



Woodborough Parish Council Response to GBC Local Development Plan Consultation August 2025

Chapter 1 - Introduction

Question INT3 Updating the evidence base

Key Settlement Review (not being updated)

We agree with the findings of the Key Settlement Review which find that Woodborough is not a key settlement but is classified as 'other'. However, given the complete lack of facilities in the village and the infrequent bus service to access facilities in other settlements, we would argue that the AECOM score for the village should be scored low in this regard rather than the existing medium-low on accessibility. The findings are appropriate for a high-level review, but when considering where significant amounts of new development should be located including in these 'other villages', further analysis of these findings is required to ensure development is located in the most sustainable locations.

Chapter 2 Climate Change

Flood Risk Section - General comment

Flood Risk is a significant issue for the whole of the country and its significance is reflected in the NPPF. To rely on a Flood Risk Report from 2009 and for the GNSP not to update its flood risk evidence seems to be a fundamental flaw in the preparation of this plan.

This plan will impact communities for the next 15 years, therefore there needs to be some detailed consideration of where development should be located in relation to flood risk and climate change. Woodborough has been, and continues to be, seriously impacted by both flood water and surface water run-off, a situation exacerbated by its topography and lack of investment in any flood mitigation measures. As a Parish Council we strongly object to a plan that seeks to add further development without properly considering how it will affect this situation. We believe from the outset this will lead to the plan being unsound.

As flooding is such a critical issue for many communities in Gedling this is an issue upon which we believe further evidence is required before sites can be appropriately allocated.

Question CC5 - The sequential test should be for the whole of Gedling.

Question CC6 - Given how serious the flood risk case is, for there to be exemptions for sites in higher flood risk areas, these have to be fully evidenced and justified and only considered in the most sustainable

locations.

Question CC7 - If drainage systems were implemented in the construction phase, this would reduce the risk of run off during construction and the likelihood of nearby residents being impacted. We would therefore strongly support this policy wording. This would need regular monitoring during the construction phase in order to hold developers to account and make changes where appropriate. The developer contribution would need to be sufficient to ensure that drainage systems and flood alleviation were incorporated into the development for the long-term, not just during construction phase.

Chapter 3 – Spatial Strategy

Question SS1 - We agree with the spatial strategy which directs development to the most sustainable locations. For reasons given in the body of this response, we would question whether Woodborough is a sustainable location for medium to large developments.

Question SS3 - Any development in 'other villages' has to be proportionate to the size of that settlement and the services it contains and importantly its accessibility to services in larger settlements.

The 'other' settlements all have different roles and functions and provide varied opportunities and constraints to development. This definition has to be carefully considered and should not be a blanket numbers approach.

For example, other villages in Gedling Borough may be smaller settlements but have better public transport links to nearby urban areas in terms of trains, trams or proximity to the M1 and could potentially accommodate more development than a larger settlement with limited public transport options such as Woodborough.

Woodborough has limited infrastructure which does not even meet the needs of current residents. Referring to definition given at 4.17 of the consultation report:

- The main road through the village is narrow, reducing to single carriageway access at points due to positioning of historic cottages. At several points on the main street there is no pavement to one side of the road.
- Drainage is insufficient to cope with periods of rain and there is no common flood protection. Residents in particularly vulnerable properties have had to spend considerable amounts of their own money to protect their own properties. This individual approach is entirely understandable but has exacerbated the overall situation by channelling the surface flood water more tightly.
- Public transport is limited to one bus service which runs less frequently during evenings and weekends.
- Whilst there is a primary school and a privately run pre-school, children have to leave the village to attend secondary school from the age of 11. This increases traffic as parents largely drive their children to school.
- There are no community services such as libraries or youth activities. Whilst there are cubs and guide groups that meet in the village hall, the Woodborough Scout group meet in nearby Calverton as there are not sufficient facilities in the village for them. It is not feasible to walk along the road to Calverton as there is no pavement on the 50 mph road.

- There are no health or social care facilities in Woodborough. Residents have to travel to Calverton or Lowdham to access medical services and pharmacies.
- There are no waste recycling facilities in the village, residents have to be able to drive to Calverton Recycling Centre or pay a premium for a private company to remove.
- There is one small shop in Woodborough which also offers limited post office services. However, under the current ownership it has very limited stock and unpredictable opening hours. It currently does not open at weekends or in the evenings when residents may need it most. Again, this means that residents have to rely on having vehicle access to other local shopping centres.
- Internet connection and mobile phone signal in Woodborough are patchy and slow due to the topography and the limited cable options.
- There are limited employment and training opportunities in Woodborough.

