| | Site | 221 Allen | by/Halam Road |
|--|------|-----------|---|
| Policies | | NP | Application |
| Sustainable Development: | | | |
| SD1 Delivering Sustainable Development | | | Regimented layout doesn't conform to Design Guide |
| Environment: | | | |
| E1 – Flood Risk Assessments and Mitigation | | | |
| E2 – Flood Resilient Design | | | not adequately demonstrated; enormous balancing pond |
| E3 - Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity | | | Grubbed up much of the central hedge in spite of it being important landscape vegetation, and chopped down trees. Buffer strip with hedge in NW corner is inadequate. |
| E4 – Public Rights of Way | | | RoWs along east and south boundaries, the latter reduced to an urban alley |
| E5 – Green Link | | | n/a |
| E6 – Climate Change and Carbon Emissions | | | n/a |
| Design and the Historic Environment: | | | 1,0 |
| DH1 – Sense of Place | | | ОК |
| DH2 – Public Realm | | | |
| DH3 – Historic Environment | | | OK |
| | | | n/a |
| Transport and Access: | | | |
| TA1 – Cycle and Pedestrian Routes | | | OK |
| TA2 – Public Transport Connectivity | | | just over 400m? Increase in traffic likely to affect Halloughton Road as |
| TA3 – Highways Impact | | | traffic uses the rat run to Nottingham Road |
| TA4 – Parking Standards | | | |
| TA5 – Parking Strategy | | | n/a |
| Community Facilities: | | | |
| CF1 – Identified Assets | | | n/a |
| CF2 – Green and Open Spaces and Burial Grounds | | | n/a |
| CF3 – Primary Shopping Frontage | | | n/a |
| CF4 – Tourism | | | n/a |
| Housing and Employment: | | | |
| HE1 – Housing Type and Density | | | |
| Dwelling numbers | | 65 | 67 |
| %age of types | 1b | | 8 |
| | 2b | 1+2b=60% | 31 1+2 b = 58% |
| | 3b | 3b=15% | |
| | 4b | 4b+=25% | |
| | 5b | | 3 4+5b = 24% |
| | 6+b | | 5 4.55 - 24.5 |
| bungalows | | | |
| HE2 – Affordable Housing Provision | | | |
| Affordable % | | 35% | |
| Social % | | 30% | 30.00% |
| HE4 – Economic Development | | | 30.00% |
| Site Specific Policy compliance: | | 11/ a | |
| | | | doesn't address the transition into the town layout very urban and regimented, beyond the central |
| | | | area |
| | | | |
| | | | Grubbed up much of the central hedge in spite of it being important landscape vegetation, and chopped down trees. Buffer strip with hedge in NW corner is inadequate. |
| | | | being important landscape vegetation, and chopped down trees. Buffer strip with hedge in NW corner is inadequate. RoWs retained |
| | | | being important landscape vegetation, and chopped down trees. Buffer strip with hedge in NW corner is inadequate. |
| | | | being important landscape vegetation, and chopped down trees. Buffer strip with hedge in NW corner is inadequate. RoWs retained Play area tucked at the back rather than in the central |
| | | | being important landscape vegetation, and chopped down trees. Buffer strip with hedge in NW corner is inadequate. RoWs retained Play area tucked at the back rather than in the central |
| | | | being important landscape vegetation, and chopped down trees. Buffer strip with hedge in NW corner is inadequate. RoWs retained Play area tucked at the back rather than in the central |
| | | | being important landscape vegetation, and chopped down trees. Buffer strip with hedge in NW corner is inadequate. RoWs retained Play area tucked at the back rather than in the central |
| Appendix 1 – Southwell Design Guide | | | being important landscape vegetation, and chopped down trees. Buffer strip with hedge in NW corner is inadequate. RoWs retained Play area tucked at the back rather than in the central |
| Appendix 1 – Southwell Design Guide | | | being important landscape vegetation, and chopped down trees. Buffer strip with hedge in NW corner is inadequate. RoWs retained Play area tucked at the back rather than in the central |
| Appendix 1 – Southwell Design Guide | | | being important landscape vegetation, and chopped down trees. Buffer strip with hedge in NW corner is inadequate. RoWs retained Play area tucked at the back rather than in the central |