordable housing scheme as part of the S106A which would include details of tenure mix, dwelling (size mix) details of the location, and the affordable housing provider.</p>

	<p><b>the 28 March 2022 transition agreement then First Homes will also need to be applied.</b></p>		<p>mix, dwelling (size mix) details of the location, and the affordable housing provider. However, the timing of this agreed to be agreed but it would be expected prior to the commencement of development on the site or as part of the reserved matters application once the layout and design is considered.</p>	
<p><b>Health</b></p>	<p>CCG standard formula require contribution of <b>£920 for each 2xbed dwelling and £600 for each 1x bedroom dwelling.</b></p>		<p>Agreed that this request is covered by the Authority's Community Infrastructure Levy Policy (CIL).</p>	
<p><b>NHS Hospitals Trust</b></p>	<p>A contribution of <b>£86,169.00</b> was requested to cover the cost to the NHS of emergency admissions generated by this level of housing.</p> <p>A development of 100 dwellings equates to 242 new residents (based on the current assumption of</p>		<p>The site is allocated in the Local Plan Part 2 and as such the population growth and impacts on the NHS have long been known. The NHS therefore should have planned for this level of population growth in the local area. Therefore, <b>the request is not considered to be justified</b> in this instance.</p>	<p>N/A</p>

	<p>2.42 people per dwelling as adopted by relevant council Council's Education team). Using existing 2016 demographic data as detailed in the calculations in Appendix 2 will generate 323 acute interventions over the period of 12 months.</p> <p>Emergency admissions: 33  For the 24 emergency admissions, representing 10% of the residents, the Trust will have no method of recovering the 80% of tariff needed to invest in the stepped change needed for services. <b>Formula:</b>  <b>Emergency admissions - Development Population x Average Emergency Admission Activity Rate per Head of Population x Average Emergency Tariff x 80% Cost per Emergency Admission Activity = Developer Contribution.</b></p>			
--	---	--	--	--



	<p>Premium Costs:</p> <p>For all the 323 anticipated hospital-based interventions, the Trust will have no method of recovering the additional Premium Costs needed to ensure the level of service required. <b>Formula: Development Population x Average Admission Activity Rate per Head of Population x Average Tariff x proportion of Trust staff cost of total cost (58%) x NHSI Agency Premium Cap (55%) = Developer Contribution.</b></p>			
<p><b>Open Space</b></p>	<p>The Rushcliffe Playing Pitch Strategy 2017 identifies a current shortfall of pitch provision that this development would worsen. Based on 100 dwellings and an <b>average of 2.3 residents per dwelling</b> this equates to 230 new residents which will create additional</p>	<p>Agrees to the principle of the requested provision being provided as indicated in the indicative masterplan.</p>	<p>As we are only considering the principle of development (and access) at this stage; the location, size and management of open space within the site cannot be considered in detail. The applicant has agreed to the provision of open space within the site and for details to be provided as part of an Open Space Scheme. The details of it can be secured by</p>	<p>TBC</p>

	<p>demand which can't be met by existing provision.  <u>Children's play</u></p> <p>For Children's play on site provision of equipped play space <b>Local equipped area for Play (LEAP)</b> equivalent of <b>0.25 hectares per 1,000 = 0.0575 hectares is required onsite within the allocation area covered by the three applications.</b> With regards the siting and location of the play area proposed I would draw attention to The Fields in Trust National Playing Fields Association General Design Principles Guidance (attached). 6.1.9 states that play areas should be sited in open, welcoming locations and visible from nearby dwelling or well used pedestrian routes.</p> <p><u>Unequipped play/ amenity public open</u></p>		<p>the S106A and considered in detail at the reserved matters stage.</p> <p>Also, with the allocation comprising three separate planning applications (and legal agreements) a mechanism to ensure that one site is provided on the allocation will be required.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

	<p>Unequipped play/ amenity public open space equivalent for unequipped children's play/ amenity open space provision as a new site we would expect on site <b>provision of unequipped play space of at least 0.55= 0.1265 hectares is required</b> (onsite).</p> <p><u>Sports and Leisure provision</u></p> <p>This development will be liable for a Community Infrastructure Levy (<b>CIL</b>) for sports and leisure provision <u>Allotments</u></p> <p>The Rushcliffe Borough Council Leisure Facilities Strategy 2017-2027 <b>requires 0.4 hectares of provision for allotments per 1,000 population</b> on-site (i.e., within the allocation covered by the three applications). Cotgrave town Council are</p>			
--	--	--	--	--

	98% occupied but and operating a waiting list so 0.092 hectares is required.			
<b>Monitoring Fee</b>	S106 monitoring costs of <b>£273 per principal obligation X by the number of years</b> over which monitoring will be required.	Agrees to the principle of proving a monitoring fee but the actual amount is TBA	The approach is accepted but the actual overall monitoring fee shall be agreed with the applicant prior to the conclusion of the S106A.	Prior to Commencement of Development to pay to the Borough Council the Monitoring Fee Not to Commence Development until the Monitoring Fee has been paid to the Borough Council.
<b>Indexation</b>	All financial contributions subject to indexation using Retail Price Index or the BCIS All-in Tender Price Index as appropriate	TBA	TBA	TBA
<b>Legal Costs</b>	With all Sect 106 agreements, the applicant is required to pay the Council's legal fees. In this instance these would be <b>£2,000.</b>	TBC	Required to complete agreement.	To be paid on completion of agreement.