Woodborough residents are ultimately reliant on the car to access services and facilities, this will not change as result of new housebuilding on the sites shown. Any significant development on the west side of the village will considerably add to the traffic on Mapperley Plains in both directions. This is already a busy trunk road in to the city and will be under further pressure as the development currently underway near Brookfields Garden Centre is completed and inhabited. This road will need investment to ensure that it meets the needs of approved development, without adding further pressure from other potential developments.

The NPPF is clear that plans should promote a sustainable pattern of development that seeks to: meet the development needs of their area and align growth and infrastructure. In defining 'other settlements' it is clear these are the least capable of accommodating development but equally the differences between these villages needs to be recognised and only development proportionate to the services offered or access to services be planned for.

All factors such as flood risk, heritage, highways must be considered when determining what is an appropriate amount of development for these villages.

We believe that the AECOM settlement assessment does not adequately consider these points and we feel a more detailed review of each of the other villages and their ability to accommodate development should be undertaken. Growth should be aligned with infrastructure and the Gedling Plan should follow this by ensuring development is located where it can be supported by infrastructure including; services, facilities and good public transport links.

Question SS4 - We feel that Gedling Council actually needs to look at each option carefully and decide which one will have the least amount of harm as a whole not just which one might classify as previously developed.

Given the level of required development, Gedling should consider whether an entirely new, carefully planned, separate settlement should be developed on a larger site. This could then be planned with sufficient infrastructure and amenities to support it.

Chapter 4 - Housing

Question HOU 2 - There would appear to be no justification to exceed the housing need figures.

Question HOU 26

Woodborough is not suitable for significant developments for the reasons stated below:

The proposed site to the west of the village (G44) has been identified in the Pre-feasibility Report by ARUP, commissioned by the Environment Agency, as the optimum site for major flood alleviation scheme as it captures two thirds of the run-off water from the surrounding valley. This is the main source of flooding through the main street and into residents' homes. In October 2023 this led to 51 homes being internally flooded and there were 19 separate road closures over the winter of 2023/24.

This site remains the optimum site for flood alleviation as confirmed by the EA and Nottinghamshire County Council this year. Under paragraph (172b) of the NPPF, this land should be disregarded for development and safeguarded for future flood works to be undertaken.

Whilst the site to the east (G42) would appear to be preferable as water does not run off from this direction in to the village, it serves a valuable function as a flood plain, ensuring that the water leaves the village and does not back up and cause more extensive homes to flood internally.

Vehicle access to this site would be on to Lowdham Lane near to a sharp bend and where the road is narrow.

The larger site (G835) would be accessed from Shelt Hill which would need to be widened to allow for greater traffic as part of any development. The road to the east then joins the Epperstone bypass at a difficult and well hidden mini-roundabout. An increase in traffic at this junction would exacerbate an already potential accident black-spot and would need further consideration and investment as part of any scheme. At the other end of Shelt Hill as it joins Main Street, the road narrows still further and leads to a blind bend where it joins the main road through the village.

Part of the land identified as (G835) is subject to flooding and the run-off would then effect the site at (G42).

The site in the centre of the village (G826) is a protected green space as a reflection of the rural nature of the village. This is a valued open space which was identified as a green space and nothing has changed in the meantime to alter this designation.

Any developments in the centre of the village would need significant work to be undertaken to the central sewerage system as there is clear evidence that these already become rapidly overwhelmed with water run-off and exacerbate flooding. Manhole covers lift due to the amount of water and water levels rise in residents' toilets, which serves as an early warning to flooding.

Any development in Woodborough would require considerable mitigation in terms of flood alleviation and water flow. Opportunities could be used to improve the local area in terms of infrastructure and amenities.

This would require careful consideration in terms of design of housing, access by car and public transport, health, social care and education services as well as increased pressure on current, limited infrastructure and amenities.

Our concern would be that the small nature of most of the allocations would not provide any opportunities to improve the local area. We would want these opportunities quantified and evidenced as we are not clear what they are or might be and at what scale.

The impacts are clear, more people having to use a car to access services and facilities, impact on surface and flood water, more cars parked in the area and issues with highway safety, impact on heritage assets, but again where does the plan recognise this and how would this be mitigated?

The plan refers to potential opportunities for the area, as a Parish Council we would need clear information as to what this might refer to.

When releasing land from the Green Belt there should be benefits other than housing and green belt boundaries should only be altered where exceptional circumstances are fully evidenced and justified through the preparation or updating of plans. As a Parish we do not feel there is enough evidence to justify the release of the land around Woodborough from the Green Belt and we would expect to see more.

The guidance is clear that where it is necessary to release Green Belt land for development, plans should give priority to previously developed land, then consider grey belt which is not previously developed and then other Green Belt locations. It is clear the land shown as proposed housing allocations around Woodborough is neither previously developed nor could be assessed as Grey Belt and therefore should only be considered as a last resort when all other options have been explored.

If development is to come forward it has to be proportional to the size of the village, the lack of services and limited accessibility. Therefore only small scale.

Question HOU 27 – As above answer, that it is an unsustainable location and is not where national guidance (the NPPF) directs development as there is a huge reliance on the car to access the most basic of services.

Chapter 5 – Green Belt

In respect of Woodborough we are not aware of any green belt assessment that has been undertaken to understand which areas of land around Woodborough meet the 5 purposes of Green Belt and which could potentially be released to housing without undermining the purpose of the Green Belt allocation.

The green belt around Woodborough serves to safeguard the countryside from encroachment pressure and preserve the setting and character of historic towns. Residents regularly report seeing birds of prey, deer, hares and a multitude of other wildlife species in the surrounding fields and woodlands. Woodborough is essentially a rural, agricultural village rather than based on industrial heritage or urban sprawl.

We note that the Council recognises that a Green Belt Assessment is required and we hope this will provide a detailed analysis of the boundaries of the inset villages and the proposed allocations.

Question GB 4 - This is critical as the whole basis of government policy is to achieve sustainable development. Before allocating any development in the other settlements a full understanding of their sustainability and if this can be improved needs to be understood. The AECOM study being relied upon is high level and can be used as a starting point but should not be relied upon when comparing settlements and deciding where development can go.

Chapter 8 – Housing Mix

Question MIX 7 - Yes there is agreement, but these sites would need to be within the defined settlement boundary, not be defined as green belt and not in areas where there is clear evidence that further development would exacerbate flooding and surface water.

Chapter 10 – Historic Environment

Question HIS 1

Any policies regarding heritage assets needs to follow the guidance as set out in the NPPF. All proposals which have the potential to impact a heritage asset should be supported by heritage assessments which fully identify the significance of that asset, the potential harm caused by the development and any benefits to weigh in its favour.

Woodborough has an extensive conservation area with 16 listed buildings and numerous non designated heritage assets, some of which are listed in the Domesday Book. Any future development needs to have regard to the impact on heritage and this needs to be recognised as a constraint to development in the village. Many of these valued historical sites are already being made more vulnerable due to increased incidences of flooding and increased traffic through the village, much of which is generated by traffic passing through the village rather than by Woodborough residents using the roads.

Chapter 11 – Local Services

Question SERV 1 – Please refer back to response to question SS3 under Chapter 3 Spatial Strategy for response to this question.

Chapter 14 – Blue-Green Infrastructure, Parks and Open Space

Question BGI4 – There are a further three areas that we feel should be identified as ‘Green Spaces’ in Woodborough:

- The playing field off Lingwood Lane, behind the village hall. This space is used extensively for leisure by the residents and is owned by the Parish Council. On a regular basis the playing field is used for children's football (with up to 100 boys and girls playing and training weekly), adult football, cricket and fitness classes, as well as dog walking and casual leisure. It is the site of popular village events such as summer fair, Feast Sports and the firework display.
- Ploughman's Wood. This is one of the few remaining ancient woodlands in the county and considered a part of the original Sherwood Forest. It has been in existence since at least the 1400s but probably has much earlier origins. It is a haven for wildlife as well as providing a beautiful place for residents of both Woodborough and Lambley to walk. It sits between the parishes of Lowdham, Woodborough and Lambley. It is managed by the Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust.
- Smalls Croft. The green spaces in the centre of the Smalls Croft development provide a popular green space for all residents of the village and should be protected so that it can be retained.

This response has been discussed in great detail and agreed unanimously by Woodborough Parish Council at its Extraordinary meeting on 27/8/25 for submission to Gedling Borough Council as part of their Gedling Development Plan Consultation.

**Woodborough Parish Council
27th August 2025**

www.woodboroughpc.org.uk

Chair – Liz Anderson

Clerk – Averil Marczak

4 Knighton Rd, Woodthorpe, Nottingham, NG5 4FL

0115 8498195

clerk@woodboroughpc.org.uk